

JPRS 76230

14 August 1980

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

NO. 8, May 1980



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.

14 August 1980

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 8, May 1980

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

CONTENTS

Appeal of Communists to the Peoples of European Countries for Peace and Disarmament	1
On the Results of the Paris Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe	4
At the CC CPSU Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers	5
Marxism-Leninism and the Modern Era	7
Lenin in the Historical Destinies of the Peoples of the East (Yumzhagin Tsedenbal)	17
USSR Banking System in Action (V. Alkhimov)	35
Economic Machinery and Planned Price Setting (N. Glushkov)	48
What Is Great Cannot Be Forgotten (I. Bagramyan)	66
Soldiers and Home Guard: Writer's Notes (G. Frolov)	83
Invincible Fraternal Alliance (Paul Verner)	96
Great Power of the Revolution	108
The Anti-Marxist Movement in the PRC (V. Lazarev)	119

CONTENTS (continued)

In the Labyrinth of the 'Mass Society' (G. Oganov)	135
Outstanding Page in the History of Soviet Economic Thought (L. Abalkin)	150
Devastation of the Soul (Al. Romanov).	158
Bookshelf	162
Obituary of Oleg Dmitriyevich Sokolov	165

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 8,
May 1980

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : May 1980

Signed to press : 22 May 1980

Copies : 912,000

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

APPEAL OF COMMUNISTS TO THE PEOPLES OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES FOR PEACE AND
DISARMAMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 3-4

[Text] You are alarmed by the reckless acceleration of the arms race.

People of the European countries, you are right to be vigilant.

The means of destruction and death stockpiled on our so-densely populated continent, or aimed against it, are a major threat to our common fate. You also know what monstrous waste, what huge funds are being diverted from the satisfaction of the daily needs and future development of the European peoples and nations. You see the tremendous harm which the recently mounted campaign of military psychosis, aimed at resuming the cold war, is causing to peace, detente, mutual trust and international cooperation.

Yet, it is planned to place new nuclear arsenals in the heart of Europe; new attempts are undertaken to destroy the results of detente; concluded agreements, talks under way, and economic, cultural, sports and human relations are being openly questioned.

The peoples of our continent paid a stiff price for the opportunity to determine the real cost of peace and lasting friendship and cooperation. The 35th anniversary of the victory over Hitlerism helps us better to feel the extent to which peace is one of the primary rights of man and a necessary human blessing.

All of us who are building our lives in a European country could lose everything as a result of this dangerous escalation. Let us eliminate the very possibility of the death of this part of the globe whose essential human and economic potential is needed by all mankind. Let us protect its natural and historical riches which are part of the property of man on earth.

Whoever we may be and wherever we may be living in Europe, we could only benefit from the solution of existing problems through talks; we could

only benefit from a reduction of armaments and armed forces, and from progress in disarmament, consistent with the requirements of the equal and guaranteed security of all states and nations.

The forces necessary for achieving this objective exist.

We, communists, are champions of peace. We want disarmament, cooperation and friendship among the peoples. That is why we say that peace is our common cause and that our joint struggle could insure the triumph of this cause.

Let us:

Aim at revoking the NATO decisions on the production and deployment of new American missiles in Europe or for a real stop in the implementation of these decisions in order to initiate effective talks on the matter of medium-range missiles under conditions of equality and equal security;

Together aim at the soonest possible ratification of the SALT II treaty and at continuing talks on the further reduction of nuclear armaments;

Struggle for decisive changes in the Vienna talks and for the reduction of armed forces and armaments, and support all partial measures in that direction, including the creation on our continent of nuclear-free zones with guarantees preventing the use of such weapons against them;

Struggle jointly for holding the Madrid meeting on European security and cooperation in 1980. Let us give ourselves the assignment of progressing in the implementation by all countries of all stipulations of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, particularly by strengthening political with military detente;

Aim at convening in Warsaw a European conference on military detente and disarmament;

Demand the implementation of the decisions of the special United Nations disarmament session;

Aim at the funds thus released being channeled into development and struggle with hunger, as has been proposed by the nonaligned countries. This is consistent with the interests of all mankind.

Yes, the struggle for disarmament is paramount today!

We, the communists of all European countries, are ready, when it is a question of a struggle for peace and disarmament, to engage in any type of dialog or talk, and for any joint action. We would like all peace-loving forces to rally around this objective. Whatever our nationality, convictions, or way of life may be, we are telling all of you, communists, socialists, social democrats, Christians and people of other faiths:

"Peace is our common property!"

Gathered in this meeting, we proclaim our aspiration toward an open initiative within which the broadest possible contacts would be established and the broadest possible dialog would take place. We are prepared, in ways agreeable to all, to engage in consultations and exchange of views with all forces in Europe, brimming with the resolve to act in the spirit of Helsinki and in anticipation of Madrid, in the interest of the continuation of the policy of detente and of finding ways for the reduction of armaments on our continent.

Men and women of good will, let us act together in each separate and in Europe as a whole.

The cause of progress, happiness and peace shall win through unity.

5003

CSO: 1802

ON THE RESULTS OF THE PARIS MEETING OF COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES OF EUROPE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 p 5

[CC CPSU statement]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee considered the report of the CPSU delegation to the Paris peace and disarmament meeting of communist and workers' parties of Europe and approved its activities.

The CPSU Central Committee deems that the Paris meeting will provide important political incentive for the struggle against the threat of war.

The CPSU Central Committee supports the initiatives formulated in the "Appeal to the Peoples of the European Countries for Peace and Disarmament" adopted at the meeting. On their basis, as well as in accordance with any other possible suggestions in that direction, the CPSU is ready to cooperate with all communist and workers' parties of Europe and with all other political parties and public organizations for the sake of achieving these vital objectives.

The CPSU Central Committee ascribes essential significance to the fact that the participants in the meeting unanimously expressed their desire that their parties aim at achieving a turn in the development of international circumstances with a view to defending the peace, the continuation and intensification of detente, and the addition of military to political detente. What is very important under contemporary conditions is that all delegations emphasized the need to rebuff the aggressive imperialists, American above all, policy which is responsible for the continuation and expansion of the arms race which is intensifying the threat of war. The main task in this struggle is to prevent a new round in the arms race on the continent, a danger created, above all, by the December 1979 NATO Council decision on the production and placement of American medium-range missiles in Western Europe.

The CPSU Central Committee has instructed the corresponding party and soviet organizations to take the necessary measures to help the implementation of the conclusions and initiatives formulated at the Paris peace and disarmament meeting of communist and workers' parties of Europe.

5003

CSO: 1802

AT THE CC CPSU POLITBURO, USSR SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDUM AND USSR COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 6-7

[Text] After considering the results of the 14-15 May 1980 anniversary conference of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact members, in Warsaw, the CC CPSU Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers fully approve the activities of the delegation of the Soviet Union, headed by L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman.

The one-quarter of a century which has elapsed since the conclusion of the Warsaw Pact indicates that the multilateral alliance among socialist states is the biggest factor for peace in Europe and on a universal scale. It reliably protects the socialist gains of its members and actively serves the interests of peaceful cooperation.

The Warsaw Pact members have always favored the development and intensification of detente and a radical improvement of the international political climate. Once again this was weightily confirmed by the declaration adopted at the conference of the Political Consultative Committee, held in the capital of the Polish People's Republic.

This important political document offers a profound analysis of the contemporary European and international situation and shows the reasons for its aggravation. The imperialist and hegemonistic forces are trying to work up the arms race. They are creating conflict situations, which increases the threat of war. At their latest May session the NATO leading organs once again passed decisions in that direction. The members of the Warsaw Pact are countering the dangerous NATO course with a broad program of action aimed at eliminating the threat of a resumption of the cold war, strengthening trust and mutual understanding in international relations, and channeling the course of events into a healthy and peaceful bed. They energetically call for the strict and full implementation of all principles and stipulations of the Final Act adopted at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Madrid meeting, to be held in the autumn of 1980, and the convening and fruitful work of a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe could play an important constructive role in European affairs.

The decisions of the conference of the Political Consultative Committee are aimed at providing a new strong impetus to the process of detente. The Soviet people express the hope that the initiatives of the socialist countries will meet with the understanding and support of public opinion and the peoples and governments of Western countries.

The arms race urged on by the United States and other NATO members forces the members of the Warsaw Pact to take the necessary measures to strengthen their defense capability. However, all of their measures in this area have neither threatened nor are threatening the security of any country.

Disarmament was, and remains, the socialist ideal. The members of the Warsaw Pact are aiming at reaching agreements in all current talks on disarmament and at the resumption of talks in areas where they have broken down. In this respect the enactment of the SALT II treaty, whose ratification the American side is continuing to delay, would be of major significance. Talks on limiting medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe are necessary and possible. The proposals of the Soviet Union in this respect are known: Should NATO revoke the decision to produce and place new types of American medium-range nuclear missiles, or at least stop its implementation, talks may be initiated on this important matter.

The conference of the Political Consultative Committee has become a new proof of the deep attachment felt by the fraternal countries to the principles of internationalism and their invariable solidarity with all peoples fighting for the strengthening of their political and economic independence and the right to control their own destinies. Firmly condemning the gross interference of imperialist and hegemonist forces in the internal affairs of other countries, they firmly favor the settling of existing conflicts through political means and indicate the specific ways which could lead to the unraveling of the tangled knots in international politics.

The CC CPSU Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers ascribe great importance to the proposal for a summit meeting by heads of states of all parts of the globe in the immediate future. Such a meeting could focus the attention on key problems of international life and define means for the elimination of hotbeds of international tension and for the prevention of war.

The Warsaw Pact members aim at the continuation and intensification of the dialog among countries belonging to different social systems and extensive interaction among all peace-loving forces. The conference of the Political Consultative Committee offer accurate guidelines for progress in consolidating the peace in Europe and throughout the world.

The CC CPSU Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers are convinced that the friendship and unity among the fraternal socialist countries, and the further development of their cooperation with peace-loving states and broad public forces will lead to new successes in the policy of detente and will make the 1980's years of peace and peaceful construction.

MARXISM-LENINISM AND THE MODERN ERA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 8-16

Opening speech at the International Scientific Conference in Moscow
15 April 1980 by N. Zingales, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee]

[Text] The scientific conference "Marxism-Leninism and the Modern Era" is devoted to a significant date—the 110th anniversary of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin's birth.

We are celebrating this glorious anniversary under conditions where the Soviet people, implementing the historic decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, are carrying out peaceful communist building. Relying on the country's colossal material and spiritual potential and combining the advantages of the socialist system with the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, our party and people are resolving new revolutionary creative tasks, increased in terms of both scale and complexity. We are directing our efforts toward developing the country's production forces in every possible way, further strengthening its political, economic and defense might and raising the Soviet people's material and cultural living standards. Our people are greeting the Lenin anniversary in a situation of inviolable ideological, political and social cohesion and of fraternal unity of all the Soviet Nation's nations and nationalities.

Mass socialist competition for a fitting greetings to the Lenin jubilee and a successful completion of the 10th Five-Year Plan has been widely developed in the country. Soviet people are full of confidence in the creative forces of the motherland and the correctness of the policy of Lenin's communist party. "We communists believe, and not only believe—we are convinced, we know—that the 80's will be years of new successes in communist building," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CC CPSU and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, stated at his meeting with the voters of Moscow's Bauman'skiy Electoral Okrug. "They will be years of the strengthening and development of world socialism and further headway in the struggle to insure lasting peace."

Our optimism rests on an unshakable theoretical and ideological foundation—Marxism-Leninism, the time-tested teaching on the revolutionary

transformation of the world. Lenin's ideas, his selfless service of the cause of the liberation of the working class and all the working people, the cause of building the new society, his very life and activity, are all a great example to every member of our party, to every Soviet person--a vital, moral example against which we measure our every step. Lenin lives on in our hearts and minds, in our deeds, plans and forecasts for the future; his ideas have become an integral part of our Soviet reality.

The Lenin jubilee is being celebrated by all progressive mankind and the millions of fighters for peace and socialism. And that is perfectly natural. The course of present-day social development confirms the great vitality of Lenin's teaching and its enduring significance for the international working class, communist and workers' movement, and the national liberation struggle of all the world's people's. Leninism has been, is, and will continue to be the revolutionary banner of our era--the era of mankind's transition from capitalism to communism.

A consistent continuer of the cause of Marx and Engels, Lenin comprehensively developed Marxist theory under the conditions of the preparation and enactment of the proletariat's decisive battles to liberate the working people from capitalist exploitation and social oppression and to build a new society.

Lenin ushered in a new stage in the development of Marxism and enriched all its component parts--philosophy, political economy and scientific communism. The great leader and theorist of the working class and all the liberation forces of our time, he raised the development of the social sciences to a new level. For instance, it is well known that Lenin, better than anyone, was able to appreciate the importance of the revolution in natural sciences at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries and of its philosophical consequences and revealed the reasons for the methodological crisis of science and ways of escaping it. "Materialism and Empirio-criticism" remains an outstanding example of Lenin's scientific creativity. Time has entirely confirmed the truth and tremendous revolutionizing significance of this classic work by Lenin.

Lenin attached paramount importance to elaborating the problems of the Marxist world outlook and materialist dialectics. He has gone down in the history of science as an extremely great thinker who, taking Marx' teaching as his basis and developing it, was able to reveal profoundly and comprehensively the fundamental laws and trends of social development in the new era, to generalize world experience of the revolutionary liberation struggle and to find ways of victoriously resolving the tasks of the socialist revolution.

After analyzing capitalism's evolution in the time since the publication of Marx' "Das Kapital," Lenin elaborated his teaching on imperialism as the highest and final stage of capitalism. Present-day reality fully confirms the exceptional perspicacity of Vladimir Il'ich, who described imperialism

as decaying, parasitical, dying capitalism, reactionary in every respect. The capitalist system is in a state of general crisis and of the aggravation of its antagonistic contradictions. The attempts to resolve these through ruthless exploitation of the working people, the suppression of their class protest and the strengthening of the monopolies' omnipotence, and especially the swelling of the military-industrial complex, and also through the pursuit of an aggressive foreign policy directed against world socialism and the people's independence and freedom--a policy fraught with the threat of a world thermonuclear holocaust--are doomed to failure.

Lenin discovered the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism, showed the objective laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism, including the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country or several, and defined the paths of development of the world revolutionary process under the conditions of the general crisis of capitalism.

"A wise, difficult and complex science" is what Lenin called social revolution. Lenin developed the Marxist theory of socialist revolution, equipping with it the international working class and its militant vanguard--the communist and workers' parties. Lenin's teaching on the revolutionary situation, on the leading role of the working class and its allies, on the revolutionary party and on the dictatorship of the proletariat has been practically verified in the October and subsequent revolutions.

Lenin elaborated the theory of the building of socialism and communism, which became the action program for the creators of the new society.

Leninism grew up, strengthened and was tempered in the fierce struggle against class enemies and currents hostile to scientific socialism, including ones that used the flag of Marxism as cover. In his theoretical works and the practice of the revolutionary struggle Lenin ruthlessly exposed bourgeois ideology, debunked social reformism and revealed the dangerousness of right-wing opportunism and left-wing "ultrarevolutionariness," which condemned the workers' movement to defeat.

Creatively developing the Marxist theory of the class struggle in conformity with the new stage of world development, Lenin was the brilliant strategist and tactician of the proletarian revolutionary movement and the organizer and leader of the Russian Communist Party and working people's masses, which accomplished the first-ever victorious socialist revolution.

Lenin showed that the working class can fulfill its historic mission only if it is cohesive, organized and equipped with a scientific theory. Lenin rightly saw the new type of political party, which he created, tempered and brought to a worldwide-historic victory, as the chief means of achieving this and the main organizational and political force of the revolutionary class.

One of Lenin's contemporaries, the British historian, writer and journalist Ralph Fox, wrote: ". . . He will go down in the annals of history as not only the leader of the Russian revolution but also the creator of a new kind of political life, a new type of political party. In the Bolshevik party that emerged in this struggle and in the disputes under Lenin's leadership, history created a new factor of tremendous world importance."

Lenin unerringly steered the party's strategic course under the most complex conditions of the struggle to prepare and enact a socialist revolution. Thanks to Lenin, the Bolshevik party brilliantly mastered the whole arsenal of means of the political leadership of the masses in accordance with the specific historical situation and disposition of class forces, displaying in the process unshakable consistency in achieving the proletariat's revolutionary aims.

Lenin's party was able to educate and organize the industrial proletariat, which rallied around itself the working peasantry, the oppressed nations and nationalities, the soldier masses and all Russia's progressive forces. The party prepared the political army of the revolution for the decisive battle and boldly led it into the storming of the autocracy and capitalism. Enduring extremely cruel trials and displaying selfless heroism, the working people, led by the party, defended October's gains during the Civil War and the intervention.

Vladimir Il'ich Lenin was the creator and leader of the world's first socialist state, worker and peasant state.

His life in the post-October period is striking in its unusual intensity and multifacetedness. He led state economic, military and cultural building and the country's foreign policy, took an active part in seething social affairs and often addressed working people. This intense work, which required maximum effort, was combined with fruitful theoretical activity. His post-October works--from the Soviet power's first decrees on peace and land to his last articles--determine the main direction of building the new society.

Developing and concretizing the Marxist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin elaborated the foundations and principles of political organization of the socialist society. He attached paramount importance to the soviets as a new form of state power, greatly valued the masses' practical experience, saw it as the focus of the people's collective intellect and will, and regarded broad participation by the people in the running of the country as a decisive condition of building the new society.

"For the first time the people's masses are resolving, on a scale affecting hundreds of millions of people, the task of implementing the dictatorship of the proletarians and semiproletarians--a task without whose solution **THERE CAN BE NO** [capitalized words published in italics] question of socialism," Lenin wrote ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works],

Vol 37, p 62). The organic combination of unified, centralized leadership with the development of the masses' initiative and creativity, the consistent development of socialist democracy, and the further strengthening of Soviet statehood remain the guiding principles of the policy of Lenin's party even during the present stage.

Lenin's ideas formed the basis for the first Soviet Constitution and the formation of the USSR. Throughout the subsequent decades they have determined the foundations of our state structure and social life. They were most highly developed in the 1977 USSR Fundamental Law--the constitution of the state of the whole people, the developed socialist state.

Lenin's theory of the socialist plan economic system and Lenin's program for building the foundations of socialism through industrialization, collectivization, cultural revolution, the solution of the nationalities issue and the insuring of effective equality among nations brightly illuminated the path of the Soviet people's creative activity for many years to come.

Under conditions of peaceful building, as during the years of the struggle for power and the repulse of internal counterrevolution and foreign intervention, Lenin did his utmost to strengthen the party and improve the methods of its leadership of society. He was concerned for the political and organizational unity of its ranks, its ideological equipment, implacability toward shortcomings, development of intraparty democracy, communists' initiative and criticism and self-criticism, and the insuring of collective leadership.

Lenin was the great leader of the international working class. While he was a wholehearted patriot who embodied the best features of the Russian people and all the wealth of their culture, he was at the same time a convinced, consistent internationalist. Lenin was always at the very center of the ideological and political struggle of the international working class. He regarded Russia's revolutionary movement as an integral part of the world revolutionary process, and the October Revolution as not only a turning point in our motherland's history, but also the Russian proletariat's contribution to the liberation of all the world's working people and the start of a new era in mankind's history.

Generalizing the experience of the three Russian revolutions and the experience of the struggle of the international working class and analyzing the course of socialist transformations in Russia in the post-October period, Lenin revealed the scientific profundity of the correlation of the general laws and national peculiarities of the making of the new system and perspicaciously indicated the main directions of the world liberation movement's development. While he believed unshakably in the ultimate victory of world socialist revolution, he at the same time stressed repeatedly that this was a protracted, complex and by no means straightforward process and warned against disregarding the objective conditions of the revolutionary struggle in individual countries.

Lenin was the source of the modern international communist, workers' and national liberation movement. As a revolutionary internationalist, he was characterized by selfless loyalty to the proletarian cause, implacability toward any manifestations of opportunism, revisionism and bourgeois nationalism, and at the same time by political flexibility and the ability to rally round the working class and its party all the forces that life itself pits against the monopolies' power and the system of imperialist combination. Lenin's teaching on the proletariat's allies in the struggle for democracy and socialism and on the indissoluble connection between social and national liberation and all the theoretical and practical activity of the great leader of the international working class are, even nowadays, a reliable compass and inspiring example to all true revolutionaries.

Proletarian internationalism, raised by Lenin to new heights, is one of the most important sources of the all-conquering force of Marxism-Leninism. The correct combination of the national and international, the consistent defense of the equality of nations and the struggle for international cohesion among working people have been and remain necessary preconditions for implementing the program aims of communist and workers' parties. Following Lenin's behests, the CPSU consistently upholds the principle of proletarian internationalism and advocates cohesion in the communist and workers' movement and unity of action by all anti-imperialist, peace-loving forces.

During the years of life under the conditions of hostile capitalist encirclement--years that were difficult for Soviet Russia--Lenin laid the foundations and put forward the principles of socialist foreign policy, which still determine the Soviet Union's general course in the international arena. Lenin's forecast that real socialism would gradually assert on earth a new type of international relations based on just, democratic principles has been entirely vindicated. Welded together by their common interests, aims and ideals, the socialist comity countries are, by their joint efforts, building up their economic, scientific, technical and cultural potential, insuring their security and defense capability and consistently pursuing a principled, peace-loving line in international affairs.

The ideas put forward by Lenin of the struggle for peace, the prevention of war and disarmament, peaceful mutually advantageous cooperation among states with different social systems and the peoples' right to self-determination and to a free choice of path of social development have gained a firm hold on the consciousness of millions of people. They are materialized increasingly widely in the practice of international life. Under pressure from the forces of national liberation, supported by world socialism, imperialism's colonial system has collapsed. Thanks to the socialist countries' consistent coordinated action and the change in the correlation of forces in the world arena, the possibility emerged of the detente process, which became the dominant trend in the development of international relations in the 70's.

Alongside this, at the border between the 70's and 80's, there was a sharp intensification in the activity of reactionary imperialist circles, especially in the United States, which worked to aggravate the international situation, seeking a return to cold war and building up a frantic arms race with the aim of securing military superiority over the Soviet Union and the other socialist states. The United States and its allies launched aggression, a veritable undeclared war, against Afghanistan, whose people have embarked on the path of a new life.

The Beijing leaders, obsessed by great-power chauvinism and hegemonist aspirations, are direct accomplices of the U.S. imperialists and are enemies of peace and socialism.

While taking the necessary measures to safeguard the Soviet Union's security and coordinating its actions with the fraternal socialist countries, the CPSU seeks firmly and consistently to preserve and consolidate peace and to deepen and develop detente. "Soviet people and our friends abroad may be confident: The Leninist foreign policy course is unshakable," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stated in his replies to the PRAVDA correspondent's questions. "It is defined by the CPSU congresses' decisions and is embodied in all our foreign policy activity. This course combines a consistent love of peace with the firm rebuff of aggression. It has proved its worth in past decades and we will continue to follow it. No one can deflect us from this course."

Under the banner of Lenin, our motherland has implemented revolutionary creative achievements of worldwide-historic significance. The Soviet people endured with honor the terrible trials of the grimmest war in mankind's history, utterly routing German fascism and Japanese militarism.

Our party and people remain unshakably loyal to Leninism and the further we advance along the road to communism the more clearly are manifested Leninism's invincible strength and effectiveness, the profundity of Lenin's insight into the nature of the objective laws and trends of world historical development and the unsurpassed power of Lenin's foresight.

In the resolution "On the 110th Anniversary of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin's Birth" the CPSU Central Committee stressed that "***LENINISM IS THE MARXISM OF THE MODERN ERA, THE UNIFIED INTEGRAL, CONSTANTLY DEVELOPING TEACHING OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING CLASS***" [capitalized passage published in italics].

Guided by Lenin's methodology, relying on the historical experience of the people's masses, generalizing new processes and phenomena of social life, our party is creatively solving the topical problems of communist building and is developing and enriching Lenin's ideological legacy. The teaching on developed socialism, elaborated by the CPSU in conjunction with the socialist countries' fraternal parties, is a major contribution to the treasure house of Marxism-Leninism. It embodies a comprehensive analysis and provides a full[tselnyy] picture of this essential stage in the making

of the communist formation, reveals the objective laws of the development of the economy, social relations, political system, way of life and social consciousness for the foreseeable future and lays down a reliable theoretical base for the domestic and foreign policy of the socialist states' Marxist-Leninist parties.

The CPSU is traveling toward its 26th congress. Under its proven leadership, economic building of huge scope and complexity is being carried out in the country and the whole economy is being turned toward intensive development, improved efficiency and quality and emphasis on end results of economic activity. In his speeches at the CC CPSU November (1979) Plenum and to the voters of Moscow's Baumanskiv Electoral Okrug Comrade L. I. Brezhnev advanced theses regarding ways of further implementing the party's economic policy. These are raising the standard of management at every level, improving planning and the economic mechanism, heightening responsibility, strengthening discipline in every workplace and all sectors of work, and widely developing socialist competition.

Inextricably connected with the implementation of its economic strategy, the party consistently implements a social policy aimed at improving the people's material and cultural living standards and further increasing Soviet society's social homogeneity. It works consistently to deepen and to improve socialist democracy, stimulate the activity of soviets, public organizations and labor collectives and develop interested, creative participation by the masses in state and social affairs.

Lenin's party carried out tremendous political, theoretical, organizational and educational work. It develops the masses' political and labor activity in every possible way. The party seeks to educate every Soviet person in the spirit of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook, patriotic steadfastness and international solidarity. Party organizations' work in the sphere of communist education is aimed at fulfilling the 25th CPSU Congress decisions, the CC CPSU resolution "On Further Improving Ideological and Political-Educational Work" and the proposals made at last fall's all-union conference of ideological workers. Our aim is to insure a further upsurge in the scientific standard of ideological and theoretical work, a comprehensive improvement of political, labor and moral education, and a deepening of its link with life and solution of urgent economic and political tasks. We must wage a tireless ideological struggle against imperialism, which uses the most sophisticated and insidious methods of "psychological warfare" against the forces of socialism and peace.

In his speech 31 March 1980, when he was being presented with the Lenin Prize, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: "What could be more important and nobler than to intervene in practical life, help people gain a clearer understanding of the meaning of that life and direction of its flow, and help make that life better, more correct, brighter and richer not only materially, but spiritually? That is the yardstick with which the party approaches all forms of ideological work."

The CPSU regards the strengthening of the inviolable unity of party and people as the first principle of all its activity. The working people respond to the party with complete trust. The party's high prestige among the people and indissoluble connection with the masses were again cogently displayed in the course of the recent elections to the union and autonomous republic supreme soviets and the local soviets. Soviet people expressed unanimous support of the domestic and foreign policy of the Communist Party and Soviet state and the Leninist course of the CPSU Central Committee, headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, that loyal continuer of the great Leninist cause. The Soviet people boundlessly trust their beloved Communist party, being well aware that its policy is Leninism in action.

Lenin's ideas, personality and Herculean revolutionary activity have exerted and continue to exert an extremely profound impact on the course of history. The face of the modern world is unthinkable without Lenin. New generations' interest in Lenin as a man is truly unfading, and the force of the moral example of this wonderful son of mankind is tremendous.

Lenin was typified by the harmonious combination of the features of a great leader and an extremely modest man--in Mayakovskiy's expression, "the earthliest of all the people who have lived on earth." Even during his lifetime his powerful intellect, enormous knowledge, masterly grasp of the dialectical method, inflexible will, revolutionary ardor, transparent honesty and matchless organizational genius won him incontestable authority in the revolutionary movement and worldwide fame. And at the same time no one else was able to merge so organically and naturally with the masses, to understand the working people's interests and aspirations and be an equal among equals.

The further we advance along the path indicated by Lenin, the more profoundly we realize the need to turn again and again to Lenin, to his unfading ideological, theoretical and practical legacy. As we read Lenin's brilliant propositions, we discover new facets and gain increasingly profound insight into their truly inexhaustible content.

Political storms are raging with unabated force around Lenin and Leninism. Today, as during his lifetime, the very name of Lenin evokes the hatred of exploiters and oppressors and a desire to "refute" his great scientific discoveries and revolutionary ideas, to distort and belittle, to declare that Lenin's teaching, the experience of October and the experience of the land of the soviets are "purely local and national" and "historically outdated." Nor can one fail to mention those who, while posing as adherents of Marxism, claim to divorce Lenin from Marx, shamelessly vulgarizing Leninism, and those who slander and revise total--ignorance on theoretical questions.

While defending the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism against the encroachments of class enemies and revisionists of every stripe and keeping them pure, the communists regard it as their

sacred duty to continue to creatively develop our revolutionary science, to analyze the objective laws of social development and the new processes and trends in the life of the modern world, to seek and to find effective ways of solving the new problems confronting us. The precondition of the successful solution of this responsible task is constant, profound study and creative development of all the wealth of Lenin's ideas.

That is how our party, its Central Committee, the Central Committee Politburo and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev act, carrying out the tireless fruitful elaboration of problems of revolutionary theory and creatively developing it.

The greatness of Leninism also consists in the fact that it represents perpetually living, developing teaching in which revolutionariness, a scientific approach and a specific historical approach are organically inherent, ruling out any manifestations of dogmatism and subjectivism. Loyalty to Lenin's teaching and firmness in defending its propositions expand the potential for a creative quest. Leninism opens up the most reliable ways of elaborating a scientifically substantiated policy and opens up the broadest horizons of historical foresight.

It is precisely thanks to this that our Leninist party and the Soviet people have been and continue to be in the vanguard of mankind's social progress, bearing aloft the banner of peace and communism.

CSO: 1802

LENIN IN THE HISTORICAL DESTINIES OF THE PEOPLES OF THE EAST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 17-32

[Article by Yumzhagin Tsedenbal, first secretary of the MPRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party] Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the People's Great Hural]

[Text] Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. This immortal name is beloved by all and sacred to all who cherish peace, labor and freedom. The doctrine and cause of the brilliant philosopher and revolutionary live in the minds and hearts of hundreds of millions of people.

In the gigantic laboratory of his inordinately powerful mind, Lenin comprehensively studied human society as it had developed in the 20th century, a crucial century for all social history. He applied the Marxist dialectical method to the analysis of the new historical conditions with scientific accuracy and with the creative daring of a revolutionary, thus enriching all structural components of Marxism with most important theoretical concepts and conclusions. Lenin's doctrine of imperialism and his outstanding theory of the socialist revolution, which became the peak of revolutionary creative thinking of the most progressive class in contemporary society, was one of the biggest landmarks of the new stage in Marxist development. Lenin's analysis, confirmed through the subsequent historical experience of all countries without exception, led to the irrefutable conclusion that in the contemporary age "forward development--ignoring possible temporary steps backward--can lead only to a socialist society and a socialist revolution" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 30, p 13). Lenin's doctrine is the guiding star of socialism for all mankind.

Lenin was an internationalist in the loftiest meaning of the word. He perceived and shared with amazing accuracy and completeness the hopes and expectations of all oppressed peoples, clearly seeing here the inseparable comity of their historical destinies. No other person has done so much for the peoples of the East, and for their prosperity, freedom and happiness. Only a most human man and ardent internationalist such as Lenin could so confidently point out the growth of revolutionary forces in colonial and dependent countries, and firmly proclaim the legitimacy of the the demand

of their peoples to be people (Lenin, op cit, Vol 45, p 175). Throughout his life, struggle and work, Lenin helped them to rise to the level of makers of their own history, and to realize that, along with all others, they could and should struggle, win, change and build. Based on the view of the development of society as a "single and legitimate process despite its tremendous comprehensiveness and contradictoriness" (ibid, Vol 26, p 58), Lenin was convinced that all nations must participate in it on an equal footing. Vladimir Il'ich's intransigent service to the peoples of the East is the assertion and substantiation of this widest possible historical prospect.

In order to imagine the scale and problems, historical significance and contradictions of the contemporary phase of the national-liberation revolution, we must again and again turn to the Leninist theoretical legacy and to the experience in the implementation of his ideas on the national-colonial problem.

I

Lenin was able to define and realize the problems of the age with exceptional clarity. The approaching revolutionary storms and social upheavals captured all his thoughts and feelings and determined the content of his activities as the leader of the working class. He saw and proved that wherever one might turn, at each step there would be problems which mankind was fully able to resolve immediately, but was prevented by imperialism--by dying capitalism clinging to life, a capitalism which had created a worldwide system of oppression and slavery, and which, as a system as a whole, was ripe for a socialist revolution. The struggle against it was to be a single global revolutionary process. It was precisely Lenin who restored and developed the basic idea of K. Marx and F. Engels on the universality of the revolutionary process, both in terms of its scale and the common sociopolitical content of its component flows. It was precisely in this context, on the basis of this prospect, in the course of the fierce struggle against social chauvinism, which is fed by the still-extant petty ideas of Eurocentrism, that Lenin provided the only proper formulation of and solution for the national-colonial problem. He developed an integral theory of the national-liberation struggle in the epoch of imperialism, determined its universal-historical scale, and accurately defined its position in the overall channel of the global revolutionary process. In this case he allowed no underestimating or belittling of its role whatever, or any left-wing attempts (which have taken and are taking place) to inflate it under the banner of the specific nature of conditions in the East, and to separate the national-liberation struggle from its natural allies--the revolutionary workers' movement in the mother countries and, above all, the victorious proletarian revolutions.

Foreseeing the inevitability of the definitive awakening of the enslaved peoples "for a new life and for a struggle for elementary human rights and for democracy" (ibid, Vol 23, p 146), Lenin indicated the ways for the

elimination of national and colonial oppression: He was the author of scientific ideas on the international unification of the working class and the oppressed peoples in the struggle against imperialism, the all-round development of the communist program and tactics on the national-colonial problem, and the definition of the foundations of the policy of the socialist state toward the countries of the East.

All we could add to this is that Lenin's decision did not contain even a shadow of schematism: The need for a precise and specifically substantiated analysis of the various historical stages in the solution of the national problem and the social content of these stages stem from the very essence of his theory on the national problem as a whole as a theory of one of the aspects of global development, subordinated to social laws, yet possessing an essential specific feature. Lenin left us unsurpassed models of the application of this demand to reality.

The theory of the possibility of a noncapitalist way of development of backward countries was the logical completion of the Leninist analysis of the problems of the national-liberation movement and of its laws and prospects. Creatively developing Marx' and Engels' theoretical assumption in the new historical conditions, and summing up revolutionary practices in progressive and economically backward countries, particularly, the practical experience of the RKP(b) on the adoption of a soviet system by the peoples of Central Asia and the Transcaucasus, Lenin reached a conclusion in which his profound thoughts were concentrated as in a focal lens: "With the help of the proletariat of the progressive countries, the backward countries will be able to convert to a soviet system and, after specific stages of development, to communism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development" (Lenin, op cit, Vol 41, p 246).

Having created the theory of the national-colonial revolution, Lenin armed the oppressed nations with an integral ideological weapon, thanks to which the peoples of the East found and are finding the true way to national freedom and social progress.

Lenin's great figure rises over the lives of the peoples of the East, not only as a great theoretician and teacher, but as a true fighter for their factual liberation, equality and comprehensive progress of all nations.

Laying the beginning of the conversion of mankind from capitalism to socialism on a universal scale, the Great October Socialist Revolution he headed inaugurated a new age in the development of the national-liberation movement.

Lenin pointed out that "the Russian model indicates to all countries something quite essential . . ." (ibid, Vol 41, p 4). This "quite essential" thing has always been specific for each nation, country or part of the world. The ideas and experience of the October Revolution have multiple meanings. They are exceptionally rich in aspects important to the

liberation struggle of the peoples of the East, by the fact alone, perhaps, that the October Revolution organically combined the struggle of the proletariat for socialism with the struggle of the oppressed peoples of Russia against national oppression and feudal and semifeudal exploitation. Suffice it to recall as well that, under the leadership of the Leninist party, the Russian working class was the first to practically resolve one of the most difficult problems of the building of socialism: the proper definition and implementation of measures needed for the management of the peasantry and for a firm alliance with it, and for a number of gradual transitions to large-scale socialized machine output.

Through the example of the October Revolution and the experience of the Soviet state, not only the international working class, but the oppressed peoples, whose anger and struggle were aimed against colonialism--the greatest imperialist evil--saw a great deal of something "very essential" affecting them. This was not only through familiarity with the life-bringing ideas of Leninism found in communist literature, but above all through the practical experience of a factually existing proletarian state.

The peoples who rose to the struggle for liberation did not draw from the experience of the October Revolution only the force of its example. Lenin's tremendous concern for the working people of the colonial and dependent countries was manifested with particular emphasis in the fact that, from the very first days of its existence, the Soviet state he headed acted as the close friend and ally of the peoples of the East and pursued a systematically internationalist policy of supporting their struggle for their just cause. "The 1914-1918 imperialist war and the Soviet system in Russia," Lenin wrote, "are definitively turning these matters into an active factor of world politics and the revolutionary destruction of imperialism, even though the obstinate educated petit bourgeoisie of Europe and America, including the leaders of the Second and Second-and-a-Half Internationals, are still blind to this fact" (Lenin, op cit, Vol 44, p 5).

Lenin dedicated a great deal of efforts to the development of the revolutionary movement in the East. The Communist International, created on his initiative and his decisive participation, formulated and implemented the strategic unification of the world workers' and national-liberation movements in the common struggle against international imperialism. Here it is important to emphasize that the key idea of this strategy--Lenin's idea of the anti-imperialist nature of the national-liberation movement--was aimed at the entire period of transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism. Naturally, the tasks of national liberation from imperialism do not remain fixed. However, taking into consideration the conditions and deployment of class forces in the international arena at any given moment, they are always consistent with the overall tasks of the struggle against imperialism and could be properly understood only in this context.

Lenin's tireless attention and tremendous concern for the destinies of the peoples of the East were clearly embodied in his attitude toward the

Mongolian people. All of Lenin's thoughts and statements concerning Mongolia are imbued with a spirit of fraternal friendship and aid. Particularly noteworthy was Lenin's conclusion that Mongolia is one of the countries which, by virtue of international consensus, has a greater opportunity to convert from a prebourgeois society to a socialist system with the substantial aid of the victorious Russian proletariat and "convert," as he wrote as early as 1916, "to the use of machines, to facilitating labor and to democracy and socialism" (Lenin, op cit, Vol 30, p 120).

Guided by Lenin's ideas, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party (MPRP) created by revolutionaries who had adopted the ideas of scientific socialism, and with the international support of the first state of workers and peasants in the world, headed by the people's revolution in Mongolia. This was the first victorious people's revolution in the East, brilliantly confirming the accuracy and vital strength of Lenin's theory of the national-colonial revolution, and a number of most important Leninist theoretical concepts. They included the inevitability of the conversion of the struggle for national and social freedom in the oppressed countries with the proletarian struggle for socialism; the anti-imperialist direction of the struggle waged by the enslaved peoples; the possibility and necessity to use the common communist theory adapted to the specific conditions of economically backward countries; the need to establish popular rule, i.e., considering the conditions of our country, of peasant councils and other political organizations; the idea of a single anti-imperialist front, and others.

In this case the Mongolian revolutionaries always remembered Lenin's wise thought expressed precisely in accordance with the characteristics of the social structure of Eastern countries: "Adapt both soviet institutions and the communist party (its membership and special tasks) to the level of the peasant countries of the colonial East.

"This is the essence. This is what we must think about and to which specific answers must be found" (ibid, Vol 41, p 457).

The triumph of the proletarian revolution in Russia and the victory of the people's revolution in Mongolia made possible the practical implementation of Lenin's idea of the class alliance between the victorious Russian proletariat and the Mongolian peasantry and the state alliance between the Russian and Mongolian peoples. Friendly and truly fraternal relations were established and officially codified between Soviet Russia and People's Mongolia. This was the first outstanding page in international relations of an entirely new type, based on the principles of socialist internationalism.

Following the path indicated by Lenin, in 40 years--an insignificant time in terms of world history--the Mongolian people accomplished what the petit bourgeois-social reformists, not to mention the bourgeois ideologists, considered simply impossible. Having completed the people's democratic stage of

the revolution by 1940, by 1960 the Mongolian People's Republic achieved the transition from feudalism to socialism. This way, undertaking the building of socialism, the country bypassed an entire historical age--the capitalist system. Thus the Mongolian people fulfilled Lenin's brilliant prediction concerning our country and earned the right to consider themselves pioneers in the progress along Lenin's indicated noncapitalist way of development, a transition to socialism, bypassing the painful capitalist system. Unquestionably, this is a subject of the greatest honor and pride of our people.

Today, led by its Marxist-Leninist vanguard, the Mongolian people is successfully resolving the problems of the new stage in the building of socialism. Over the past 20 years it has covered a considerable historical distance in laying the material and technical foundations for socialism and completing the building of a new, socialist society. Mongolia's conversion from precapitalist relations to socialism enables us to draw certain conclusions of topical significance.

The consolidation and development of Mongolian-Soviet friendship, founded by the great Lenin and D. Sukhe-Bator, were of prime significance in insuring such an outstanding victory.

Unity and cooperation with the Soviet Union were profoundly legitimate. They were based on the common interests of the revolutionary struggle and dictated by domestic and international conditions, and military-political, socioeconomic and many other circumstances.

The unity and cooperation between the Mongolian and Soviet peoples was a specific implementation of the class principles of Leninist foreign policy, aimed at giving international support to peoples fighting for freedom and social progress, as well as the result of the deliberate aspiration of the Mongolian Revolutionary Party and people's state toward unification with the victorious proletariat. This too was of great importance to the achievement of this alliance, as repeatedly pointed out by Lenin. Receiving irreplaceable comprehensive aid from the Soviet people and from the peoples of the other socialist countries, in turn, the MPR has been and is doing everything possible to properly fulfill its international duty to its class brothers and to strengthen the international positions of socialism. It has made and is making to the extent of its possibilities a contribution to the anti-imperialist struggle.

The leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party was, and remains, the decisive prerequisite for the successful building of the new society. Lenin's brilliant conclusions which defined the place and role of the revolutionary party of the working class are basic to the revolutionary parties of the working people of the backward countries as well, who are fighting for the national and social liberation of their peoples and for insuring their social progress. It was precisely Lenin who emphasized both the possibility and importance of applying the general communist theory "to conditions

in which the peasantry is the main mass, and when it is necessary to resolve the problem of the struggle not against capital, but against medieval vestiges" (Lenin, op cit, Vol 39, 329).

The struggle of a people marching toward socialism assures a conscious and purposeful nature only when it is headed by a truly revolutionary party guided in its activities by the theory of scientific communism and the principles of proletarian internationalism.

Reliance on the broad popular masses was the pivot of the revolutionary policy of the MPRP. In the period of preparations for and making of the people's revolution, our party formulated and implemented a policy of unification of all progressive and democratic forces of society in the struggle against foreign and domestic oppressors. After the victory of the revolution, particularly at the time of the proclamation of the general party line of noncapitalist development, the MPRP and the people's government relied mainly on the poor and middle section of the toiling peasantry and the revolutionary segment of the middle classes. As a result of the tremendous constructive work done by the party and the state to develop the country's economy and culture, by 1940 the social structure of the society had radically changed and the concept of the "people's mass" in the Mongolian People's Republic began to include, in addition to the peasantry, a new national working class and a people's intelligentsia. This meant that the social base of the people's democratic system had strengthened considerably.

In the socialist stage of the people's revolution, the working class began to act as their leading force in the building of socialism. At the same time, the role of the toiling peasantry and the intelligentsia rose in the building of the new society. The historical practice of our country, whose overwhelming majority consisted of peasant masses, proved the groundlessness of the various social democratic and left-wing nationalistic views on the role of the peasantry in the revolutionary process, in which it is presented as some kind inert and even reactionary mass, or else, conversely, as the main leading force in the building of socialism.

The anticapitalist policy of the party and of the state is of tremendous importance in the transition from precapitalist relations to socialism. It was literally the backbone of the socioeconomic course followed by the MPRP throughout the entire period and its intermediate stages. Backward countries (even in a country such as Mongolia where a capitalist economic system was totally absent) following the gain of national independence and the elimination of precapitalist relations, rather substantial forces appear dragging the country toward a capitalist development. This is natural, for a peasant petty commodity economy predominates in a backward country, an economy which, in Lenin's words, "Creates capitalism and a bourgeoisie always, daily, hourly, spontaneously and on a mass scale" (ibid, Vol 41, p 6). It is precisely this element that is intensively and purposefully encouraged by imperialism and its agents within the country.

The creation and development of state and cooperative national economic sectors, serving the interests of the toiling masses, the strict observance of class principles in the economic and social policy of the party, the strengthening of the party, state and economic organizations with people loyal to the cause of the revolution, the skillful utilization of revolutionary laws and various economic mechanisms in the decisive struggle against all forms of exploitation, and reliance in this struggle on the broad people's masses were all factors which enabled our party and people's state to initially restrict and, subsequently, to stop the process of the birth and development of capitalism based on petty commodity production. The long practice of our struggle and contemporary reality in other countries convincingly prove that even in the case of a very minute abatement of the struggle against the abhorring capitalist elements, the latter, like rust, imperceptibly yet persistently and steadfastly, corrode the stronghold of the noncapitalist economy and undermine the foundations of the political, ideological and all other institutions of the new system.

Both the historical and the current experience acquired in the struggle against this menace proves the following as well: the transition of economically backward countries to socialism, bypassing capitalism, is not a vague formative and half-way path of petty reforms, but a revolutionary way which inevitably demands progress toward socialism. Naturally, as Lenin frequently and particularly strongly emphasized, "In countries with a petty peasant economy the conversion to socialism is impossible without a number of gradual preliminary stages" (Lenin, op cit, Vol 37, p 356); he called upon the communists and revolutionaries of the East to find and test the most expedient and practical measures.

In Mongolia the transition from feudalism to socialism as a single revolutionary process took place through two major stages: the democratic stage and the stage of socialist change. The history of the struggle waged by the Mongolian people is familiar not only with successes and victories, but failures and omissions as well. The MPRP does not forget the bitter lesson of the voluntaristic action of the left-wing leadership which, in the 1930's, tried to skip a legitimate revolutionary stage and undertake the laying of the foundations for socialism without proper preparatory measures, both economic and sociopolitical. The struggle waged by the party against such attempts and their timely defeat were, and remain, the guarantees for a scientifically substantiated course and for the ripening of the new system.

Such are some of the results and lessons of the struggle waged by the Mongolian people for the noncapitalist development of the country.

The historical experience of the MPRP and of other countries which reached socialism starting with early forms of social development convincingly proves that the true social progress of peoples liberated from colonial oppression is the socialist way and no other orientation. The bourgeois defenders and the supporters of neocolonialism today continue to claim that

capitalism is, allegedly, still capable of offering possibilities for social progress to these countries. However, the true answer to this question can be provided only by proceeding from the basic trend of the contemporary age of development of mankind. The main content of our age is the transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism. Capitalism, as L. I. Brezhnev has accurately pointed out, is a society without a future. Therefore, could a system without a future become a guideline for social progress? To the liberated peoples the concept of true social progress is only one, rather than an alternative. The progress of mankind is inseparably linked with the global revolutionary process, which is irreversible.

II

in terms of the contemporary national-liberation struggle and its prospects Lenin's elaboration of the problem of the objective nature of its ties with world socialism and the revolutionary workers' movement has a particularly profound and topical meaning.

We could confidently say that Lenin's theory of combining the national-liberation movement with the proletarian revolution and the world revolutionary movement and--as one of the elements of this theory--the close connection between the problems of national and social liberation, is of truly universal-historical significance. Emphasizing the objective role of world socialism as the main opponent of imperialism and the objective role of the national-liberation movement, Lenin indicated the entire danger of the subjectivistic underestimation or negation of the vital importance of their link and inseparable components of the global revolutionary process.

This link is based on the fact that the global revolutionary process, single in terms of its historical nature, is aimed above all against imperialism and, in the final account, also against capitalism as a social system. Substantiating this thought, Lenin formulated the concept imbued with the spirit of internationalism that "the socialist revolution will be not only and mainly a struggle waged by the revolutionary proletariat in each country against its own bourgeoisie; no, it will be a struggle waged by all colonies and countries oppressed by imperialism, and by all dependent countries against international imperialism" (Lenin, op cit, Vol 39, p 327).

This did not mean that each national-liberation movement mandatorily directly participates in the socialist reorganization of the world, but that it directly participates in the solution of the common anti-imperialist problem, the main problem of our time. This is accomplished by each national-liberation movement in its own manner, within the framework of specific conditions and circumstances. However, the common feature uniting such movements is the steady intensification of their anti-imperialist content.

Lack of understanding of this objective unity between the national-liberation movements and world socialism and the revolutionary workers'

movement could lead to the self-isolation of the liberated countries and to the appearance of national exclusivity. This is quite skillfully used by imperialism and its internal agents to divide the national-revolutionary forces, organize counterrevolutionary coups in the liberated countries and to promote fratricidal conflicts.

The conclusion from all this is that the basic interests of all nations fighting imperialism coincide, and that these nations must apply maximum conscious efforts for the establishment of an alliance, mutual understanding and fruitful cooperation. Lenin repeatedly emphasized and comprehensively developed this idea using a variety of approaches. Thus, as early as "On the Caricature of Marxism and on 'Imperialist Economism,'" he wrote that, "We have always been and will remain in favor of a closest possible rapprochement and merger among the conscious workers of the leading countries with the workers, peasants and slaves of all oppressed countries. . . . We shall apply all possible efforts to come closer and merge with the Mongols, Persians, Indians and Egyptians. We deem it our duty and our interest to do so, for otherwise socialism in Europe would be precarious" (Lenin, *op cit*, Vol 30, p 120).

Showing the importance of an alliance with socialism for the forces of national liberation, Lenin deemed it entirely necessary to show respect for the national characteristics of the peoples of colonial countries. Naturally, he most clearly cautioned in this case against the relative danger of nationalistic prejudices, the pitting of national characteristics against the liberation movement, and all kinds of speculations on such characteristics on the part of feudal lords and capitalists. He directly indicated the need to fight reactionary and medieval elements influential in backward countries and against attempts to combine the liberation movement against European and American imperialism with a strengthening of the positions of khans, landowners, and so on (see *ibid*, Vol 41, p 166).

Fully assessing the importance of the consideration of national characteristics, Lenin did not deem possible in the least an automatic duplication of the Soviet revolution and a transfer of the methods and content of the work done by the communist party to countries with virtually no working class. Thus, in a talk with the delegation with the Mongolian People's Republic, on 5 November 1921, asked, "Should the People's Revolutionary Party become a communist party?" Lenin answered: "I do not recommend this, for one must not 'convert' one party into another . . . A great deal more work will have to be done by the revolutionaries on their governmental, economic and cultural construction, until a proletariat mass is created from the nomad elements, a mass which, subsequently, will contribute to the 'transformation' of the People's Revolutionary Party into a communist party. A simple change of labels is both harmful and dangerous" (*ibid*, Vol 44, p 233).

As world events developed, Lenin's idea of a revolutionary anti-imperialist alliance assumed a new scope and depth in the course of the development of

social practice itself. This was already confirmed by the military-political results of World War II, which brought about, with the decisive participation of the Soviet Union, the defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism. Thanks to the radical change in the ratio of socio-political forces in the world arena in favor of democracy and socialism, the national-liberation movement as well assumed an unparalleled scope and reached a new height. It was no longer locally splintered, but became a truly universal phenomenon. However, it was precisely the active support which the socialist countries gave the national-liberation movement that contributed more than anything else to the general assault on colonialism.

As the historical experience of the breakdown of the colonial system proved, the outcome of the national-liberation struggle in the individual countries and regions was largely predetermined by the solidity of the alliance between world socialism and the detachments of the national-liberation movement. The greatest results in this struggle were achieved by countries whose national-liberation forces were able to rely on the direct support of the forces of world socialism.

The new ratio of political forces in the world arena which developed after World War II and as a result of the establishment of the world socialist system was the main prerequisite for the breakdown of the entire imperialist colonial system. The period of decolonization in Africa followed that of Asia. About 100 new independent countries appeared on the ruins of the colonial system.

As a whole, L. I. Brezhnev has noted, the imperialist colonial system in its classical forms may be considered as already eliminated. This is a fact of universal-historical significance.

The victory of the national-liberation revolutions led to profound changes in international relations. A period whose inevitability had been anticipated by Lenin a number of decades ago--"the period of participation of all the peoples of the East in deciding the fate of the entire world . . ." (Lenin, *op cit*, Vol 39, p 328) came. Freed from imperialist colonial oppression, the young national states began to act ever more actively as an influential force in the world arena. Objectively, this is a progressive, revolutionary and anti-imperialist force. It is entirely natural that now the task of preserving, expanding and intensifying the alliance planned by Lenin between this objective anti-imperialist force and the main detachment of the world revolutionary movement opposing imperialism--world socialism--must assume even greater importance and sharpness. Under these conditions, the consistent orientation of the various revolutionary currents of the world socialist system, which is in the vanguard of social progress and which is bearing the main burden of the global confrontation with imperialism, and which is also able to provide the necessary assistance to the other detachments of the liberation movement, is more important than ever before. "The world socialist system," the participants in the 1969 International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties emphasized, "is a decisive force in the anti-imperialist struggle."

Let us particularly note that this view reflects not the wishes or claims of the communists, but the objective facts of development of human society. The working class in the socialist countries is performing a qualitatively new function in the revolutionary struggle, for the class struggle against exploitation and oppression and imperialist reaction and aggression has reached the level of global confrontation between the two antagonistic social systems.

The confrontation between the two systems is having a decisive influence on the future of the revolutionary struggle waged on different fronts and for the sake of achieving different specific objectives. We must emphasize that however specific the theoretical-ideological concepts and practical-political positions may distinguish the real or potential allies of socialism, their range throughout the world is immeasurably broader than that of the allies of imperialism.

The development and intensification of the social content of the national-liberation movements is assuming here its ever more noticeable place. In turn, however, strengthening the unity with all anti-imperialist forces, and rallying them both internationally and nationally, remain primary tasks in the successful development of these movements.

In present-day conditions this task has two aspects: internal, related to the possibility and necessity to create a broad, flexible and durable unification of the masses on an anti-imperialist and anti-colonial basis, and external, affecting the unity and solidarity of all anti-imperialist forces on an international scale, i.e., strengthening the alliance among the forces of national liberation, world socialism and the international workers' movement. This, precisely, is the prerequisite for the success of the contemporary national-liberation movement.

III

The contemporary national-liberation movement has entered a qualitatively new stage of development. Its main characteristic, its characteristic feature, is that the process of national liberation of colonial and dependent countries has been essentially completed, and that life is ever more adamantly giving priority to the task of the social liberation of the peoples.

The positive changes achieved over the past decade in international circumstances have contributed to a tremendous extent to the successful development and intensification of the contemporary national-liberation revolutions. It was precisely during that period that the national-liberation movement gained new major successes. The heroic people of Vietnam won a historic victory. Imperialist attempts to deal with the socialist states and to crush the national-liberation revolution, the biggest after World War II, failed. The reunification of Vietnam, now a single socialist republic, was completed with the liquidation of imperialist aggression.

The emergence of the Lao people on the path to socialism, the victory of the Kampuchean United National Salvation Front over the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary regime, the most reactionary terrorist genocidal regime, won with the decisive support of the socialist countries, the successes of the just struggle waged by the peoples of Afghanistan, Iran, Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and other Afro-Asian countries, and the victory of the people of Nicaragua are all truly historical landmarks of the global liberation movement. These events confirm the existence of processes in different and, occasionally, quite complex stages. However, they enable us to draw a number of specific conclusions. First of all, they refute the "forecasts" of the bourgeois theoreticians on the alleged forthcoming abatement of the wave of the national-liberation struggle after the 1960's; as the revolutions of the 1970's indicated, on the contrary, its scale has broadened and spread over new parts of the world. Secondly, this struggle acquired a new meaning, clearly indicating a weakening of the dependence on imperialism, not only in the sense of the elimination of traditional colonialism, i.e., the achievement of national-sovereign independence, but in the sense of an adamant counteraction to economic and political neo-colonialism, and increased political resistance to imperialist intrigues. Thirdly, and finally, something particularly important, the struggle for national liberation in a number of countries, bearing in mind its essential content, began to develop into a struggle against exploitative relations, both feudal and capitalist.

We are thus witnessing the fact that, however conflicting the picture the contemporary national-liberation movement may appear, its basic trends are consistent with Lenin's prediction: increased anti-imperialist direction, intensification of social content, and strengthening the alliance with other streams of the contemporary world revolutionary process.

In the extensive area of the national-liberation movement, all these tempestuous events are a remarkable confirmation of Lenin's prediction that, "In the future decisive battles of the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the population on earth, initially directed toward national liberation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism and, perhaps, assume a far greater revolutionary role than we may expect" (Lenin, op cit, Vol 44, p 38).

In this respect, progressive changes may be seen in a number of countries, such as the creation of state and cooperative national economic sectors, elimination of feudal landownership and implementation of radical agrarian reforms in the interests of the broad people's masses, nationalization of foreign capitalist enterprises, assuming control over the distribution and utilization of national resources, and so on. A national working class, called upon to play a key role in the revolutionary transformation of social life in these countries, is growing. Ever more millions of people among the nonproletarian strata of the working people are becoming involved in the global revolutionary process. Many of them are turning Marx' doctrine and it is not astounding that this step may be difficult and

conflicting. Unable to immediately and "decisively break with all the traditions of the bourgeois world outlook in general and of bourgeois-democratic world outlook in particular" (Lenin, op cit, Vol 20, p 65), initially they adopt only some aspects of Marxism, individual parts, individual slogans, and individual demands. However, the leaning of revolutionary-democratic forces toward the ideas of Marxism-Leninism is becoming ever stronger. A number of revolutionary-democratic parties have proclaimed it the ideological and political foundations for their activities. The trend toward scientific socialism by the leading detachments of the national-liberation movement is becoming ever clearer.

Like the working people of the entire socialist comity, the Mongolian people do not conceal their sympathy for countries orienting their development toward socialism. "In the socialist countries these countries find loyal and reliable friends, ready to give them all possible aid and support in their development in a progressive direction," L. I. Brezhnev has emphasized. "This support is not only moral and political but economic and organizational, including assistance in strengthening their defense." This was convincingly proved during the heroic and just defense war waged by the Vietnamese people, as well as now, when Afghan people are defending their revolutionary gains.

Naturally, Lenin never considered the national and social liberation of the peoples of the East an easy and smooth process. He even emphasized that "The future in universal history will include precisely a day in which the peoples oppressed by imperialism will definitively awaken, and when the decisive long and hard battle for their liberation will begin" (Lenin, op cit, Vol 45, p 362).

The raving colonialist imperialist pressure offers the clearest proof of this statement.

At the present stage the imperialists would like to regain at all cost their lost positions in the East. They are trying to reduce to naught the national liberation and democratic freedoms gained by the peoples of many countries. Using all possible means, ranging from fraud and blackmail, elimination of progressive statesmen, and implantation of their puppets, to armed interventions--they are trying to ensnare the young sovereign states in neocolonial dependence, and restore or preserve in other forms their economic, political and spiritual domination. To this effect they are extensively using racial, tribal and religious vestiges and hostilities developed after centuries of colonial domination, the nationalism of individual leaders of the liberation movement and their personal ambition, arrogance, and great-power behavior toward their neighbors--factors which have been the reason for many defeats or temporary retreats of the revolutionary forces.

The contemporary national-liberation movement is making its way through complex zigzags. Each step forward is achieved by surmounting tremendous

difficulties related not only to the counteraction of world imperialism, but a number of internal circumstances. By the very nature of the problems it resolves, the national-liberation movement has to operate on multiple levels and presumes the solution of socioeconomic and political, national, and international problems, present and future, of an extremely broad range.

Meanwhile, today a complex process of demarcation among sociopolitical forces is taking place in the developing countries themselves. The class struggle is intensifying. The developing societies have a very complex and heterogeneous socioclass structure in a constant state of flux and development, determining, in the final account, the corresponding complexity and the dynamism of superstructural phenomena. This applies above all to sociopolitical life.

Lenin repeatedly emphasized the dialectical tie between economics and politics. He noted that in a number of specific historical situations politics assumes primacy over economics (inevitably). This Leninist concept is fully applicable to the contemporary Afro-Asian countries. Here politics frequently enters an area in which socioclass conflicts become particularly clear, above all in connection with the determination of the national course and the selection of the direction of social development. Therefore, the path to national and social liberation and social progress is one marked by a most sharp class struggle, a struggle among different political forces and ideological currents.

In this respect as well Lenin's lessons remain entirely topical. Lenin formulated the very theory of the national-colonial revolution and the concept of noncapitalist development in the course of fierce clashes with right-wing and left-wing opportunism. He directly pointed out that "the struggle against imperialism, unless inseparably linked with the struggle against opportunism, remains a meaningless and false phrase" (Lenin, op cit, Vol 27, p 424).

The struggle against reactionary Maoist ideology is particularly important in the successful development of the national-liberation movement at the present stage.

The Beijing leaders clash with Lenin on all basic problems of the national-liberation movement. They counter the great idea of proletarian internationalism and international class solidarity, which is the foundation of Lenin's theory of the national-colonial revolution, with a confusing mixture of petit bourgeois nationalism, great-power chauvinism, hegemonism, expansionism and threadbare anti-Sovietism. All of Beijing's anti-Leninist doctrine and practical actions are entirely aimed at dividing the detachments within the world revolutionary process, separating the contemporary national-liberation movement from world socialism, and pitting them against each other. Through their actions they are totally discrediting the very idea of socialism in the eyes of the peoples of the liberated countries.

They are replacing Lenin's outstanding life-asserting idea of the ways and means for building socialism under the conditions of previously backward countries with variants of "barracks socialism" which compromises the nature of the new society. Furthermore, they are imposing such pseudo-socialisms on other nations. An example of this is the monstrous experiment they conducted in Kampuchea. Rokh Samay, general secretary of the United Front for the National Salvation of Kampuchea Central Committee, justifiably notes that, "By the fault of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique and its Chinese patrons Kampuchea has become a bloody sea of the people's suffering. In a few years the clique of traitors and their Chinese masters were able to destroy over three million innocent citizens."

Characteristically, while Pol Pot and his gang were destroying the Kampuchean people for the sake of the implementation of Beijing's plans, the Western "democrats" bashfully criticized him only for his "extremes" and "insufficient democracy." When the people of Kampuchea overthrew the tyrants and began to restore in the country life based on new democratic foundations, suddenly the Pol Pot supporters became the "legitimate" rulers of the people who had expelled them. Well, Pol Pots are needed by the imperialists as are shahs, Somosas, Paks, Pinochets and other bloodstained dictators, for all of them are doing one and the same, only from different sides: some of them are defending capitalism with the ax and the gallows, destroying the forces fighting against it; others, using the same method, are insulting the very idea of socialism and repelling the working people from it.

Every conscientious working person in the East well knows that Lenin based the national policy of the socialist state on the principles of granting previously oppressed peoples and national minorities the right to national self-determination, a careful and respectful attitude toward national feelings, and all-round assistance in achieving factual equality through the accelerated development of the economy and culture of these peoples and for eliminating the traces of mistrust and alienation inherited from the capitalist epoch (see Lenin, op cit, Vol 38, p 111). In the national policy of the Chinese Maoist leadership all these Leninist principles are turned upside down. The Maoist are applying an extremely reactionary policy of coercive assimilation to the non-Chinese peoples inhabiting 60 percent of the PRC's territory, as the result of which these nations and nationalities face the real threat of total loss of national originality. This fate has already affected some Chinese ethnic minorities, including those inhabiting Inner Mongolia.

The hostile Maoist position toward the peoples of the East is manifested with particular strength in Beijing's present border policy. As early as 15 years ago Mao Zedong stated that, "We must mandatorily get hold of Southeast Asia, including South Vietnam, Thailand, Burma, Malaysia and Singapore." The plans for territorial seizures affecting China's neighbors did not limit themselves to this in the least. The Maoists are formulating territorial claims against the Soviet Union, India, Japan and many other countries.

As to sovereign socialist Mongolia, they straightforwardly state that, "It (Mongolia) cannot be considered a foreign country in the least" (GUANMIN RIBAO, 11 September 1979). In their attitude toward the MPR the present Chinese leadership has not only borrowed the great-power expansionistic policy of bourgeois landowning China, but has outstripped its "teachers" in the sense that, despite long procrastinations, in the final account the predecessors of the Maoists acknowledged the independence of people's Mongolia, acknowledging the fact of the real existence of a free Mongolian state. Yet, China's Maoist leadership has been concentrating over the past 20 years huge military forces on the Sino-Mongolian border. It is energizing its reconnaissance-diversionary activities against the MRP and 'ts creating tension similar only to the period of the 1930's when our country was under the constant threat of imperialist Japan and Kuomintang China.

Today the world public opinion is realizing the alarming truth that China's expansionistic aspirations have reached a new and very dangerous phase, shifting from loud propaganda to direction action. This was confirmed by the armed aggression against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the current intensive preparations for new military adventures against the SRV and other independent countries, the constant heating of tension on the borders with its neighbors, and the clear conspiracy between the Beijing leadership and the most reactionary imperialist forces in the United States and NATO, pulling the world back to the cold war. Together with the United States it is arming and training gangs of Afghan rebels on Pakistani territory.

Present-day China has become one of the greatest threats to the universal peace and security of the peoples of Asia. As to the propaganda "justification" of aggressive intents, waving basic national pride, the Chinese expansionists do not shy from dusting up 700-year-old files and invoking Genghis Khan, the most cruel conqueror. Of late they have begun to depict Genghis Khan as a Chinese emperor who, it is claimed, made a tremendous contribution to China's historical development, proclaiming themselves no more and no less his heirs and followers. By the logic of Beijing's leaders, having been turned into a Chinese emperor, Genghis Khan is alleged to have given his heirs "grounds" for claims on lands which he seized over seven centuries ago. Such is the ideological and moral bankruptcy reached by the Maoist public.

Economic and political pressure, gross interference in the domestic affairs of other countries, military threats and armed invasion of neighboring territories, and unceremonious deal with international imperialism, and encouragement of neocolonialism, and of fascist and racist regimes in different countries convincingly proves that the Chinese leadership has definitively moved into the camp of the worst enemies of the freedom of the peoples of the East.

The anti-people's great-China Maoist policy is causing tremendous harm to the vital interests of the Chinese people themselves. The militarization

of production, appropriation of huge funds for military expenditures, isolation for the world socialist system and, therefore, impoverishment of the economic and cultural potential of the PRC, and disregard of the basic economic law of socialism are exhausting the national economy, wearing out the working people, blocking the upsurge of the people's prosperity, and excluding the possibility for the solution of a number of important topical problems facing that huge country.

All this presents a bitter example of the way a handful of intriguers labeling themselves communists could long hinder the development of a great nation, and the way an erroneous policy could undermine the cause of socialism.

Imperialism still finds among countries which have recently freed themselves from imperialist domination some which, for a longer or shorter time, become its reserve. However, this is no more than a temporary historical twist.

The MPRP and the entire Mongolian people welcomed with satisfaction the stipulation contained in the declaration of Warsaw Pact members, entirely consistent with Lenin's ideas, to the effect that, "The countries attending the conference systematically support the national-liberation struggle of the peoples against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism and racism, and against all forms of domination, favoring respect for the right of every nation to be the full master of its destiny and implement its aspiration to develop along the path of progress."

Lenin's ideas of the unification of all anti-imperialist forces in the interest of the peace and social progress of all mankind and socialism are penetrating all corners of the globe and capturing the minds of the people.

The doctrine of Lenin's, whose 110th birthday anniversary was noted by all progressive mankind, continues to illuminate the way to communism, both for those who have already built a developed socialist society, or are building it, and those who are struggling for the very opportunity to undertake this building. It rallied the working people of all countries and nations in the world. It is omnipotent because it is true.

One of its principles, expressed in the appeals of the CC CPSU--the great heir and perpetuator of Lenin's immortal ideas and cause--issued on the occasion of May Day 1980, states: "May the unbreakable alliance among the three basic revolutionary forces of our time--world socialism, the international proletariat, and the national-liberation movement--strengthen!"

5003
CSO: 1802

USSR BANKING SYSTEM IN ACTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 33-44

[Article V. Alkhimov, chairman of the board, USSR Gosbank]

[Text] Under the leadership of the communist party, the Soviet people are firmly following the course set by the 25th CPSU Congress and are successfully implementing the program for communist construction. Compared with the same period of the Ninth Five-Year Plan, in the first four years of the 10th Five-Year Plan the country's national income was 323 billion rubles higher; industrial production rose 600 billion and gross agricultural output, by over 40 billion rubles. This made possible the planned implementation of the party's course of resolving the most important social problems and upgrading the living standard of the people.

Our state has tremendous possibilities for further economic growth and successful progress. "However, in order to use them," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev points out, "we must raise the level of management in the broadest meaning of the term." Unquestionably, this will be helped by the specific measures drafted by the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers on improving planning and the entire economic mechanism, directing management and planning activities toward the achievement of high national economic end results and the fuller satisfaction of growing social requirements. In this connection planning work is being further expanded and intensified in the fields of monetary circulation, finance and credit as well.

Banks continue to play a very important role in the systematically developing socialist economy, which covers all public production, distribution and exchange units. On the eve of the Great October Revolution V. I. Lenin wrote that, "A single extremely big state bank with departments in each volost' and factory would already represent nine-tenths of the socialist apparatus. It would mean statewide accounting, since statewide recording of the production and distribution of products. It would be, so to say, something like the framework of the socialist society" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 34, p 307). Our party and Soviet state are steadfastly following these instructions in the organization and development of the monetary-credit system of the socialist society.

Today the monetary-credit system of the Soviet Union is an aggregate of institutions in charge of the organization and planning of monetary circulation, credits, cashless payment and savings, as well as international payment and credit relations. It includes the USSR State Bank with labor savings banks under its administration, the All-Union Bank for the Financing of Capital Investments (USSR Stroybank), the USSR Foreign Trade Bank (USSR Vneshtorgbank) and a network of Soviet banks abroad.

The USSR Gosbank is one of the biggest in the world. It is the single emitting bank which organizes and controls monetary circulation and provides short-term and long-term loans and financing of capital investments by the individual sectors, and is the cash and accounts center of the country. Together with the Foreign Trade Bank, the Gosbank organizes and performs international clearing operations and crediting to Soviet foreign trade; conducts operations involving foreign currencies and gold; and sets foreign exchange rates in rubles. These two banks exercise current control over the execution and condition of the accounts and balance of payments of the Soviet Union.

The USSR Stroybank is a credit institution providing financing and long-term credits for capital investment by the most important national economic sectors, such as industry, transportation, communications and the construction industry. In connection with the tremendous and ever-rising volume of capital construction, the role and significance of the Stroybank increase. The Stroybank is in charge payments in capital construction and financial control over the work of construction ministries, departments and other organizations.

This brief enumeration of the functions performed by individual credit institutions within the unified Soviet centralized monetary-credit system shows that it is one of the most important units of the planned economic mechanism. Through its banking monopoly the Soviet state directs the banking apparatus, as an apparatus of nationwide accounting of production and distribution of products and control of the economic life of the country, toward the ever fuller utilization of commodity-monetary relations in accordance with the new content they have acquired in the period of developed socialism.

I

Lenin pointed out that the planned utilization of money and money circulation is an important instrument in controlling the country's economic life. He said that, ". . . Monetary circulation is a device which provides an excellent test of the satisfactory nature of turnover in the country. An improper turnover turns money into useless pieces of paper" (Lenin, op cit, Vol 43, p 66). On the basis of Lenin's concepts the communist party and the Soviet state pay tireless attention to this problem.

The 25th CPSU Congress emphasized that the further strengthening of monetary circulation in the country and the stability of the purchasing power

of the Soviet ruble must be secured on the basis of the planned development of the national economy, the growth of trade and the stability of prices of most important consumer items.

As a result of the measures implemented by the party and the government to increase the production of consumer goods and develop population services, and of the successful implementation of the social program of the five-year plan and the growth of public consumption funds, in the first four years of the five-year plan real per capita income rose 14 percent. There was an increase in population savings in bank accounts which reached 146.2 billion rubles at the beginning of 1980. In this connection, balancing the monetary income of the Soviet people and their growing requirements with the production of high quality goods in a great variety, and providing services to the country at large and by individual economic rayon become particularly important. This is a mandatory condition for the completion of the planned cycle of circulation of available funds, highly organized monetary circulation and, consequently, expanded reproduction.

As was pointed out at the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum, increasing output and variety, and upgrading the quality of consumer goods remains a key task. Therefore, the volume of capital investment in basic industrial sectors producing such goods is being increased considerably. According to the plan for light industry, and compared with the 1979 level, construction installation work will be increased 55 percent; food industry, 15 percent; and the meat and dairy industry, 19 percent. This will make possible a certain increase in the growth rates of the production of consumer goods in 1980, along with a considerable increase in retail trade, which, together with the additional assignment, will total 267 billion rubles.

The Gosbank institutions will play an important role in the solution of this problem. They are actively participating in the formulation of proposals on increasing the production of said goods through reserves established in the course of crediting operations and through the study of the economic activities of associations, enterprises, sovkhozes and kolkhozes. At the same time, the bank is granting major credits. For example, at the beginning of 1980 loans for material values and production outlays alone totaled 32.4 billion rubles granted to light and food industry enterprises, including the procurement system. Furthermore, the bank is issuing loans also above the amounts of state capital investments whenever enterprise activities are related to the highly effective production of consumer goods.

In 1979 alone 13,669 such projects were completed with the help of above-plan loans. The Gosbank institutions granted loans totaling about one billion rubles. This made possible an additional annual output worth 2.4 billion rubles and an additional profit in excess of 600 million rubles.

We must develop further credit allocations for highly effective measures aimed at increasing consumer goods production. Now, when annual plans are

formulated from below--at enterprises and associations on the basis of the search for reserves--their initiatives in the production of new goods and upgrading the quality of output must be supported more energetically. The banks grant loans for such purposes providing that outlays can be recovered and the loans repaid through additional profits. Establishing the time for the recovery of outlays and the sources for the repayment of the loan, some of the turnover tax (as much as 50 percent) from the sale of such goods produced as a result of the credited measures may be used as a source for the repayment of the loan.

The CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree on improving the economic mechanism defined the means for further improving the organization of planning and control of monetary circulation. In accordance with the decisions made, the state five-year plan will contain material, manpower and financial balances and the balance for population income and expenditures, taking into consideration the needs of the Soviet people for goods and services and based on the steadily rising financial income. Formulating said five-year balances with an annual breakdown, the USSR Gosplan, USSR Ministry of Finance and USSR Gosbank must make the necessary computations and submit specific proposals on increasing the production of consumer goods with a view to insuring the balancing. A very important decree stipulation is that, "In order to insure the stability of monetary circulation necessary reserves must be planned for." This means that commodity resources needed to meet demand in cases of overfulfillment of production and population income plans must be taken into consideration in drawing the population income and expenditures balance.

The elaboration of monetary balances determining the basic direction the emitting policy of the state is a new and complex task in the formulation of the state five-year plans. Its implementation calls for raising the level of planning not only on the part of USSR Gosbank institutions, but of planning and financial organs as well, at all management levels. The comprehensive work done on such matters creates the necessary conditions for a more profound substantiation of the balances of population monetary income and expenditures and the cash-flow plans drafted by the USSR Gosbank on their basis.

Upgrading the role of the republic and local organs in planning the production of consumer goods is of great importance in monetary circulation. The councils of ministers of union and autonomous republics, and the executive committees of kray, oblast and city soviets of people's deputies must draft and pass on the consolidated five-year and annual plans for the production of consumer goods, including associations (enterprises) under union jurisdiction, and supervise the implementation of these plans.

All this, put together, creates favorable prerequisites for upgrading the level of planning and regulating monetary circulation, making the necessary computations and formulating proposals for the draft balances of population income and expenditures, and creating the necessary reserves for insuring

the stability of monetary circulation. To this effect the banking institutions must participate more actively in the consideration of draft production plans at their formulation stage in order to determine the necessary increase in the output of enterprises engaged in the production of consumer goods or in providing population services.

The USSR Gosbank is always concerned with insuring the prompt payment of wages to workers and employees. The meeting of such payments within the period stipulated by enterprises and establishments which have the necessary funds is a mandatory law governing the activities of banking institutions. Should an association or enterprise experience temporary financial difficulties, the bank may issue short-term loans. However, it must also insure the economical utilization of available funds.

A study has indicated that a number republics, krais and oblasts have allowed unjustified wage-fund overexpenditures. This has been caused, above all, by the employment of above-plan numbers of workers and employees and unplanned increases of average wages, and the nonfulfillment of assignments on increasing labor productivity and of the planned ratio between the growth rates of labor productivity and of average wages. As of now greater attention will be paid to problems of wages and economical utilization of wage funds. To this effect, in 1980 payroll funds must be issued to enterprises and organizations on the basis of volumes of output approved by ministries and departments, rather than by enterprises themselves.

The role of central management organs and banks in controlling the utilization of wage funds by associations, enterprises and organizations engaged in construction-installation work, exceeding the planned amounts, and for repairs of buildings, installations and local motor vehicle roads shall be increased. Such payments will be made strictly within the amounts approved by the republic councils of ministers, and USSR ministries and departments, included in the national economic plan, rather than within the limits of funds approved by individual organizations autonomously and, in a number of cases, including major overexpenditures.

Over the next 10 to 15 years the growth of output must be secured entirely through higher labor productivity, without increasing the size of personnel. Therefore, savings on manpower, which is the main component of the country's production forces, become very important. The government's decision to approve, starting with 1980, ceilings for the number of workers and employees hired by associations, enterprises, and organizations must play an important role in resolving this problem. The banks must supervise the observance of plan discipline by all economic units.

Tightened bank control over the utilization of the wage fund will follow a number of other directions as well, particularly that of supervising the observance of wage norms per ruble of output, as issued to production associations. Superior organizations could refine such norms only under exceptional conditions following changes in the production structure,

production cooperation, revisions of technologies and prices, and so on. In this case, it is mandatory to make at the same time the necessary corrections to all interrelated plan indicators.

II

The role and significance of bank loans are enhanced within the overall economic management mechanism. Today the state has huge loan funds. They are formed as a result of monetary accumulations at the disposal of the socialist enterprises, funds accumulated through the budget system, the funds of the crediting and financial institutions themselves, and population funds deposited in savings accounts. This loan fund is the people's property used by the banks to meet the needs of the economy by issuing short-term and long-term loans.

The following data characterize the dynamic development of credit relations between the bank and the economy:

Bank Loans to the National Economy and the Population
(end of year surpluses; millions of rubles)

	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979
Total Loans	204,044	227,868	254,039	274,920	300,397
Including:					
Short-Term Loans	160,715	177,871	194,245	206,566	225,020
Long-Term Loans	43,329	49,997	59,792	68,354	75,377

The table shows that loan investments have been growing steadily. Over the past four years loans for short-term projects which include agricultural and industrial raw materials, materials, fuel, finished goods, and commodities in trade, have increase 40 percent. Today almost one out of two rubles in working capital in the national economy comes from bank loans. In a number of sectors the share is considerably higher. For example, it equals 58.4 percent in agriculture and 59.1 percent in trade.

Bank loans insure the full cycle of circulation of working capital, starting with the purchasing of raw materials, fuel and basic and auxiliary materials, and ending with the final product. The bank grants substantial loans for industrial and agricultural production outlays, without which the continuity of the production process cannot be assured. Finally, bank loans are granted for the creation of stocks of finished goods of a seasonal nature, on the basis of the material balances for their utilization, and for commodities sold in wholesale and retail trade.

Therefore, loans are used to pay for material values and planned outlays. Their high percentage of collateral provided by commodity-material values

is one of the important prerequisites for the stability of the Soviet ruble and the active influence of credits on the fulfillment of plans for quality, nomenclature and variety of output.

The short-term loans granted by the USSR Gosbank, accounting for the bulk of credit investments in the national economy, rose substantially in the 10th Five-Year Plan. Approximately one-third of all short-term loans have been made to industry, the leading sector of the national economy; trade accounts for 21.2 percent, while agriculture for 22.9 percent. Here it is important to emphasize that the ratio among such investments is changing in favor of agriculture, even though in addition to short-term loans, long-term loans have been made in this sector exceeding 44 billion rubles.

The huge funds invested in agriculture must be used with maximum effectiveness. Yet, some sovkhozes and kolkhozes allow major violations in monetary expenditures. Essentially, this involves the channeling of funds into unplanned construction, free delivery of capital goods and transport vehicles to other organizations, purchases of unnecessary machines and commodities, and scattering of capital investments among a large number of projects.

In the course of their study of the activities of the farms, the banking institutions discover such violations and, using the credit-payment mechanism, try to prevent the use of funds for nonplanned projects. Participating in the consideration of production and financial plans, they allocate credits only for measures whose implementation is expedient and would yield required economic results.

Loans are playing a greater role in providing economic incentive for the practical utilization of scientific achievements, for scientific research, experimental design, and technological operations, and for outlays related to mastering and producing progressive commodities. The new aspect here is that both the USSR Gosbank and Stroybank will offer two new types of loans to production and scientific-production associations: the first will be to pay for projects financed out of the unified science and technology development fund, providing that such projects are carried out within a time shorter than stipulated in the plan; the second will be granted to associations for the implementation of highly effective measures for the development of science and technology, not stipulated by the plan.

Loans for capital construction will play a considerable role as well. One of the main directions which have determined their development in this sector is the settling of accounts between contractors and clients based on fully completed projects. Credits in such operations assume prime significance. As of now outlays for unfinished construction-installation projects will be essentially secured through bank loans, while the system of advancing funds by the customer to the contractor shall be abolished. This will ascribe new features to the relations between the bank and the contractor. The granting of loans as outlays increase in the course of the construction process will make it possible to substantially strengthen the control of

the bank over the completion of the projects ready to begin output and provide services, i.e., for end construction results.

The November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum raised to the level of a most important national economic task the further development of industrial sectors determining the aspect of the material and technical base of our economy. This applies to the sectors of the fuel, energy, chemical, metallurgical and machine-building industries. Credit relations with these sectors are based on stimulating higher productive capital returns, discovery of hidden reserves, and economical utilization of raw material and fuel and energy resources.

Major possibilities exist in this area. A number of production facilities are still producing substandard goods, "eroding" their own working capital as a result of losses, or accumulating above-norm stocks of commodity-material values. For example, in the machine building industry alone about one billion rubles have been invested in such values.

The proper organization of monetary and credit circulation demands a strict approach to the structure of credit investments. We must bear in mind that each bank ruble put into circulation will be stable only when it is backed by growing productive capital, flexible material values and commodity resources. Credit should not be granted on the basis of a financial gap developing between production outlays and funds earned from sales, and even less so for the compensation of losses. This calls for steady work to insure an economically justified structure of credit investments.

A number of measures guaranteeing an increase in the resources left at the disposal of the enterprises, based on improved end results, are now stipulated with a view to developing the economic initiative of labor collectives and expanding the rights of production associations and enterprises. The task consists, precisely, of increasing the responsibility of economic managers for the proper and economical utilization of state funds at their disposal, and making more sensible use of their own sources. In accordance with the government's decisions, shortages of working capital of industrial associations, enterprises and organizations which have failed to fulfill their revenue plans must be compensated by them within a three-year period by fulfilling the assignments set by ministries and departments for earning additional and above-plan profits, as well as the result of reduced withholdings from profits for the economic incentive fund.

The bank personnel realize that wherever losses are caused by unforeseen circumstances, natural disasters, or other reasons uncontrolled by associations and enterprises, the latter would find it difficult to compensate through their own efforts for the breach in working capital. However, should the enterprise itself be guilty of negligence, where overexpenditures of metal, raw materials, fuel and electric power are allowed, where the equipment shift coefficient is low and losses from defective work are high, as a result of which the enterprise is operating at a loss, the

enterprise must mandatorily use its own reserves or, if necessary, the reserves of the respective ministry or department.

For this reason, the profound study by the banking institutions of the economic and financial condition of each enterprise or association allowing a careless attitude toward working capital and the accumulation of surplus commodity stocks assumes ever greater significance. The purpose of this study is to assist in exposing cases of negligence, carelessness, and waste, and rapidly and operatively block such negative phenomena.

Replacing cash with various credit circulation forms, thus saving on payment instruments, is a major function of credit in present-day conditions. This function is expressed in the planned organization of cashless payments in which credit operations are one of the elements which enable us to insure the continuity of the marketing of public output. A great deal was done following the 25th CPSU Congress to improve the organization of payments and speed up document turnover. However, a number of problems have remained unresolved. Let us take, for example, the case of prompt payments by purchasers for delivered goods. We know that not all of them settle accounts with suppliers within the stipulated deadlines. This has frequently been the case even when the latter have conscientiously fulfilled their contractual stipulations. Yet, bank loans to the purchaser who is short of his own funds, cannot always be granted because of delinquent repayment of previously granted loans

As of now, in order to insure prompt payments for goods delivered in accordance with concluded contracts, and with a view to increasing the responsibility of the purchasers for the observance of payment discipline, it has been stipulated that should the purchaser be temporarily short of funds when a payment is due, payments based on submitted documents shall be honored by the USSR Gosbank and Stroybank out of loans debited to the purchaser, who must repay them within 60 days at 5 percent annual interest. The payment deadline may be extended, but at a higher interest rate.

Should the purchaser be temporarily short of funds, regardless of the condition of accounts between the purchaser and the bank, based on previously granted loans, the payment documents shall be honored by the bank, which will grant a loan. Granting the purchaser credit for payments to suppliers, the Gosbank institutions thus control the observance of one of the most important indicators used in assessing the results of economic activities of associations and enterprises in industry--the fulfillment of the plan for the delivery of industrial-technical and consumer goods in terms of their variety and deadlines stipulated in concluded contracts. All this will contribute to the development of stable and healthy relations between supplier and purchaser, for the enterprise acting as a supplier will be responsible for observing delivery conditions, while the enterprise acting as the purchaser will be held more responsible for the observance of payment discipline. In turn, this will increase the attention of economic managers to the organization of association and enterprise finances.

The November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum described capital construction as a "major state problem." Every year over one-fifth of the national income goes into capital construction and the utilization of such funds largely determines the indicators of our economic development. In this area, however, far from everything is as it should be. The critical remarks heard at the plenum apply to all ministries and departments engaged in financing capital investments through the USSR Stroybank and Gosbank. In particular, they fully and entirely apply to the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, and USSR State Committee for Supply of Production Equipment for Agriculture.

In 1979 loans in excess of 21 billion rubles were made for the financing and long-term crediting of capital investments by such organizations. The use of capital investment funds is close to the planned figures, whereas the commissioning of facilities has fallen far behind the plan, fluctuating between the 85 and 95 percent level, as a result of which the volume of unfinished construction is rising. The cost of unfinished construction of agricultural projects undertaken by the USSR Ministry of Rural Construction is high and rising steadily. All this shows that tremendous possibilities exist to improve the work. In this connection the Gosbank offices must increase their control over the submission of project lists and the opening of a credit line within the stipulated deadlines. They must work for the maximum reduction of the number of newly initiated construction and other projects, the concentration of funds on overlapping construction projects, and observing the stipulated norm for the length of construction work.

A number of bank establishments in the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Belorussia and Kazakhstan have acquired a certain experience in this direction and have achieved positive results. On their suggestion 6,000 projects costing a total of 567,000,000 rubles, for which no cost estimates had been provided or construction funds had not been allocated in accordance with construction time norms, were deleted from the 1979 plan. The released resources were channeled into starting and overlapping projects. This made it possible to commission productive capital worth 944,000,000 rubles.

The banks' engineering and technical services play an important role in increasing control over construction work. In 1979 cost estimates for construction, capital repairs and starting operations were reduced by over 400,000,000 as a result of engineering control exercised by Gosbank personnel.

The bank is doing extensive work in controlling the amount of already completed projects or projects underway by the contractor in order to prevent cost overruns or direct padding. In such cases the culprits are held accountable. In order to make such activities even more effective, the pertinent bank services must establish closer contacts both among themselves and with the financial, people's control and prosecution organs, so that the struggle against such antistate phenomena be systematic and irreconcilable.

The Communist Party and the Soviet Government pay great attention to foreign economic relations in whose development the banking system plays an important role. Currently business contacts are maintained with 1,730 banking institutions of 120 different countries.

The main direction followed in our foreign economic relations is that of mutually profitable cooperation among fraternal countries, achieved, helped by a number of international economic organizations. This is actively helped by the broadening of credit-financial and foreign exchange relations provided by the International Bank for Economic Cooperation (IBEC) and the International Investments Bank (IIB) with which all CEMA-member countries are affiliated.

As a result of strengthened trade and economic relations with industrially developed capitalist and developing countries, the USSR Gosbank and Foreign Trade Bank have acquired steady partners--the central banks and a large number of commercial banks of these countries--with which major credit, payment and foreign exchange operations are being successfully carried out.

In recent years large-scale long-term mutually profitable cooperation with the capitalist countries, based on so-called compensation agreements, has become ever more popular. On the basis of such agreements, we purchase abroad, with the help of long-term bank credits, the machines and equipment we need, repaying such loans with earnings from the sale of goods produced by the newly completed projects. On this basis a number of big national economic projects have been built. Studies indicate that such cooperation is mutually profitable both to the Soviet organizations and banks, and to our partners in the capitalist countries. At the same time, it contributes to the establishment of lengthy and stable political relations among the countries belonging to the two social systems, and to the strengthening of peaceful good-neighborly relations.

The Soviet banks abroad, currently operating in Britain, France, the FRG, Switzerland, Austria and a number of other Western countries, are substantially contributing to the development of monetary-financial relations between the USSR and foreign countries. These banks bring into the capital market foreign exchange worth about eight billion rubles, which they grant as loans, above all, to the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, as well as to banks and companies in capitalist and developing countries.

The measures taken to improve the planning and mechanism of economic management, stipulated in the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decrees fully apply to the development of foreign economic relations. The USSR Gosbank and Foreign Trade Bank are steadily controlling the implementation of the country's consolidated foreign exchange plan and the foreign exchange plans of the ministries and departments which enable us to keep track of a number of important problems of our country's foreign economic

activities. The banks take measures to increase the influx of foreign exchange resources and their economical utilization. To this effect they encourage the efforts of enterprises to increase the production of goods for export and to improve their quality and technical standards, and their competitiveness on foreign markets.

However, let us note that the way in which a number of ministries and departments use imported equipment which is not always promptly installed and, therefore, results in foreign exchange losses, must be seriously questioned. Let us cite as an example the Ministry of Chemical Industry, which underfulfilled its plan for the installation of capital assets in a number of construction projects. For example, at the beginning of 1980 projects for producing ethylene, polyethylene, propylene and benzene had not been commissioned, even though the repayment of funds borrowed for their construction from foreign banks had already begun. The situation drastically lowers the effectiveness of equipment imports.

Possessing rich raw material resources and a variety of goods produced by the processing industry, the Soviet Union has extensive possibilities to increase its participation in the international division of labor in the interest of accelerating the building of communism in the USSR and strengthening friendly relations with other countries. Our country's great abundance of fuel and energy resources and the fast development of corresponding sectors, on the one hand, and the great demand for goods produced by this group on the foreign markets, caused by rising petroleum and petroleum products, natural gas and other energy prices, on the other, have made it possible to substantially increase export revenues in foreign exchange. Raw and cut diamonds and jewelry items, and uranium concentration services have become new major Soviet export articles. Sales of licenses and patents are rising steadily. All this offers great possibilities for activities by our banks on the international money markets and for the development of cooperation with the banks of the Western countries in foreign exchange-credit relations, with a view to providing financial assistance to the implementation of concluded agreements and contracts, and adoption of programs.

As a major trade partner, the USSR has long become a creditor, rather than a debtor on the world markets. Particularly large credits are offered to the members of the socialist comity and the developing countries, as well as to Western companies purchasing our machines and equipment. At the same time, the Soviet Union looks for credits from Western banks in purchasing machines and equipment, particularly complete plants and systems, for granting long-term banks credits with such operations has now become standard international practice.

Occasionally, our Western ill-wishers are trying to question the purely economic objectives and tasks of the credits we use and even to cast aspersions on USSR solvency. However, the business circles in the capitalist countries are well aware of the groundlessness of such conjectures, the

more so since the percentage of credits we receive from the capitalist countries is exceptionally low compared with our capital investments, national income and export possibilities. Furthermore, in recent years the monetary system of the members of the socialist comity has strengthened further. The role played by the transferable ruble in international accounts is rising.

Speaking of USSR foreign relations, let us remember Lenin's instructions on the role of gold in the international payments of the socialist state. Lenin spoke of the need to develop gold reserves and their skillful handling, so that, "The RSFSR must produce the gold, sell it at higher prices and use it to pay lower prices for purchases" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 226). Following these behests, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government are always concerned with the preservation and increase of the gold reserve. Great attention is paid to upgrading labor productivity in the gold extraction industry and to the price of gold on the world market.

Long-term and current planning of trade and other payments insures the Soviet Union's minimum utilization of gold as a universal currency in equalizing the balance of payments. However, during individual periods the uncontrolled nature of the capitalist market with its inherent circumstantial price fluctuations could necessitate changes in the planned volume of sales of Soviet commodities used to pay for imports. In such cases the question usually arises of replacing one export commodity with another, of selling gold. As a gold-producing country, the USSR uses gold sales with a view to increasing imports and, in particular, to eliminate disproportions in the national economy caused by unforeseen circumstances.

Let us note that all such problems of monetary-economic relations must be frequently resolved under conditions of a profound decline of the Western economy, increased company and bank bankruptcies, and currency upheavals. For this reason, our banks must steadily improve their activities, find flexible and firm methods with which to work with customers and correspondents, closely follow all events in economic, foreign exchange and financial areas, and in maintaining close cooperation with the banks of other countries, particularly those which support progressive changes and trends in the international division of labor.

Such are the basic directions in the activities of the banking system to improve the economic and credit-payment mechanisms. In order to make plans and measures more effective, the level of economic work in all sectors, including banking institutions, must be raised.

The USSR Gosbank must pay greater attention to the economic side of the work and make fuller use of its right to exert economic influence on the development of the national economy. All this calls for improving the work style and methods, upgrading the responsibility of the personnel within the entire banking system for their assignments, and strengthening discipline and labor discipline.

ECONOMIC MACHINERY AND PLANNED PRICE SETTING

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 45-59

[Article by N. Glushkov, chairman of the USSR State Committee on Prices]

[Text] Planned Price Setting and Questions of Efficiency

The system of planned price formation represents an important part of the complex of the economic machinery for administering the socialist economy. Success in implementing measures to improve the economic machinery and to strengthen its impact on raising the efficiency of the economy of developed socialist society largely depends on the quality of price formation.

Price is the chief instrument of cost accounting. It is on the basis of prices that turnover of the social product is effected between the spheres of production and consumption, the physical production sectors and the nonproduction sphere, and individual enterprises (organizations) and, finally, that national income is redistributed.

The shaping of price levels and correlations serves as an important means with whose help the socialist state can reinforce plan targets with economic incentives, insure the necessary coordination between demand for output and the production potential for meeting that demand and develop production in accordance with the differentiated requirements of individual sectors, regions and groups of the population.

The significance of the stimulative function of prices is increasing under conditions of the scientific and technical revolution. The prices system is called upon to increase its impact on the economy by stimulating scientific and technical progress, helping to raise production efficiency and work quality and contributing to every possible economy of material expenditure in all components of the national economy and to the rational utilization of production capital and labor resources.

The price set in a planned manner for all consumer goods and for agricultural and industrial output and the charges for electricity, thermal energy and all forms of transport and of housing, municipal and consumer services

are, on the one hand, the plan normative for expenditure (production costs) and profitability in social production, and, on the other hand, the normative which shapes public consumer demand for essential goods and services. As a result, price is associated with many aspects of the production and economic activities of enterprises and organizations and with the people's culture and daily life and to a definite extent exerts a substantial influence on shaping the socialist way of life.

All cost indicators used in planning and in national economic accounting are based on the prices system; the correctness of the basic indicators of the socialist society's development depends directly on the accuracy and authenticity of prices.

However, the potential latent in the economic nature of prices cannot be realized automatically. This requires their constant improvement with regard to the changing conditions of economic development and the demands of the party's economic policy at different stages of communist building. This is why, simultaneously with the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On Improving Planning and Strengthening the Economic Machinery's Impact on Raising Production Efficiency and Work Quality," the decision was made to improve wholesale prices and charges in industry.

Scientific and technical progress in the Soviet national economy manifests itself in the sphere of price formation in the form of two opposing objective trends which operate simultaneously. One of these manifests itself in the reduction of spending on production, and thereby also in the reduction of wholesale prices as a result of higher social labor productivity as new, technically more sophisticated and economically highly efficient equipment is introduced and as the achievements of progressive science and technology are combined with the advantages of the socialist social system. The other opposed trend determines the growth of expenditure and prices as a result of the increasing scale of the process of bringing nonrenewable natural resources into economic circulation--a process associated in many instances with the opening up of deposits which are poorer in terms of basic substance content and are situated in more remote and less accessible regions. The existence of these two objective trends must be taken into account in the systematic activity to develop the socialist economy, including the planning of price dynamics. We proceed here from the premise that trends toward rising expenditure and prices are not something insuperable. The raising of the economic efficiency of geological prospecting work, the improvement of techniques and technology for exploiting fuel and mineral raw material deposits, the bringing of new sources of fuel, energy and raw material resources into economic circulation, all possible saving of these resources in the sphere of their consumption, the systematic influencing of the level of output prime cost and, above all, the insuring of the increasing preferential growth of labor productivity compared with the growth of wage costs per unit of output produced--the use of these and other possibilities for the systematic impact of the socialist state's economic-

organizing activities on the development of the economy makes it possible to weaken and overcome the growth trend in the movement of expenditure and prices.

It is precisely because the movement of prices is not an automatic, simple process but occurs under conditions of the struggle between opposing trends that the need to increase wholesale prices for the output of particular sectors of industry may arise at certain times. However, the dialectic of real economic life teaches that raising wholesale prices in individual sectors of the economy must create in other, consuming spheres of production objective preconditions for saving resources and on this basis insure a subsequent reduction in wholesale prices.

But if, nonetheless, the objective course of the development and distribution of the country's productive forces and the mining and geological conditions for extracting coal, oil, ferrous and nonferrous ores, phosphates and so forth--conditions which are deteriorating in a number of regions--are inevitably resulting in increased production costs (prime costs) for fuel, energy and ore resources, costs which cannot yet be brought down by introducing new and more productive equipment and technology, saving funds or increasing labor productivity in the extractive sectors of the national economy, then the task of saving fuel and energy resources and metals must **UNAVOIDABLY AND WITHOUT FAIL** [neizbezhno, nectvratimo] [capitalized words published boldface] be resolved in those sectors of the national economy which consume these resources. If this demand for economy is not implemented, then **ALL THE INCREASED EXPENDITURE ON EXTRACTING COAL, OIL, GAS, FERROUS AND NONFERROUS METAL ORES, PHOSPHATES AND POTASSIUM SALTS** [capitalized words published boldface] will result in a reduction in the volume of national income.

But this cannot be allowed. The only real, correct way to overcome such negative phenomena in the economy was defined in the 24th and 25th CPSU congress decisions and in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's instructions--it is the way of raising the efficiency and quality of all our activities.

Unfortunately, these vitally important party guidelines are being implemented unsatisfactorily in a number of instances. Certain enterprises and associations are slow to replace the production of obsolete machines, machine tools and other equipment, drag out in the extreme the time taken to start up production capacities and new output and wastefully consume fuel, energy, metals and other resources. All this results in the failure from year to year to fulfill the plans for increased labor productivity and lower prime cost--which seriously restricts the state's potential for further raising the people's living standards.

Let us examine, for example, certain specific shortcomings affecting production efficiency in machine building.

The CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On the Further Development of Machine Building in 1978-1980" (July 1978) defined the task

of increasing the productivity of machinery and equipment in 1985, as well as its service life before capital repair, by 50-100 percent compared with 1973.

An analysis of the materials sent at the USSR State Committee on Prices for the approval of wholesale prices shows that in the technical-normative documentation of new machinery and equipment the increase in productivity and durability is insured on a considerably smaller scale than provided for in the aforesaid resolution. For new or modernized output the indicators of productivity and durability have changed in the following ratio:

Product	Percentage Increase in Productivity (capacity)	Percentage Increase in Durability
Machinery and Equipment of the Chief Machine-Building Sectors		
1976	10.0	13.8
1977	11.6	22.0
1978	15.3	30.0
1979	15.0	15.0
of which:		
machine-tool building	30.6	26.6
heavy machine building	12.4	15.6
motor-vehicle building	3.3	9.3
agricultural machine building	31.2	2.8
chemical machine building	20.7	21.6
construction and road machine building	12.2	12.3
electrical equipment industry	5.2	16.0

Here new machines included in the state plan of the USSR's economic and social development have higher indicators for increased productivity and durability. Thus, the rated coefficient of productivity growth obtained for new metalworking equipment included in the state plan and assimilated by enterprises of the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool-Building Industry (compared with the base coefficient) stood at 1.6 on average; the coefficient of increased service life for new chemical equipment assimilated by enterprises of the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building was 2.2. However, new equipment being included in the state plan has a small share (less than 1.0 percent) and does not determine the qualitative improvement of the production structure for machine-building products.

Machine-building ministries do not devote proper attention to the planning of fundamentally new, highly efficient output. The proportion of such output, including that produced on the basis of discoveries or inventions, constitutes less than 1 percent of the total volume of machine-building output.

Very frequently, instead of modernizing machinery, equipment and instruments and improving their technical and economic indicators, technical-normative documentation is simply reconfirmed. For approximately 40 percent of the products the materials for approving whose wholesale prices are sent to the USSR State Committee on Prices, actual modernization amounts only to reconfirming the specifications without improving the parameters of the output. In particular, for 300 products of the Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment and Control Systems, the validity of whose specifications expired in the first half of 1979, the revised specifications were distinguished only by a new date of approval, while the basic technical and economic indicators and the quality of the instruments remained unchanged.

Since the machine-building output for which prices were approved in 1976-1979 will, as a rule, be in series production through the end of the 11th Five-Year Plan, low indicators for its increased productivity and durability will have a restraining effect on the increased work efficiency of the main consumers of this output.

The efficiency of new equipment also falls as a consequence of its slow assimilation both in production and in operation. Long delays in starting up production of new equipment mean that the initial high level of expenditure falls extremely slowly and the production of this equipment becomes either loss-making for enterprises or inefficient for the consumer. Thus, the Chelyabinsk Tractor Plant has been starting up production of the T-130 160-horsepower tractor since 1978. With reference to existing prices for the T-130 tractor and taking the increased useful effect of the T-130 tractor into consideration, its wholesale price should not be more than R12,000. However, owing to the long time taken to start up its production, the prime cost is considerably in excess of the stated price level. This resulted in the wholesale price of the T-130 tractor being confirmed at R16,000, which is 50 percent above the level of the economically justified price. Even as of 1 January 1981--9 years after the tractor began to be assimilated--owing to the high expenditure on production, the wholesale price has been set at R13,000. The total cost to the national economy of overstating the expenditure on production of the T-130 tractor over the whole period has amounted to more than R160 million.

And there is a similar situation with a Kama Truck Plant vehicle, whose prime production cost and existing wholesale price are correspondingly 40 and 60 percent above the wholesale price with regard to its useful effect.

A considerable increase in expenditure which is not in line with improved basic operating properties (carrying capacity, service life before capital

repair) characterizes the Belaz-549 dump truck manufactured by the Belorussian Motor Vehicle Association. With a less than twofold increase in carrying capacity (from 40 to 75 tons) and a 50 percent increase in its service life before capital repair compared with the Belaz-548A dump truck, the prime cost of the Belaz-549 dump truck has more than quintupled in comparison with the prime cost of the Belaz-548A.

Individual types of output, primarily machinery and equipment for livestock raising and fodder production, are produced with the involvement of a large number of unspecified enterprises of different ministries--which results in an excessive increase in expenditure on the manufacture of these products, which are financed from the state budget.

The state's total losses from the production of this output under so-called "broad cooperation" at nonspecialized enterprises participating in the production of machine assemblies and components for livestock raising and fodder production, which are not characteristic of their product mix, will amount to approximately R600 million during 1976-1980.

Unfortunately, these or similar examples exist in practically all sectors of the national economy.

A single conclusion follows from what has been said: It is necessary to strengthen the policy of thrift in practice, increase the role and significance of production costing (normative and account costing) and decisively turn the attention of economic, planning and financial organs toward resolving the task of systematically reducing, month by month, prime production cost at all enterprises (associations), in all spheres of production, in transportation and construction.

But for this it is not enough just to try to convince people and to explain the need for the policy of thrift. It is necessary to set all ministries, departments, enterprises and organizations compulsory targets for reducing prime cost (or increasing profits as a result of reducing them) in their plans for each year and for the five-year plan as a whole. In our opinion, there is no other way to really resolve the task of raising efficiency.

This should especially be emphasized in connection with the fact that an important new economic indicator--the net output normative--is being introduced into the practice of planning industrial production in the 11th Five-Year Plan.

The net output normative will be developed as a sectorial indicator. It includes the wages of industrial production personnel and profits and is an organic part of the planned price (wholesale, purchase and retail price, or charges for energy, transport operations and services).

The formulation of draft net-output normatives is being carried out at the same time as the establishment of a planned price on the basis of both of a

unified sectorial production costing compiled by the production associations (enterprises), scientific research institutes and the design organizations of ministries and departments, and of progressive technical-economic normatives, including labor-intensiveness.

The confirmation of the net-output normatives is entrusted to the USSR State Committee on Prices and other price-formation bodies using the new wholesale prices as a base. The concentration of this work in the State Committee on Prices is explained not merely by the fact that the committee's apparatus possesses a large volume of concrete material on the structure of prices for the output of the individual sectors and subsectors of industry, which facilitates the computation of the new output normatives, but also by the need to insure the obligatory linkage of the net-output normatives with the wholesale price system.

The net-output normatives act as a new evaluation indicator which characterizes more accurately and reliably the labor collectives' contribution to the creation of a part of the surplus product envisaged in the structure of the planned price. The net-output normative in no way reduces the significance of the planned price in the system of the economic machinery, since cost accounting relationships can only be based upon the planned price, which provides for the full compensation of the mean sector production outlays (including all material expenditure) and formulates the planned accumulations (profit) for each type (range) of output.

Of course, the transition from experimental verification of the net-output normative to the systematic introduction of this important evaluation indicator in all machine-building sectors and in a number of sectors of the construction materials industry and certain sectors producing consumer goods is generating many new problems.

An open exchange of opinions is under way on a number of specific issues of the formation and functioning of the net-output normative.

Among such important issues one should single out the linkage between sectorial and enterprise net-output normatives, the insuring of a reduction in the labor-intensiveness and material-intensiveness of production, of equal benefit and of technical progress incentives, and many other issues. Unequivocal answers to these questions have still not been formulated. We are continuing to study the experience of the industrial enterprises (associations).

But it is possible to say with confidence that the net-output normative will function successfully only within the system of all indicators of planned price formation and not in isolation from them, for of itself it does not solve nor can it solve such problems as reducing the energy-intensiveness and material-intensiveness of production. Our task consists of transforming the net-output normative into an active instrument of the CPSU's economic policy.

Wholesale Prices and Charges in Industry

The wholesale prices and charges currently in effect in industry largely took shape in 1967 and have essentially been functioning for 12 years now. During this period a number of amendments have been introduced for individual groups and types of output. Thus from 1 January 1973 there was an eight-percent reduction in the wholesale prices of machine-building and metalworking enterprises.

At that time there was an increase in enterprise wholesale prices in the majority of light industry sectors. The overall level of these prices per sector rose eight percent after accounting for changes in the purchase prices of agricultural raw material, and also in wholesale prices for individual types of industrial raw material utilized in the manufacture of consumer goods. Meanwhile there was no change in retail prices of light industry goods.

There were individual rises in coking coal prices and the prices of ferrous metallurgy output along with a reduction in nonferrous metallurgy prices. However, the changes were all the same in the nature of partial amendments which on the whole did not alter the prevailing system of wholesale prices.

There can be seen at present a certain gulf between prices and production costs in the extraction industries, conditioned to a definite degree by the impact of a number of objective factors, such as: deteriorating geological and mining conditions in the extraction of natural resources in areas of the country opened up earlier; an increase in the proportion of remote northern and eastern regions of the country involved in the extraction of fuel and raw material, entailing a growth in capital expenditure on opening up new deposits and an increase in the rates of amortization; the increasing cost of environmental protection in all areas of extraction.

At the same time it should be acknowledged that the increase in production costs has also been influenced by the slackening of attention on the part of several ministries and enterprises to the tasks entailed by the policy of thrift and of lowering the prime cost of production. The major measures introduced to regulate wages have not been utilized in due measure to stimulate increased labor productivity. Planned targets for saving material resources are not being met in certain associations and at a number of enterprises. All this has entailed increased production costs and the transformation of part of the main extractive sectors into loss-making industries (above all, coal extraction in the Donbass).

The substantial reduction of the profitability, and even the transformation into loss-making industries, of a number of important sectors of the extractive industry weakens cost accounting here and simultaneously reduces incentives to save fuel and energy resources and material resources at the subsequent stages of their utilization, inasmuch as the wholesale prices for these resources do not reflect the true expenditure on their extraction.

However, the liquidation of the unprofitableness of individual sectors of the extractive industry cannot be attained by the simple redistribution of the profit of profitable sectors within the confines of the prevailing overall level of wholesale prices for heavy industry output. The hiking of fuel and mineral raw material prices impacts--in more ways than one, what is more--like a chain reaction [v poryadke tsepnoy svyaz] on the outlays and profitability of all related sectors consuming fuel and mineral raw material on a considerable scale. In this connection there arises the need to improve the prevailing system of wholesale prices.

Inasmuch as the perfecting of wholesale prices is being effected simultaneously with the perfecting of the economic machinery currently under way, the review of wholesale prices and charges cannot be restricted to the solution of questions of altering the levels of these prices and charges in individual sectors and subsectors of industry. The review must incorporate the accomplishment of measures for the qualitative improvement of the very machinery of prices in the direction of intensifying their influence on the development of the socialist economy: the attainment of greater balance among the main elements of the national economy; the rational utilization of material resources; improvement of the territorial siting of productive forces, and so forth.

The review of wholesale prices in 1980-1981 envisages the accomplishment of a number of important, fundamental measures in this direction:

The fuller reflection in industrial output prime cost, and thus in wholesale prices, of expenditure on geological exploration and reforestation work, and also of outlays on social insurance for workers and employees. The introduction of a system of payment for the distribution of water consumed by industrial enterprises from the water resources systems;

Increasing the stimulative role of additional increases on wholesale prices for new high-efficiency output of an industrial-engineering specification and at the same time extending the practice of applying discounts to prices for goods in the second-quality grade;

Boosting the role of prices in lowering the material-intensiveness of manufactured output and in broadening the utilization of inexpensive types of raw and other materials. In this area it is envisaged applying a number of additional incentive measures for the manufacturers. Thus, given the utilization in production of cheaper types of materials than those already in use and given the maintenance of output quality in this context at its former level, the wholesale prices for this output will remain unchanged until the end of the five-year plan. The wholesale prices for new articles with reduced material-intensiveness are established with consideration for the maintenance of the amount of profit obtained from the sale of the previously produced (being replaced) output, but no lower than the profitability normative established for the corresponding output group;

A change in the methods of defining output profitability levels when determining wholesale prices for the purpose of limiting the manufacturing enterprises' interest in producing materials-intensive output. It is a question of extending the practice of defining profitability when establishing wholesale prices in terms of the relationship of profit to output prime cost minus the cost of the raw material, materials, fuel, energy, semi-finished goods and subassemblies used.

The new wholesale prices and charges will take effect 1 January 1982 (1 January 1981 for the the electronic engineering sector).

The USSR Council of Ministers has charged the USSR State Committee on Prices, the ministries and departments of the USSR, the union republic councils of ministers, associations and enterprises with insuring, when formulating the new wholesale prices and charges, that they take into consideration the established targets for the reduction of output prime cost on the basis of the extensive utilization of scientific and technological achievements, the improvement of production and management, the growth of labor productivity, the strictest economy of fuel and energy resources and other material resources and also the best utilization of fixed and circulating capital.

The alteration of the levels of wholesale prices during the forthcoming review must be combined with their qualitative improvement which insures the intensification of the prices' influence on the effectiveness and quality of output.

There should be strict control over the whole business of norming fuel and energy expenditure by establishing permanently declining normatives and stipulating the responsibility for their precise observance. Of course, this work is being done even now, and each year sees a reduction in the specific expenditure norms for fuel and energy resources; but all the same, for the basic types of output in ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy and the chemical, petroleum-refining and pulp and paper industries--that is, in the most energy-intensive sectors--the expenditure of fuel and energy still greatly exceeds the technically feasible normatives, while in nonferrous metallurgy, on top of this, extremely inadequate use is made of the calorific capacity of sulfide ores, which contain from 800 to 1,200 kilocalories per kilogram.

Yet the possibilities for economy here are great. For instance, the Norilskiy Mining and Metallurgical Combine's Nadezhdinskiy Metallurgical Plant, whose commissioning is planned for 1981-1982, will, by applying a new ore concentration smelting technology and utilizing the high-temperature metallurgical gases, make an annual saving of 2.4 billion kilowatt hours of electric power in comparison with the currently existing technology. This will mean that in the future it will be possible to accomplish the processing of sulfide ores entirely by means of the thermal energy contained within them. If one considers that we annually process

tens of millions of tons of sulfide ores, then the energy result of the saving is assessed at million of tons of ideal fuel.

There are also economy reserves in other sectors.

Thus, at any modern refinery the useful expenditure of energy constitutes as yet no more than 20 percent.

For the main sectors of heavy industry and machine building as a whole, the losses of fuel and energy resources in 1980 are assessed at 20 million tons of ideal fuel, for whose extraction no less than R450 million are expended, excluding the capital investments essential for the establishment of production capacities.

It is essential to take urgent steps in the sphere of improving planning and price formation of insure the saving of fuel and energy resources.

We ought above all else to plan and incorporate in all the natural and cost indicators of enterprises (associations) the production and consumption of secondary energy resources, and set up a system of economic incentive for the complete utilization of fuel and energy resources and penalties for nonproduction losses of such resources.

Naturally, such measures should be introduced gradually, in step with the readiness of industrial enterprises, since the efficient utilization of energy requires the creation of special installations (waste-heat boilers or other gas-cooling and heat-recovery systems).

The introduction of new wholesale prices for industrial output and charges for electrical and thermal energy must not entail--and it is essential to emphasize this--an increase in existing retail prices.

Concerning Prices for Output of the Agrarian-Industrial Complex

Questions of price formation for the output of the agrarian-industrial complex must be viewed in the light of the tasks set the price-formation bodies, ministries and departments by the July (1978) and November (1979) CC CPSU [plenums].

At the July (1978) and November (1979) plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev made a detailed analysis of the state of our agriculture and set forth a program for its further development. It outlined important tasks for the five-year plan regarding an increase in the production of grain, meat, milk, eggs, wool, potatoes and other products. A condition of the attainment of these high indicators is agriculture's transfer to an industrial footing, its further specialization and concentration and interfarm cooperation.

Special significance is attached to improving the economic relationships between agriculture and the sectors of industry which furnish it with the

means of production and which process agricultural raw material--that is, among all sectors of the agrarian-industrial complex.

The correct, economically valid structure of the system of prices for the means of production and production services for agriculture, on the one hand, and, on the other, of the purchase prices for agricultural output acquires particularly great significance for the maintenance of the essential proportionality in the development of industry and agriculture and of the equivalent exchange between them, and for reinforcing cost accounting relationships at enterprises and in the associations and sectors.

Analysis has shown that the growth rates of production expenditure in 1978 in comparison with 1966 were higher on kolkhozes and sovkhoses than the growth rates for the gross output of agriculture. Moreover, roughly one-half of the absolute increase in expenditure is accounted for by outlays on the kolkhozes' and sovkhoses' acquisition of industrially produced materials (fuel, spare parts, mineral fertilizers, mixed feed and so on).

Of course, it is impossible to attribute the entire increase in kolkhoz and sovkhos production expenditure to the growth of wholesale prices for agricultural equipment and other output acquired by the kolkhozes and sovkhoses. Shortcomings in the organization of production in agriculture itself, in particular instances of the insufficiently rational utilization of production capital, also have a substantial impact here.

The unprofitability of agricultural production in a number of republics, krays, oblasts, rayons and farms is also a consequence of low yields and stockraising productivity and of insufficiently efficient use of equipment, fertilizers and fodder. In many instances farms under identical production conditions show different levels of profitability although purchase prices are the same--something which is particularly clearly evident from an analysis of the economic indicators of leading and laggard farms in the RSFSR Nonchernozem Zone. A similar picture can be seen in other republics and zones also.

However, it would be wrong to ignore the real instances of increases in the price of industrial output supplied to agriculture.

The rise in the prices of new agricultural equipment is often considerably greater than the increase in the useful effect from using the equipment.

The question of the proportionality of prices in the agrarian-industrial complex is becoming particularly urgent in connection with the review of wholesale prices. The introduction of new wholesale prices for industrial output and charges for electricity and thermal energy must not occasion additional expenditure in agriculture that cannot be recouped.

At the CC CPSU November (1979) Plenum, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted that it is still the case in agriculture that insufficient attention is paid to

raising the quality of agricultural output and insuring its safekeeping. The system of moral and material incentives needs improving. Plan indicators, and also prices, must be determined to a much greater extent by output quality.

The price-formation organs, ministries and departments are faced with important tasks to implement these demands and further improve price formation in the direction of taking greater account of the quality and safekeeping of agricultural output.

The main direction in improving the profitability of kolkhozes and sovkhoses must be the systematic reduction of production costs by increasing production efficiency, improving its level of technical equipment, insuring the increasing preferential growth of labor productivity by comparison with the rise in remuneration and strengthening specialization and concentration on the basis of interfarm cooperation.

Thanks to the efforts of the CPSU and the selfless labor of the entire Soviet people our country has created a powerful agrarian-industrial base for grain production which, despite the complex weather and soil and climatic conditions, stably insures the production of the cheapest grain in the world. This is a great achievement of the socialist agricultural system.

Retail Prices for Consumer Goods

To understand the movement of the retail prices system in our country, you need to remember certain indicators characterizing the demographic structure and level of prosperity. As of 1 January 1980 our country's population was 264.5 million--an increase of 48 percent over 1950. The average monthly wage of workers and employees in 1979 was R163.5 (not counting additional payments from social consumption funds), whereas in 1950 it was R64.2, which represents an increase of 150 percent. During the current five-year plan alone kolkhoz members' monetary income has increased by more than 25 percent and now totals R114 per month. In 1979 social consumption funds were more than R400 per capita per year. They have increased almost sixfold since 1950. As of the beginning of 1980, the number of pensioners was 49 million.

The length of the work week has decreased to 41 hours in industry and to 35 hours in the coal industry, with 2 days off. Wages have risen constantly at the same time.

In 1979 a total (useful) area of 102.5 million square meters of apartment blocks was commissioned, the annual capital investment in housing construction being more than R17 billion. In 1950 the total area of housing commissioned was only 40.4 million square meters. The increase is 150 percent.

How does the system of state retail prices look against this background? Retail prices in our country were shaped in 1947--33 years ago--at the same time as the rationing system and free market [kommercheskiy] prices were abolished. Taking into account the changes in prices during the war, retail prices had almost trebled compared with 1940, the increase in food prices being 260 percent and in industrial-goods prices, 120 percent.

Then, over the course of a few years (1948-1954), these prices were substantially lowered. However, retail prices were lowered at this time under conditions where wages were practically not increasing at all and were comparatively low for most of the population.

The 1955 retail prices still largely hold today for many consumer goods. The prices of some food goods (meat and meat products, milk and milk products, certain fish products and also alcoholic drinks, coffee and chocolate confectionery) have risen somewhat, but the prices of certain industrial goods have decreased.

The USSR Central Statistical Administration price indexes quoted below cogently confirm this. They are calculated as a percentage of 140 average annual prices.

Years	All Goods	Food Goods	Nonfood Goods
1940	100	100	100
1947	298	361	220
1950	186	203	165
1955	138	141	134
1965	140	152	126
1970	139	152	124
1975	139	154	122
1978	140	155	123
1979	142	156	125

The table shows that 1979 prices had increased overall by 4 percentage points by comparison with 1955, food prices showed an increase of 15 percent, while prices for all nonfood goods had decreased 9 percent.

And over the same period wages--not counting other state expenditure and payments from the social consumption funds and housing construction--increased 130 percent.

At the same time it should be said that, in setting the retail prices of certain industrial goods the production of which cannot be increased infinitely, considerable account must be taken of the correlation between supply and demand and the extent to which the goods are in short supply.

Let us analyze the question of prices for new industrial goods--goods of improved quality and new goods (goods bearing the mark "n"). The USSR

State Committee on Prices and republic and local price-formation organs strictly insure that the prices of new industrial goods are economically valid--that is, interest industry in rapidly renewing its range and provide a profit, but are at the same time within reach of the average main consumer.

High-quality, fashionable goods are a firm part of our daily life. Customers' requirements are rising from year to year. Enterprises in the footwear, sewn goods, knitwear, furniture and other sectors of industry are expanding the production of new, better-quality goods. In Kiev and Lvov, for instance, special salon stores promoting new models and designs have been opened to sell particularly fashionable and elegant goods that are in great demand among the population. Clearly, other republics can also make use of the experience of the Ukraine's trade workers.

	1950	1965	1975	1979
Meat and meat products				
million tons	1.1	5.3	10.1	10.2
Butter--thousand tons	230	702	1,116	1,285
Vegetable oil--thousand tons	158	558	717	790
Milk and dairy products, including cheese and ewe's milk				
cheese (in milk equivalent)--million tons	1.6	15.4	29.0	30.8
Eggs--billions	1.5	10.3	31.2	37.4
Sugar--million tons	1.2	5.5	7.4	7.6
Confectionery products--million tons	0.9	2.3	3.3	3.7
All kinds of clocks and watches				
--thousands	8,226	21,926	35,536	39,737
Radios and radio phonographs				
--thousands	992	4,980	7,591	6,693
Television sets--thousands	12	3,338	6,002	6,453
Cameras--thousands	234	1,262	1,773	2,289
Refrigerators--thousands	1.2	1,458	4,823	5,038
Washing machines--thousands	0.3	3,141	3,241	3,436
Electric vacuum cleaners				
--thousands	6.1	643	2,073	2,671
Motorcycles and motor scooters				
--thousands	113	690	1,033	1,206
Passenger cars--thousands		64	964	1,095
Bicycles and motor-assisted cycles--thousands	684	3,663	4,368	4,571
Sewing machines--thousands	510	1,677	1,237	1,186
China, earthenware and glassware				
--million rubles	147	403	1,181	1,772
Furniture--million rubles	153.3	1,986	4,248	5,312

However, the proportion of goods bearing the "n" mark is still no more than a few percent of total turnover. Despite the economic advantages enterprises drive from producing better-quality goods, certain ministries and departments are not paying due attention to organizing their production and are not taking sufficient measures to expand and renew the range of output, especially of cultural and consumer articles and domestic appliances, while production costs are still high for a number of goods in production, including new color television sets.

The movement in consumer demand under the influence of changes in incomes and prices is characterized by the [preceding--the table as published followed the text here] figures. This is what the dynamics of the sale of foodstuffs and certain other goods via state and cooperative trade look like.

The increase in the populations's real income is determined not only by growth in the wages of workers and employees and in the pay of kolkhoz members and by the increase in payments and concessions from public consumption funds, but also by the level of prices for goods and services. Policy in the sphere of retail prices is determined at the modern stage by the 25th CPSU Congress decisions and provides for stability to be insured in the state retail prices of the basic foodstuffs and nonfood commodities and for a reduction in the prices of individual types of commodities as the necessary conditions are created and commodity resources accumulated.

The apartment rent charge, which is the lowest in the world, has remained unchanged since 1928.

The stability of retail prices is a graphic advantage of the centralized planned economy over the economy of capitalism, where unprecedented growth in inflation has been observed in recent years. Thus, during the period 1970-1978 the prices of consumer goods and services increased 70 percent in the United States, 170 percent in Britain, 100 percent in France, 50 percent in the FRG, 110 percent in Japan and 170 percent in Italy.

Account must be taken here of the fact that great additional expenditure is required of the state to insure a stable level in the retail prices of certain most important commodities and in the rates for individual kinds of services.

It is known, for example, that at the present time state expenditure on buying, processing and selling meat and dairy products is considerably in excess of the retail prices for those products, the difference between them being made up out of the state budget. The state spends R25 billion for this purpose. The state additionally allocates approximately R6 billion a year for housing costs in connection with the low level of rent and other charges. Payments for housing do not meet even one-third of the actual spending for that purpose. Many types of children's food and school articles, individual mass species of fish, fuel and certain other things

are sold to the population at below production cost. The state spends a lot of money on developing and maintaining public transport.

To make the range of children's goods cheaper and more widely available, particularly children's clothes, the state also grants additional concessions for these purposes from the budget. Cloth for the manufacture of children's sewn goods, for example, is released to the sewn goods industry at a discount of 20-50 percent.

The chief economic condition for insuring retail price stability is to further increase social production efficiency, reduce the prime cost of production, intensify the policy of economizing on material and labor expenditure and strengthen financial discipline, that is, to seek material resources by way of the internal reserves of the socialist economy.

In recent years an unfavorable situation has arisen with regard to the prices for agricultural produce sold in city kolkhoz markets. There are 5,700 of them in the country, with a commodity turnover of R6.5 billion a year. It should be pointed out here that under conditions of high rates of development in state and cooperative trade, of the increasing share of the public sector in the production of agricultural produce and, accordingly, the falling share of the private subsidiary plots of kolkhoz members, workers and employees, the proportion of kolkhoz trade in total sales of foodstuffs (at comparable prices) has more than halved during 1960-1978. In total sales of foodstuffs the share of sales by consumer cooperatives of agricultural products at prices prevailing in local markets also fell over 60 percent in the same period.

Working people's letters sent to the USSR State Committee on Prices point out that prices in kolkhoz markets are at odds with the interests of society: They are considerably higher than state retail prices, do not accord with labor expenditure and result in the personal enrichment of the sellers of agricultural produce. The letters also suggest introducing state regulation of prices at kolkhoz markets.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev drew attention to precisely this aspect of the matter in the report "On the Draft Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR and the Results of its Nationwide Discussion," pointing out that "the appropriate state organs must firmly exercise the right of control given them by the constitution and strictly see to it that the plots of land made available to citizens are used rationally, for the benefit of society, and that the income from subsidiary plots and from individual labor activity accords with the principles of socialism." It has to be admitted that price-forming organs have still done practically nothing to bring order to kolkhoz market prices.

We also receive many letters whose authors insistently raise the question of the low price of bread, which, in their opinion, leads to a wasteful, careless attitude toward bread consumption on the part of a certain

section of the population. It has to be stated bluntly that the concern for bread is perfectly justified.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out at the CC CPSU November (1978) Plenum that the question of losses of grain, vegetables, fruit and cotton is not only an economic question, but also a big political question and that every communist and every economic and party worker must show heartfelt concern for the public good.

But this task cannot be resolved by simply raising bread prices. The price of bread is the equivalent of prices for meat, milk, groats, macaroni, confectionery products and dozens of other commodities.

In connection with the significant rise in the people's general well-being and the increased consumption of meat, milk, eggs, vegetables and other products, there has been a sharp drop in our per capita consumption of bread products--from 164 kg in 1960 to 139 kg in 1979, that is, a drop of 25 kg.

It would be possible to make further sensible savings of bread, but the country's baking industry still works to produce in bulk--it produces a lot of bread in the form of loaves and sticks weighing over 500 grams, while less than 10 percent of production is in the form of individual bread products weighing 50-100-300 grams, just as 20 years ago.

While strictly insuring the policy of stability in state retail prices for basic foodstuffs and nonfood commodities, price-formation organs must examine especially carefully the quality indicators and other consumer properties of new products and analyze and take into consideration the economically valid production costs associated with achieving these commodities' new quality and other indicators. Special attention must be paid to preventing instances where new commodities have unsubstantiated prices set for them which do not correspond to the degree of improvement in their consumer properties. The price-formation organs must erect an insuperable barrier to those economic planners who try to resolve question of raising production efficiency by raising prices.

CS01 1802

WHAT IS GREAT CANNOT BE FORGOTTEN

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 60-77

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union I. Bagramyan]

[Text] Thirty-five years of tremendous accomplishments separate us from the time of victory in the Great Patriotic War. However, the events of those heroic years have neither faded nor been erased in our minds. The war continues to live within us, in our recollections, in the life of those who were on the front and those who were born after the battles were over. The war past appears like a period of greatest trials and unparalleled heroism. What is great cannot be forgotten. We believe that our descendants as well will again and again reinterpret this truly epoch-making event, for it was not the fate of the Soviet alone that was being decided in the Patriotic War. The fate of world civilization, of all social progress, was on the balance.

The organizational and ideological activities of the communist party, which invested its collective mind, will and energy in the defense of the socialist fatherland, and the people and its armed forces who led it into brilliant victories, were the decisive factors of the historical victory of our people. The October Revolution was made under the leadership of the Leninist party and our homeland took the path of socialism. The party's leading activities, gigantic in scope and purposefulness, led to the conversion of backward Russia into a country with a developed industry and large-scale collective agriculture. The party and Lenin were creators of an army of a new type, unsurpassed in terms of moral-combat qualities. The party raised the Soviet people in a spirit of proletarian internationalism and Soviet patriotism, and of sacred hatred for the oppressors and enslavers of the working people and, therefore, of the fascists of all hues. In the prewar years it spared no efforts to lay a reliable material and technical foundation for the country's defense capability. The party also developed a progressive military-strategic doctrine and helped the military cadres in the development of an operative art enriched by the theory of deep offensive operations. It was on this basis that the Soviet Command resolved the problems of training the troops and conducting the operations of large front and army units.

Before mounting its aggression against our homeland, fascist Germany had enslaved 11 European countries, thus substantially increasing its strategic position. Hitler and his masters--the German capitalists and the international monopolies--considered, not without reason, that they had accomplished all this in order to launch against the Soviet Union a monstrously powerful strike which no developed capitalist country would have been able to resist. Never before had an invader raised such a huge army with such technical power and high professional training as the German-fascist Wehrmacht.

In the complex conditions in which Hitlerite Germany launched its war against the USSR, the organizing and guiding role of the Leninist party was manifested, yet once again, with particular strength. In order to insure the organized operative management of the armed struggle and the activities in the rear, full powers were granted to a special organ--the State Committee for Defense (GKO). J. V. Stalin, general secretary of the CC VKP(b) was appointed its chairman. The GKO focused all the efforts of the people on the implementation of the party's appeal: "Everything for the front, everything for victory!" The best leading party cadres headed party-political work among the troops, cementing our armed forces. Hundreds of thousands of party members went to the front to fight in the most important sectors.

Reactionary bourgeois historiography is grossly falsifying the events in the first period of the war. The treacherous attack mounted by fascist Germany on the USSR is interpreted by the falsifiers as having been a preventive war. This monstrous lie was required to justify the aggressive plans of the modern aggressive imperialist forces. In particular, the bourgeois West German historians claim that, starting the war against the USSR, Germany, allegedly, had no detailed plan, for which reason it was forced to resort to "improvisations" in 1941. This insinuates the idea that had there been such a plan, the military operations would have brought about decisive results. To please the militarists, the bourgeois sociologists and former Hitlerite generals strain themselves to prove that Germany's defeat was not the result of the Soviet Union's sociopolitical, economic and military superiority, but of a number of miscalculations on Hitler's part. In particular, they claim that in 1941 it would have been possible to capture Moscow and defeat the USSR had Hitler not made a "basic fatal error," of turning part of his Group of Armies Center, in August, in a southwestern direction. It would be pertinent to recall here that a similar explanation was given by the possessed fuhrer himself in explaining the reasons for Germany's defeat in World War I. On 30 January 1941 he stated that, "The victory of Germany's enemies in 1918 was the result of an accumulation of errors and of the exceptional incapability of the then German leadership. No such accumulation of errors had ever occurred in history before, and will never be repeated in the future." Therefore, the modern falsifiers of history are not "pioneers" in this matter, but are simply repeating after Hitler himself.

The Soviet Union withstood the first period of the war as a result of the superiority of its social and governmental system and socialist ideology, and thanks to the power of its arms and the unity of the people rallied around the communist party, and the party's titanic organizational work, rather than as a result of the errors committed by the fascist leader.

In the course of the battles of the frontier the Soviet troops already wrote outstanding historical pages of unparalleled courage, firmness and military skill.

The battle for Smolensk was a major step in the defeat of Hitler's blitzkrieg plan. In the course of the fierce battles which developed in Belorussia, the Smolensk area, and between the Zapadnaya Dvina and Dnepr rivers, the forces defending the approach to Moscow courageously repelled enemy forces superior in men, artillery and airplanes by a factor of two and in tanks by a factor of four. The Soviet guards were born in the course of the Smolensk battle.

At the same time, fierce battles developed in the Baltic and the approaches to Leningrad, where Soviet land forces fought in close interaction with the Air Force and the Navy, displaying an inflexible resolve to defend the cradle of the revolution. The heroic epic of the defense of the surrounded city, which lasted 900 days and nights, unparalleled in the history of wars, began on 8 September 1941. Beyond the Polar Circle our units, acting together with the seamen of the Northern Fleet, threw back all Hitlerite attempts to capture Murmansk.

The heroic defense of Kiev, which lasted over two months, wrote an unforgettable chapter in the history of the first period of the war. I was directly involved in this battle as deputy chief of staff and chief of the operative section of the staff of the Southwestern Front. Under incredibly difficult conditions the defenders of Kiev fought with exceptional courage and bravery. The troops of the Kiev fortified area, which were protecting the city from the west, distinguished themselves by their high combat activity and mass heroism. The troops of the 147th and 175th divisions, respectively commanded Colonels S. K. Potekhin and S. M. Glovatskiy, and the 5th Airborne Brigade commanded by Col A. I. Rodimtseva, the combined detachment commanded by Gen F. N. Matykin, and many others covered themselves with unfading glory. The people of Kiev were of tremendous help to the troops.

The lengthy and adamant struggle for Kiev and for the bank of the Dnepr forced Hitler to use considerable forces of the Army Group Center to mount a strike against the forces of the Southwestern Front. This delayed the advance of the fascist troops along the main direction--Moscow--and gave the Soviet Command the opportunity to concentrate here major strategic reserves.

Those who fought to the last ditch in that most difficult period blocking the path of the enemy in the defense of Leningrad, Kiev, Odessa and the

Brest fortress, performed immortal combat exploits. In the struggle for these bastions the German-fascist troops suffered tremendous losses. Thanks to the mass heroism of the Red Army troops, commanders and political workers we gained the necessary time to evacuate plants and factories to the east, mobilize reserves, and set up firm defensive installations along the more distant and closer approaches to the capital.

The offensive on Moscow, code named "Typhoon," began between 30 September and 2 October with a strike from the south and the west by two powerful groups of enemy forces consisting of 74 and 1/2 divisions, including 14 tank and 8 motorized. At the cost of tremendous losses, having pushed back the heroically defending Soviet forces, the enemy was able to reach Tula and occupy Kalinin and Mozhaysk. The capital faced a mortal danger. On 19 October the GKO passed a decree proclaiming a stage of siege for Moscow and adjacent areas. Displaying miracles of heroism, by the end of October the Soviet forces stopped the enemy along the line of the Volga Reservoir, east of Volokolamsk, along the Nara and Oka rivers, and at the southwestern approaches to Moscow, where, in the Tula sector, the 50th Army commanded by Gen J. V. Boldin, was firmly supported by detachments of Tula workers.

Despite the unsuccessful outcome of the October offensive, the enemy did not abandon its intention to capture Moscow. The new offensive began between 15 and 18 November. Once again the Soviet troops wrote immortal pages in the history of war through their courage and heroism, so that, toward the end of November, it became clear the second general enemy offensive on Moscow had played itself out. The selfless defense of each position gained time for completing the raising of 10 reserve armies, which subsequently played a decisive role in the outcome in the battle for Moscow.

The Soviet forces defending Moscow mounted a powerful counterattack from 5-6 December 1941 to the beginning of January 1942. It involved the troops of the Western and Kalinin fronts, the right wing of the Southwestern Front and subsequently the Bryansk Front. As a result, the northern and southern assault flanks of the Army Group Center were defeated and thrown 100 to 250 km back from Moscow. For the first time since the outbreak of World War II the Wehrmacht had suffered a defeat on a strategic scale. Eleven tank, 4 motorized and 23 infantry enemy divisions were smashed and 12 others were bled white.

During the battles for Moscow I was temporarily assigned chief of staff of the assault group of the Southwestern Front (commanded by Gen F. Ya. Kostenko), set up for the counteroffensive. Following a plan earmarked in advance, the front assault group dealt a headlong and unexpected strike at the forces of the 2d German Army, which had wedged themselves deeply in the Yelets area. The operation began on 6 December. By 9 December, despite desperate Hitlerite resistance, Yelets was fully liberated. Several days later a big group of the 2d fascist Army was surrounded and destroyed. As a result, the forces of the Southwestern Front reached the

flank and the rear of the 2d Tank Army commanded by Guderian, which was trying to bypass Moscow from the south.

Going back to the results of the battle for the Soviet capital, we must point out that our troops took the strategic initiative away from the enemy and did not allow him to reach a single one of the main objectives of the notorious Barbarossa Plan. The plan collapsed under the crushing strikes of the Red Army and its foundations--the theory of the blitzkrieg--was entirely wrecked. All this was considered throughout the world as a common victory won by the progressive forces over fascism, and played an invaluable role in strengthening the anti-Hitlerite coalition.

Similar to the way the Soviet troops would pass from defense to counter-offensive without a break, this counterattack as well developed into a general offensive without a halt. It consecutively included 10 Soviet fronts engaged in the Demyansk, Toropets-Kholm, Rzhev-Vyazma, Barvenkovo-Lozovaya, and Kerch-Feodosiya operations.

In January 1942 I had the occasion to directly participate in the planning and implementation of one of these operations--the Barvenkovo-Lozovaya. At that time I had been appointed chief of staff of the southwestern direction combining three fronts. This operation involved the forces of six combined arms armies and three cavalry corps, concentrated on the adjacent wings of the Southwestern and Southern fronts, on the Balakleya-Slavyansk Sector. They were opposed by the 6th and 17th Field and 1st Tank armies of the enemy Group South. On 18 January the Soviet troops mounted a decisive offensive. Five days later, through the combined strikes of the infantry and the cavalry, Barvenkovo was liberated, followed by the liberation of Lozovaya, four days later. Both were of essential operative importance to the enemy. All other offensive operations of that period were fully or partially successful.

Following the winter defeats of 1941-1942, and profiting from the delay of the allies in opening a second front in Europe, having shifted to the Soviet-German Front over 40 divisions, and focusing powerful forces in the southeastern direction, considerably superior to our forces in number and materiel, in the spring of 1942 Hitler's strategists mounted a new offensive, pursuing their former far-reaching political and military-strategic objectives. As a result, at the beginning of the summer the military-political situation was such that, after the losses of the Crimea, Khar'kov and the Donbass, and subsequently after the 250-day heroic defense of Sevastopol, the Soviet side temporarily lost the strategic initiative.

Hitler's 5 April 1942 directive called for "focusing all available forces on the main operation in the southern sector of the front with a view to destroying the enemy west of the Don and, subsequently, seizing the petroleum areas of the Caucasus and the passes across the Caucasus Range." In order to secure the left wing of the group, which was to advance to the Caucasus, the Hitlerite strategists decided to mount a strike on Stalingrad

as well. It was thus that, initially, the Stalingrad direction was given an auxiliary significance. Soon afterwards, however, the enemy's plans notwithstanding, it became the main and decisive one.

The date 17 July marks the beginning of the battle for Stalingrad, in whose individual stages both sides committed over two million men, over 2,000 tanks, as many aircraft, and 26,000 guns and mortars.

For four months, despite tremendous casualties, the enemy displayed unparalleled fierceness in an effort to capture the city. "We shall storm Stalingrad and take it," Hitler claimed boastfully. In vain! "Withstand and win!" was the brief order which, like an oath, became engraved in the minds of the defenders of the Volga fortress, reflecting their inflexible resolve to bleed the enemy white and destroy him.

Preparations for a counteroffensive were underway even in the defensive period. Thanks to the determination and heroism of Stalingrad's defenders, the 6th Field and 4th Tank German armies found themselves engaged in stubborn, blood-shedding battles along a narrow sector of the front. Information reached the Soviet Supreme Command that the enemy flanks lacked adequate reserves. Taking all this into consideration, the idea of a counteroffensive developed, aimed not only to throw the enemy back, but radically turn in our favor the entire operative-strategic situation on the entire southern flank of the Soviet-German front.

On 19-20 November gun and mortar fire proclaimed the beginning of the offensive of three Soviet fronts. On 23 November, as a result of skillfully carried out concentric strikes, and with the active help of the forces of the Don Front, the forces of the Southwestern Stalingrad fronts closed the ring around the 33,000-men-strong enemy group, which had burrowed through toward Stalingrad.

In the course of the battle for Stalingrad five armies belonging to Germany and its allies were crushed. Their losses totaled about 1.5 million men. Between 19 November 1942 and 2 February 1943 alone the enemy lost 2,000 tanks and assault guns, about 3,000 airplanes, over 10,000 guns and mortars and over 70,000 automotive vehicles.

Inaugurating the memorial monument in Volgograd, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, said: "Holding its breath, the entire world followed the battle on the Volga. In Washington, London, Paris, Belgrade, Berlin and Rome, everywhere the people felt, understood, that it was here that the outcome of the war would be decided. This was clear to our enemies as well. . . . In this battle it was not merely elite Hitlerite forces who were pulverized. Here their offensive thrust played itself out and the moral spirit of fascism was crushed." The defeat of the German-fascist troops by the walls of the Volga fortress marked the beginning of a radical turn in the course of World War II.

One of the most frequent devices of the bourgeois falsifiers of the battle for Stalingrad is the tendency to rate this historical battle along with operations involving the participation of Anglo-American troops. Furthermore, the bourgeois historians try to interpret it as a "local" battle of importance only to the Soviet-German front and having virtually no influence on the course and outcome of the entire World War II. They distort the very essence of the matter of the radical turn which occurred in World War II. Since the battle El Alamein, won by the British, occurred at the same time as the battle on the Volga, the bourgeois falsifiers are trying particularly zealously to confuse the question of the role and place of these two battles in the history of World War II, thoroughly exaggerating the significance of the victory in northern Africa.

The concept of some so-called turning points of the war is one of the means used to belittle the significance of the battle on the Volga. Such turning points include events which, in reality, were of secondary significance. For example, the American General Dean, losing all feeling of measure, considers the battle on the Volga on the same level as the victory of the American Navy over the Japanese squadron at Midway, in June 1942, the failure of the German counteroffensive in the Ardennes in December 1944-January 1945, and the establishment of a bridgehead on the right bank of the Rhine, at Remagen, by the American forces, in March 1945. It is hardly necessary to prove that such separate operations stand no comparison with the great battle for Stalingrad.

At the same time with the Stalingrad epic, the closely linked great battle for the Caucasus was mounted. The forces of the Severo-Kavkazskiy and Zakavkazskiy fronts, interacting with the Black Sea Fleet, in the course of heavy and stubborn fighting, stopped the invaders at the foothills and the passes of the Glavnyy Kavkazskiy Ridge and, subsequently, when the circumstances became favorable, turning to the offensive, defeated and expelled the enemy from the territory of the Northern Caucasus; in this case the enemy group was split into two parts: one withdrew toward Rostov, while the other pulled back to the Taman' Peninsula, the holding of which was considered very important by the enemy. Here strong fortifications were built, particularly at Novorossiysk. The seven-month defense of Malaya Zemlya--the bridgehead south of Novorossiysk--is an outstanding page written in the history of the liberation of the Caucasus. Gen I. Ye. Petrov, commander of the Black Sea group of forces, frequently visited the area. Col L. I. Brezhnev, and many other officers of the staff and the political department, spent a great deal of their time among the Malaya Zemlya heroes, inspiring the troops through their personal example and impassionate party words. Novorossiysk was fully liberated on 16 September 1943. During the ceremonies marking the 30th anniversary of the defeat of the fascist forces on the Caucasus, in recognition of the outstanding services to the homeland and for the mass heroism, courage, and steadfastness displayed by the working people of the city and the Red Army forces, Novorossiysk was awarded the title "City-Hero." Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted that, "The defeat of the fascist forces at Novorossiysk was

the beginning of the breakdown of powerful enemy defensive fortifications--the so-called 'Blue Line'--and was of great importance in expelling the enemy from the Taman Peninsula and the beginning of our offensive on the Crimea and thus the beginning of the liberation of the Ukraine."

The victory at Stalingrad and in the Caucasus made it possible to mount an offensive on a strategic scale along the virtually entire length of the Soviet-German front. By the spring of 1943 the Red Army had achieved major successes in almost all sectors. By then the frontline had moved far to the west and, essentially, led straight from Leningrad to the Black Sea and it was only in the area of Orel, Krusk and Belgorod that a huge salient had formed, known to history as the Kursk Arc. It was precisely this salient that the rulers of the Third Reich selected as the target of their main strike, thirsting for revenge for the cruel defeats suffered in the course of the winter campaign. They had particular hopes for the new Tiger and Panther tanks and the Ferdinand assault guns. As a result of total mobilization and the transfer of troops from the west to the eastern front, the German-fascist command concentrated here as many as 257 divisions. The biggest shock group--as many as 50 divisions (900,000 officers and men, about 10,000 guns and mortars, as many as 2,700 tanks and self-propelled guns, and about 2,050 airplanes) were concentrated in the Kursk area.

The events of the spring and summer of 1943 are remembered by all participants. This is understandable, for the forthcoming battles were largely to determine the entire subsequent course of the war. At that time the Soviet Supreme Command was faced with a dilemma: offensive or defensive? The operative-strategic situation was extensively studied and all possible alternatives were weighed. The only proper solution was adopted, that of converting to a deliberate defense so that, pulverizing and bleeding the enemy forces white, mount a decisive counteroffensive. The decision was reached through the collective thinking and creative work of experienced military commanders and staffs, from the front to the general headquarters levels, wisened by two years of war.

On 5 July 1943, proceeding from the area south of Orel and north of Belgorod, the enemy attempted to launch a powerful offensive. The Red Army forces opposed the enemy's frenzied pressure through stubborn and active defense, inflicting him heavy casualties (the enemy lost 72,000 men, killed or wounded, 1,200 tanks and assault guns, and 1,500 airplanes). While repelling the enemy strikes in the center, the Soviet troops mounted a decisive counteroffensive on the flanks. It began on 12 July and included two strategic offensive operations: the Orel (12 July-18 August) and the Belgorod-Khar'kov (3-23 August), with the forces of the Western, Bryansk, Central, Voronezh, and Steppe fronts. Our objectives were reached in their entirety. As a result of the 50-day-long battle, 30 divisions were defeated and the enemy suffered over half-a-million casualties.

I had the opportunity to participate in the Orel offensive as commander of the 11th Guards Army. On 12 July this army, deployed on the Western Front,

interacting with the 61st Army of the Bryansk Front, suddenly struck the northern part of the Orel Salient. A very expressive assessment of this strike was made by the enemy camp. Field Marshal Manstein wrote that ". . . Passed to the offensive from the east and the northeast against the 2d Tank Army defending the Orel Salient." The development of events in this sector forced the command of the Group Center to stop the offensive of the 9th Army in order to throw its major mobile forces into the battle on the sector of the 2d Tank Army. The staffs of the German armies operating at Orel reported to Hitler, two days following the beginning of the offensive of the 11th Guards Army, that "radical changes have taken place on a broad sector of the Eastern Front, over the past 48 hours. The center of gravity of the combat operations has shifted to the area of the the 2d Tank Army. Here the crisis continued to develop with unbelievable speed."

On 5 August 1943 the capital of our homeland saluted the forces which had liberated Orel and Belgorod. Subsequently, each major victory began to be saluted with guns. The battle for the Kursk Salient completed the radical change in the course of the Great Patriotic War and the entire World War II.

In 1974 French television organized a discussion on the battles on the Kursk Salient. I had the opportunity to participate in this discussion as the head of our delegation, which included Col Gen N. A. Lomov and Col B. G. Solov'yev. Our opponents were military personalities and historians of some Western European countries, including Kerner Hollender, former regimental commander of the 78th Wehrmacht Assault Division, and the well-known West German historian Klink, author of a very tendentious monograph on the Hitlerite army operations at Kursk and Belgorod in the summer of 1943. The discussion proved that the failure of German fascism is still bothering the enemies of peace and socialism. Hitlerite Germany and its Wehrmacht were the shock forces of imperialism, and objectively to define the role of the Soviet Union and its armed forces in the defeat of the German-fascist hordes meant to acknowledge the superiority of our social, political and economic system. Naturally, the imperialists are unwilling to do so. That is why they are doing everything possible to belittle the contribution of the USSR to the victory over German fascism.

The Wehrmacht generals drew up the Operation Citadel with the dream of insuring the full triumph of German-fascist military science and martial art. However, this dream was turned into dust through the concern and efforts of our party, the talent of the Soviet military leaders, and the courage, steadfastness, and combat skill of our commanders, political workers, sergeants, and soldiers. At the Kursk Salient the Soviet troops dealt the enemy such a crushing blow that fascist Germany definitively lost the strategic initiative for the rest of the war.

What solution has been found by the defenders of revanchism? Not resorting to tricks, they simply ignore the Kursk battle or, should this become impossible, consider it as just about a battle of local significance. Such

was approximately the way in which Ernst Klink presented the matter in the discussion on French television.

Millions of French people witnessed the way the irrefutable facts brought out by our delegation forced Klink, initially to adopt deep defensive positions and, subsequently, to retreat, hiding behind new conjectures, this time on other matters. The sharp French tongues noted then that this was, "Yet another defeat on the Kursk Salient. . . ."

The Kursk epic was followed by a general offensive mounted by the Red Army along a 2,000 km front, from Nevel' to the Sea of Azov. In the course of three months the Soviet troops advanced, in some places, as much as 300 to 600 km, liberating thousands of villages and hundreds of cities, including Kiev, the capital of Soviet Ukraine, and crossed the Dnepr along a broad front. Over 118 Wehrmacht divisions--as much as one-half of all enemy forces on the Eastern Front--were defeated in the summer and autumn battles of 1943. In the evenings the fireworks of ceremonious salutes in honor of the winners became ever more frequent over Moscow.

In January 1944 the forces of the Leningrad and Volkhov fronts, supported by the Baltic Fleet, broke entirely the enemy blockade of Leningrad and expelled the fascists from Novgorod. Virtually at the same time the forces of the Ukrainian fronts on the Right-Bank Ukraine, mounted their offensive. In February the enemy found itself in a miniature Stalingrad, in the Korsun'-Shevchenko area and, in March, at Chernovtsy. At that time the Hitlerites were defeated at Nikolayev and Odessa. Offensive operations were started in April in the Crimea. Simferopol' was liberated on 13 April and Sevastopol on 9 May. Soon afterwards, crossing the Prut, our forces shifted military operations on Romanian territory. The state border of the USSR was restored over a stretch of several hundred kilometers.

Following the victorious winter-spring 1944 offensive, when we cleared over three-quarters of Soviet territory previously occupied by the invaders, and when it became clear that the total defeat of the Wehrmacht by the Soviet Army was not far, finally, the long expected second front in Europe was opened. On 6 June 1944 Anglo-American forces landed in Normandy. Therefore, there are no reasons whatever to exaggerate the role of the operations of the forces of the Western allies, as the bourgeois authors are doing. A number of works by West German historians try to prove that the reason for the delay of the U.S. and British governments in opening the second front was not deliberate policy but the weakness of the American-British armed forces. The entry of the Allied forces into Europe is presented as the result of a "miracle" which, allegedly, became possible only thanks to the rapid creation of a powerful U.S. war machine and American political successes. The operations of the American-British forces are considered the only factor which made the defeat of the Hitlerite plan possible. Furthermore, it appears, the Soviet Army allegedly profited from the victories of the Allies and mounted an offensive when "all German armies were pinned down in the West." . . .

The unquestionable facts of the history of the war purely refute the fabrications of the bourgeois falsifiers. Whereas on the Soviet-German front 607 enemy divisions were crushed and captured, the American-British forces defeated and capture 176 enemy divisions, many of which only in the final days of the war, when the fate of fascism had already been decided. In the war against the Soviet Union fascist Germany lost 10 million men, killed, wounded or captured, and over 75 percent of its weapons and military equipment.

The opening of the second front at a time when the final defeat of Germany had already been decided by the defeats suffered by the Wehrmacht on the Soviet-German front where, even after the landing of the Allied Expeditionary Forces in Normandy, the main forces of the German troops continued to operate, despite its entire importance, neither had nor could have a determining significance on the course and the outcome of World War II.

To the Soviet people the fourth year of war held great promise. As early as the planning of the operations for the winter period of 1944, General Headquarters passed the decision that in the summer the main operations would be focused on the defeat of Group Central of the fascist forces and the liberation of Belorussia. The enemy was certain that the Red Army would strike its main blow toward the south. In order to reinforce this Hitlerite delusion, the Soviet command kept in that area most of its tank armies. Other measures for enemy disinformation were carried out as well. In his memoirs, Hackeholtz, former deputy chief of staff of the Group Center, wrote that, "The course of the winter battles led to a major concentration of Russian forces on the territory of western Ukraine. In Hitler's and his advisers' view, it was here, east of L'vov, where we were able to stop the Russian offensive with great difficulty, that the Russians would mount their main offensive in the summer 1944 campaign." Nevertheless, in Belorussia the enemy had major forces (63 divisions and 3 brigades, totaling 1.2 million men, over 9,500 guns and mortars, 900 tanks and assault weapons, and about 1,342 airplanes), covering the approaches to Germany. The plan of the Soviet command was to deal powerful coordinated strikes simultaneously in six directions, using the forces of the 1st Baltic, and 3d, 2d, and 1st Belorussian fronts, breach the enemy defenses in depth, and to surround and destroy initially its flank groups of forces in the areas of Vitebsk and Bobruysk and, subsequently, enlarging the successes, defeat the main forces of the 4th German Army by surrounding it in the area east of Minsk.

The forces of the 1st Baltic Front, which I then commanded, actively participated in this extremely big set of strategic operations. On 22 May I was summoned to the general staff. Present in A. I. Antonov's office were K. K. Rokossovskiy, commander of the 1st Belorussian Front, L. Z. Mekhlis, member of the Military Council of the 2d Belorussian Front, and I. D. Chernyakhovskiy, commander of the 3d Belorussian Front. All of us were happy to meet all the battle comrades and the meeting triggered great excitement and reciprocal questions on front matters. Then, one by one, we went to see G. K. Zhukov and A. M. Zasilevskiy.

Georgiy Konstantinovich motioned me to the map on which the plans for the operation and the consequent tasks of the fronts were graphically depicted.

"Ivan Khristoforovich," he said to me, "according to the operational plan which tomorrow, with your participation, we shall report to the supreme commander in chief, the forces of your front will first breach the enemy's defenses northwest of Vitebsk, cross the Zapadnaya Dvina River, and, covering yourselves on the Polotsk side, advance your main forces toward Lepel' and Molodechno, while part of the forces will advance toward Senno with a view to surrounding and destroying the Vitebsk enemy group of forces, interacting with Chernyakhovskiy's forces, whose subsequent assignment is to inflict the main strike against Vil'nyus. What do you think of this operation?"

I expressed my profound satisfaction with the nature of the plan and the daring and decisive objectives of this great operation. However, bearing in mind that our neighbor on the right, the 2d Baltic Front, was to engage in active operations far later, I expressed fears for my right flank. The forces of our front were to be used not only to defeat the Vitebsk group of forces, but to deeply outflank the entire Group Center from the northwest.

"In such a case," I said, "the powerful enemy Group North could hit hard the extended flank and the rear of our front."

"Yes, the danger of such a strike is entirely real," Georgiy Konstantinovich noted. "The 2d Baltic Front will mount its offensive at a considerably later time. For a while the hands of the enemy in the Baltic will be free. This must be taken into consideration. What is your suggestion?"

I had already thought about this, so that my answer was quick:

"After carrying out the immediate assignment of surrounding and defeating the Vitebsk enemy forces, it would be expedient to assign the deep strike to the southwest to the right wing of the 3d Belorussian Front, directing our efforts to the west, so that, interacting with the right wing of Chernyakhovskiy's front, inflict a powerful strike at the 3d Tank Army and, at the same time, cut off the southern wing of the Group North from the Group Center."

This led to a lively exchange of views, after which Marshals Zhukov and Vasilevskiy promised to support my suggestion with the report to the supreme commander in chief for the definitive variant of the planned operation. This was done the following day, when all of us were received by J. V. Stalin.

This tremendous strategic operation was developed strictly in accordance with the plan. In its first stage, the forces of the 1st Baltic Front, interacting with the 3d Belorussian Front, surrounded and destroyed the

Vitebsk fascist group of forces. Toward the morning of 4 July, defeating as many as six enemy divisions, they liberated Polotsk, thus opening the way to the Soviet Baltic area, and then eliminated the enemy flank group of forces in the areas of Vitebsk and Bobruysk. In 12 days the Soviet forces advanced 225 to 280 km. The enemy desperately tried but failed to stop our offensive. In the morning of 3 July, the tank forces of the 3d Belorussian Front entered Minsk from the northeast, while mobile elements of the 1st Belorussian Front entered it from the south. East of the Belorussian capital over 100,000 fascist soldiers and officers found themselves inside a huge cauldron. On 12 July the forces of the three Belorussian fronts definitively split and defeated this group. Soon afterwards the Muscovites witnessed the depressed march of a nearly 60,000-strong column of Hitlerites captured in Belorussia.

The headlong offensive of the Soviet forces went on. Liberating Polotsk, the 1st Baltic Front reached the Drisvyaty Lake, where the borders of Belorussia, Lithuania and Latvia meet. Soon afterwards we captured Panevezhis and Shyaniyay, after which the mobile front group of forces rushed to the Baltic Sea, splitting the enemy Group Center and North. Meanwhile, the forces of the 3d Belorussian Front, commanded by I. D. Obzernyakhovskiy, liberated the ancient city of Vil'nyus, the Lithuanian capital. The great Belorussian, Lithuanian and Latvian partisans made a great contribution to the success of the Bagration operation. We also give their due to the courage and valor of the 1st Polish Army and the 1st Czechoslovak Army Corps, and the fliers of the Normandy French Air Force Regiment, which awarded to the honor title of "Norman." The brilliant results of the Belorussian operation are among the most outstanding proofs of the high standard of the Soviet martial art.

The summer of 1944 was marked also by a number of further major successes. The forces of the 1st Ukrainian Front defeated the fascist group of forces at Brody, liberated L'vov, Peremyshl' and Stanislav, crossed the Vistula, and captured the Sandomir bridgehead. The armies of the 1st Belorussian Front crossed the Zapadnyy Bug River, liberated Brest, Knel'm, and Lublin, advanced toward Warsaw, crossed the Vistula and captured the (Magenskiy) and Pulawy bridgeheads. The forces of the 2d Belorussian Front liberated Bialystok. At the beginning of the autumn of 1944, summing up the results of the summer campaign, we could speak of major successes achieved by the Soviet side. As a result of the defeat of the Finnish forces, on 5 September Finland withdrew from the war. The defeat of the Wehrmacht and the Romanian forces in the Iasi-Kishinev operation and the uprising which followed forced the Romanian rulers to announce their withdrawal from the war on 23 August and, two days later, to declare war on Germany. In the center of the Soviet-German front our forces stood in front of eastern Prussia, on the Vistula and the Carpathians.

The task of the final liberation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia was implemented from 14 September to 24 November 1944 in the course of the Baltic strategic operation. In the middle of September, repelling the fierce

enemy counterattacks, the forces of our front, interacting with their neighbors, advanced toward Riga and stopped 16 km away from it. The forces of the 3d and 2d Baltic fronts were approaching Sigulda, an enemy defense line not far from the Latvian capital, where their advance was slowed down considerably. In this connection, after consulting with A. M. Vasilevskiy and myself, general headquarters decided, with a view to the fastest possible and final cut off of the Group North from eastern Prussia, which would immediately weaken its resistance along the other fronts in the Baltic direction, to shift the efforts of the 1st Baltic Front from the Riga to Vaseel' direction. The implementation of this daring operation required the concealed and profoundly secret movement of half a million men, over 9,000 guns and mortars, 1,350 tanks and self-propelled rocket artillery over a distance of 80 to 240 km, in 6 days. When such a mass of forces and equipment appeared, totally unexpected by the enemy, in a new direction and, on 5 October, struck a ramming blow toward Palanga, Slapena, and the estuary of the Neman River, not without a reason the fascist command considered a virtual miracle, for as a result of our strike 38 enemy divisions were cut off of eastern Prussia. Fearing total encirclement and defeat, they immediately undertook the evacuation of Riga and a hasty withdrawal to the Kurland Peninsula, where, soon afterwards, we pressed them toward the sea and surrounded them solidly, removing them forever from the struggle and the decisive sectors of the Soviet-German front.

While the forces of the 1st Baltic Front were completing this operation, by 13 October the forces of the 3d and 2d Baltic fronts had liberated the Latvian capital. In the other directions the Soviet Army was carrying out its international mission of rescuing the peoples of Europe from the fascist yoke. In the summer of 1944 about 8,000 square kilometers of Polish territory had been cleared from the Hitlerite invaders. On 1st September 1944 our troops entered Sofia in an atmosphere of nationwide rejoicing. The liberation of Czechoslovakia began in the autumn of 1944, when the Soviet forces came to the aid of the Slovak national uprising, heroically crossing the Carpathians. Acting with them was the 1st Czechoslovak Army Corps commanded by Ludvig Svoboda, the outstanding son of the Czechoslovak people. Meanwhile, the forces of the neighboring fronts were developing operations aimed at the liberation of other countries in eastern and southeastern Europe: Austria, Albania, Hungary and Yugoslavia. Soon afterwards, all of Poland became free and the combat operations shifted to Pomerania and Mecklenburg.

After the expulsion of the fascists from the Soviet Baltic, I was assigned with my staff to East Prussia, where a new contingent of forces was added to the 1st Baltic Front. The command and the staff of this front, subsequently reorganized as the Zemland group of forces, became part of the 3d Belorussian Front (commanded by A. M. Vasilevskiy). Its assignment was to plan and prepare the Königsberg offensive operation. The Hitlerites surmounted Königsberg with three solid defense lines and antitank obstacles. The third line which surrounded the city consisted of numerous

thick bastions, ravelins and towers. An ancient citadel, surrounded by a moat, was in the center of the fortress city, defended by several thousand fanatic SS troops. The Königsberg garrison numbered 130,000 men, and as many as 4,000 guns and mortars, and 100 tanks and assault guns. We formulated a detailed plan for the storming of this fortress, which in the Führer's view was impregnable.

On 6 April 1945 the Soviet artillery threw at it thousands of tons of shells and mines. Assault groups reinforced by tanks and rocket artillery hurled themselves into the attack. The aviation struck powerful blows at the city. The fascist forces defended themselves with desperate stubbornness. However, nothing could withstand the pressure of the fire and the inflexible will of the Soviet forces. On 9 April the Red Flag of victory rose over Königsberg. Hitler was unable to accept the loss of the city which he had proclaimed the best German fortress in all of German history and the "absolutely impregnable bastion of the German spirit," and, in a fit of helpless rage, sentenced to the death the commander of its garrison.

For 100 years Königsberg had been the symbol of militarism and aggression directed against the Slavic and Baltic peoples. It had brought incalculable suffering to Poles, Lithuanians and Latvians. In April 1945 this nest of Prussian militarism was eliminated once and for all.

The successful conduct of the outstanding Vistula-Oder operation in the winter of 1945 by the forces of the 1st Belorussian Front (commanded by Marshal of the Soviet Union G. K. Zhukov) and the 1st Ukrainian Front (commanded by Marshal of the Soviet Union I. S. Konev), and the defeat of the enemy in East Prussia created favorable conditions for striking a final blow against the enemy in his lair--Berlin. The capture of the German capital was an extremely difficult task. Hitler's clique, with its end approaching, was doing everything possible to delay the catastrophe. The fall of Berlin meant an end to the war in Europe. Expecting the strike, Hitler and his assistants took all the necessary measures to strengthen defenses, using the groups of armies Vistula and Center, numbering about one million men, over 10,400 guns and mortars, 1,500 tanks and assault guns, and 3,300 airplanes. Berlin's garrison proper exceeded 200,000 men. Berlin was to be taken by the forces of the 1st Belorussian and 1st Ukrainian fronts, with the assistance of the 2d Belorussian Front.

On 16 April before dawn 10's of thousands of guns and mortars opened drum fire on the enemy fortifications. Tanks and infantry hurled themselves in the attack, actively supported by our air force. This was a tremendously powerful strike. The predawn fog was scattered by a sea of light provided by several hundred searchlights. The battles for Berlin were stubborn and hard. The Hitlerite command made desperate efforts to prevent the advance of our troops. It shifted here from other sectors ever new formations, used its last reserves, and continued to raise Volksturm detachments. On 22 April it even released criminals from jail, adding them to the defense forces. However, the offensive thrust of the Soviet troops, commanded by

Marshals G. K. Zhukov and I. S. Konev, was truly irrepressible. On 25 April our units advancing from two sides joined west of Berlin, tightly encircling in their last kettle over 400,000 enemy troops. Fierce battles developed on the streets of the city. Displaying courage, heroism and military initiative, the Soviet soldiers advanced, step by step, toward the center of the German capital. On the night of 1 May 1945, the great holiday of the international proletariat, the flag of victory was raised over the Reichstag dome.

The enemy group operating in Czechoslovakia, numbering over 900,000 men, refused to lay down arms and tried to destroy the Prague rebels. With a daring spurt the Soviet forces defeated this group as well. Prague, the capital of Czechoslovakia, was liberated from the Hitlerites and saved from destruction.

On 9 May the thunder of victorious artillery volleys with which celebrating Moscow saluted on behalf of the homeland the valorous Soviet armed forces, were heard throughout the world. The titanic confrontation between the Soviet people and the most sinister offspring of imperialism--German fascism--which had lasted 1,418 days and nights, came to an end. Our just cause triumphed. The cruel and merciless enemy was defeated and its robber state was scattered into dust.

The historic victory parade, in which I had the pleasure to participate, was held on 24 June 1945 in Moscow, on Red Square. One after the other marched regiments covered by the combat glory of the front and fleets, and units of the Moscow Garrison. There were exciting moments when the Red Battle Flags of the Soviet armed forces passed by the Mausoleum of the great Lenin, whose sacred name inspired the army and the people to unparalleled exploits for the sake of our victory. At the conclusion of the parade, a group of 200 soldiers, advancing from the parade formation, threw at the foot of the mausoleum a large number of standards of defeated Hitlerite divisions and regiments.

Victory in World War II was won through the joint efforts of many nations. The peoples and armies of the members of the anti-Hitlerite coalition made a great contribution to the common victory over the enemy. The possibility for effective political and military cooperation among countries with different social systems was proved in practice. The allied forces of Yugoslavia, Poland and Czechoslovakia, and, in the final stage of the war, Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary, valiantly fought the enemy. The resistance movement which extensively developed in the occupied countries played an important role in the fight against fascism. Partisan actions and armed uprisings, and the heroism of the national liberation forces will be recorded forever in the chronicles of the anti-fascist struggle. The communist and workers' parties were in the vanguard of the struggle against fascism.

Our country withstood the main burden of the war and played a decisive role in the defeat of Hitlerite German and militaristic Japan. During war this

truth was repeatedly acknowledged by even the most senior statesmen of the Western countries.

Our victory was the result of the joint gigantic efforts of the Soviet Armed Forces, working class, kolkhoz peasantry and labor intelligentsia, of the entire people headed by the communist party.

The defeat of German fascism, followed by that of Japanese militarism, created favorable circumstances for the struggle of the working people for socialism. As a result of the successful revolutions made in a number of European and Asian countries, the world socialist system was founded, the general crisis of capitalism was intensified, and the development of the global revolutionary process was accelerated. Favorable circumstances developed also for the further development of the workers' movement in the capitalist countries and for the growth and strengthening of communist and workers' parties. The international communist movement became the most influential force of our time. The war victory over the forces of reaction also helped the powerful upsurge of the national-liberation movement and the breakdown of the imperialist colonial system.

Today the Soviet forces are vigilantly and watchfully guarding the interests of the homeland, directing all their efforts to upgrading the level of their combat and political training, and to strengthening discipline and organization. The defenders of the homeland are making a noteworthy contribution to the solution of national economic problems as well: They are building peacetime projects, and helping the farmers in harvesting the crops. Today's generation of Soviet forces is preserving and multiplying the great combat traditions of the heroes of the Great Patriotic War. The Soviet troops welcomed the 35th anniversary of the victory with new accomplishments in their combat and political training, and in the fulfillment of their socialist pledges directed, above all, to further upgrading their vigilance and combat readiness, mastery of modern equipment and armaments, and full utilization of their combat potential.

5003

CSO: 1802

SOLDIERS AND HOME GUARD: WRITER'S NOTES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 73-81

[Article by G. Prolov]

[Text] On the 35th anniversary of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War, all of us frequently turn back to the past, to our experiences. Even though a great deal of time has passed, to this day the great exploit of the people is carefully preserved in the hearts and the minds. For many years the remembrance of the people is burning like a living fire, passed on from fathers and grandfathers to their sons and grandsons as the most precious legacy.

We are amazed sometimes at the way our children and grandchildren, born after the victory, have been able to so profoundly understand and feel with all their hearts everything experienced by the senior generations, and find in themselves this high emotion and warmth with which to share the still painful losses and our constant readiness to do everything possible so that, in the words of the Khatyn "wreath of memory," "life may never die anywhere in a vortex of fire!"

With a stubbornness worthy of better use, Western propaganda extensively claims that in our country the past war is deliberately not ignored. It is claimed that by poking at old wounds and, at the same time, constantly emphasizing the results of victorious battles, the USSR is deliberately raising allegedly rancorous and aggressive people, ready at any minute to mount a war on the "Western democracies."

The stupidity of this lie is obvious. However, it is repeated again and again, persistently, and purposefully. Now, some of the foreign readers of the newspapers GOLOS RODINY and the periodical OTCHIZNA, where I work, have begun to feel that the Soviet press is allocating excessive space to the past war. Only three such letters were received. Nevertheless, we did not ignore them. We published them and asked the readers for their thoughts on this matter. Hundreds of letters reached the editors and the absolute majority stated that the past must not be forgotten. The millions of victims of fascism, and the unparalleled destruction, suffering and pain of

the people should not be forgotten. For wherever the past is ignored, conditions for new crimes against mankind may arise.

The careful and watchful attitude displayed by the Soviet people toward the memory of the fallen comes from the depth of the essence of our socialist society, in which man, his life and his health are the most precious property of the people. We lost in the war 20 million of our fellow citizens and we shall never forget this!

. . . Ol'ga Startseva, a student at the school of Journalism of Moscow University, was assigned to our editorial room for pregraduation practice. She became interested in war-related topics and soon afterwards wrote five essays under the common title of "There Is No Pain Affecting Someone Else," describing the way the past war touched with its black wing Zagoryanki, a small dacha settlement in the Moscow area.

I remember that a number of people were impressed by the heartfelt way in which this extremely young girl had been able to find the main and, perhaps, the only true words to describe emotionally and truthfully the Zagoryanki population.

Many students her age attending her school are researching materials on journalists named heroes of the Soviet Union, and recording the recollections of veterans of the 8th Moscow Home Guards Division. Every MGU [Moscow State University] student knows that in the summer of 1941 the division was joined by over 1,000 students, graduate students, teachers and associates of the university.

The Red Pathfinders, young workers and university and secondary students have set themselves the task of tracing the life of every fallen soldier. May the sad yet proud memory of the war and the courage of the living and dead defenders of the fatherland give strength, nobility and spiritual beauty to anyone who is following the paths of military and labor glory. In the course of this search, may the young pathfinders be helped by their warm desire to be useful to the people who lost friends and relatives in the war. It is not for nothing that the people say that there is no such thing as someone else's trouble or sorrow. . . .

"Come to the Aid . . ."

In my native area, not far from Krasnitsy, a village in Belorussia, pure and transparent springs come to the surface among hazel groves and willow bushes. Splashing in the grass, carefully bypassing trees and rocks, with amazing persistence they make their way to a nameless little river.

Some 10 km downstream, having gathered hundreds of little brooks, our unnamed stream becomes wider, more noticeable. By Belaya Dubrava it is already known as Beseda. With every passing kilometer the little river gathers strength and moves the banks wider. Further on to the south it

becomes the Sozhya. At Loyev, finally, it surrenders its waters to the Dnepr-Slavutich.

The Dnepr is broad, deep and beautiful. However, we well know that all this proud greatness (remember, "wonderful Dnepr! . . .") is a fabric woven from many thousands of small streams similar to those springing to the surface not far from my Krasnitsy. . . .

The parallel with the strength of the people is remarkably similar--it rises from thousands of cities, villages, hamlets and farmsteads, in difficult and hard times, like a powerful flood, and woe to anyone who would risk to clash with it or simply stand in its way!

Approximately one year before the Great Patriotic War, realizing that a terrible danger was approaching ever closer the borders of the homeland, the outstanding Russian painter Nikolay Konstantinovich Rerikh, made the following entry in his diary:

"Anyone who stands up against the Russian people will feel the consequences. This is no threat, but this is what the thousand-year-old history of the peoples proclaims. . . . History has retained proof of a superior justice which has quite frequently menacingly said: 'Leave alone!' . . . Ah, they would like to eliminate from the face of the earth one-fifth! Listening to information on the Russians' accomplishments, they make hostile faces. Destiny is steadfastly laying the great path of the Russian peoples to infinity--do not touch!"

I like very much these wise words in Rerikh's amazingly rich Russian language, even though he lived abroad for many years, his sincere patriotism, and the prediction of the outcome of a war to those who launched it. Yet, this was stated when the rulers of Hitler's Reich were dizzy from victories, and when the Wehrmacht they directed trampled one after another the battle flags of the armies of Western European countries, when many countries were becoming the easy prey of the aggressor with all their resources.

Was this not the reason for which their "Drang nach Osten" seemed to them just about a pleasant walk in an easterly direction? They had chosen a convenient time to start the "blitzkrieg"--the middle of the summer--and far striking like pirates, at dawn.

It seemed as though nothing could spoil Hitler's plans. Even the unusual fierceness of the battles at the border did not dampen the gangsterly exultation. The wall erected by the victorious reports transmitted to Berlin concealed the initial alarming signals from the front.

Heavy and bloodshedding battles were being fought everywhere. How many amazing and frequently unknown exploits were committed those days by the Soviet people defending their fatherland! To this day the young

pathfinders of history find on the ground once containing trenches and dug-outs and in the ruins of cities and fortresses soldiers' medallions and letters squeezed into empty cartridges and shells, as last testaments of the fallen heroes of that distant year of 1941, addressed to us, the living.

Several years ago, interrogating the residents of Sokol'nichi, a Belorussian village, who remembered the events of 1941, M. F. Mel'nikov, the Krichev area expert, found out details on the exploit by artillery Sergeant Nikolay Sirotinin from Orlovskaya Oblast. Here, in this village, the artilleryman, the only living member of the combat crew, engaged in a duel with a Guderian tank column, which was rushing toward Smolensk.

Having camouflaged his "forty-fiver" in the rye by the road, with an accurate shot Sirotinin hit the leading tank and then the second and the third. . . . The column, pressed along a narrow road and surrounded by a low swampy floodland, was unable to maneuver. Finally, several tanks reached a hillock and opened fire with their guns. The burning earth shook but the only artilleryman with his gun, who acted as a gun-layer, loader and shell carrier, continued to fight in this jumble of fire and smoke.

Nikolay Sirotinin fired as though practicing: confidently, calmly and at even intervals. Nearly every shell was a hit. When the gun suddenly fell silent, a piercing silence hung over the field. The only noise was that of the flames on the armor of the stricken German tanks.

Germans wearing black tankmen's overalls, advanced toward the silenced gun. They wanted to see with their own eyes the brave men who had stopped at Sokol'nichi Guderian's tank armada praised by Goebbels' propaganda.

The rustling of the steppes stopped. The German tankmen stood as though frozen by the young sergeant lying on his own soil. His face was frozen in a smile. Apparently, the instant before a shell fragment had pierced his heart he had been happily smiling at a good shot. . . .

Slowly, as though still undecided, one of the German tankmen took off his battle darkened helmet. After him, as though ordered, the others as well took off their helmets.

. . . The fierceness of battles on the eastern front rose with every passing day. In the first two months of the war alone the Wehrmacht lost about 400,000 soldiers and officers. Let us point out that these were the best, the elite, units and formations. Nearly one-half of the tanks and a tremendous number of airplanes were destroyed.

At that point the enemy propaganda began to try somehow to explain the reasons for the failure of the "blitzkrieg." Here is what a fascist newspaper wrote:

"The Russian soldier is superior to our Western adversaries because he scorns death. Endurance and fatalism make him hold on until he is either killed in the trench or in hand-to-hand combat."

According to another newspaper, "The German soldier met an enemy who held to his political credo with fanatical stubbornness, and is opposing total resistance to the German blitzkrieg."

Other testimony by the enemy could be cited, either written immediately following the events, or many years later, in an effort to understand the core of his failures and errors committed at the very beginning of the war, when everything seemed to be going successfully.

To us, however, that summer was incredibly hard. In the very first weeks of the war, despite tremendous losses in personnel and equipment, the Hitlerites were able to seize a considerable part of Soviet territory. A mortal danger threatened the country. It was then that all Soviet people who could hold arms rose following the party's call.

On the Steep Banks of the Dnepr

Every summer I go to Belorussia, to the places where I was born and grew up, and from where I went to the army in the autumn of 1944. Virtually always this trip ends at Mogilev, our oblast center. I feel like endlessly roaming along its streets and squares, excitedly looking at familiar and unfamiliar features of my native city.

Somehow, I think that this is precisely the way I would come across my father, had he been destined to return from the war: Somewhere near Voronezh, leading a battalion in attack, he suddenly stumbled and fell forward, facing the west. He did not rise. . . .

I shall never come across my father. I have another meeting, with my native city.

It was bright and beautiful on the eve of the Great Patriotic War. Washed by the spring rains, covered with green gardens and parks, with the wind blowing from the river, the city looked amazingly young.

22 June 1941

The news of the war caught the people of Mogilev at the banks of the Dnepr, where they were preparing for the city's sports competitions. It was as though a gust of wind wiped the smiles off their faces. Everything around darkened, becoming stern, strict. Almost instantaneously the bank of the Dnepr was empty but for a hastily abandoned boat.

Here, along the Dnepr, the end of June and the first days of July 1941 were merely a prelude to the terrible approaching events. The enemy had not as

yet succeeded in hurling his entire tank firepower on Mogilev and on the positions of units urgently organizing the defense.

The people refused to believe that fierce battles were already being fought at Minsk, Bobruysk and between the Berezina and Dnepr rivers. There, their blood draining, divisions and corps fought to death, ordered to hold back the enemy at all cost and cover the approach and deployment of fresh Red Army units.

Quite soon Mogilev itself became a frontline city. On 24 June Hitlerite airplanes bombed it for the first time. Then, one bombing raid followed another. On 3 July Sr Lt Nikolay Terekhin fought three Hitlerite airplanes which were trying to bomb Mogilev. Terekhin brought one airplane down with his machine guns, and then ran out of ammunition. The pilot decided to ram the second one. He hit the tail unit of the bomber with his right wing, and downed him. Terekhin's damaged airplane was still controllable and he aimed it at the third bomber. A few seconds before the hit our pilot was able to release himself from his safety belts and open the cockpit. There was a crash and the airplanes began to fall down in pieces. Somewhere alongside, unconscious, Terekhin was falling in free fall. He came to some 400 meters from the ground, pulled the ring, and the parachute opened. . .

All this took place in a few minutes, watched by the people of Mogilev. On 8 July 1941 Sr Lt N. V. Terekhin was awarded Order of Lenin for his exploit.

Later Nikolay Vasil'yevich commanded an aviation regiment. He made 150 combat raids and destroyed 15 enemy airplanes. This courageous eagle died in air combat on 30 December 1942. . . .

The 61st Rifle Corps--one of the best large units of the Moscow Military District--was entrusted with the defense of the Dnepr line in the Mogilev sector. The corps was commanded by Maj Gen Fedor Alekseyevich Bakunin.

The corps' headquarters reached Mogilev in the early morning of 27 June. It was followed by elements of the 110th and 177th Rifle divisions, artillery regiments, engineers, sappers and other subunits. Without awaiting the arrival of all echelons, Bakunin undertook the organization of the defense. As many as 35,000 city residents worked on the building of fortifications along the Dnepr and around Mogilev. In seven days a 25 km deep defense line was built. Barricades appeared on the streets. Many houses, particularly in the center and at the crossroads, were adapted for street combat.

Everything was ready to repulse the enemy. Self-defense detachments were raised in factories and plants. In a few days they became companies, battalions and regiments of the home guard. It was only later, as we matured, that we realized that amazing unity between front and rear was being organized in front of our very eyes, and that the invincible force

described quite precisely and graphically by Vladimir Il'ich Lenin--the armed people--was growing, expanding and strengthening.

The moment they learned about the war, thousands of residents of Mogilev, from adolescents to gray haired veterans, hastened to volunteer for the front. In the first day alone about 200,000 requests were filed. All in all, about 25,000 people from the city left for the active army. However, this was not all. When registration for the home guard began, another 12,000 citizens of Mogilev proclaimed their readiness to fight the enemy.

There were veterans of the Civil War, people of different professions, and young boys and girls. Each one of them had a single request: give us weapons sooner! What great courage and resolve one could read in their eyes, and how unusually stern their faces had become! And how many young people there were among them! True, it was about them that, after the war, the soul-rendering words were written:

"Little ones, little ones, tomorrow you will go into battle. Little ones, little ones, come back home alive"

Virtually all of them died defending Mogilev in the home guard detachments, in the clandestine and partisan warfare, in the endless front roads leading to Berlin. Few remained. Their stories, to which the brief lines of archive documents may be added, have made it possible to unravel many secrets of the three-year struggle against the enemy in the Mogilev area, and identify the names of the heroes. Actually, we began to call them heroes later. At that time they were simply Lenya Lorchenko, Tanya Karpinskaya, Misha Frolov, Vanya Ivanovich, Karolina Chulitskaya

As a rule, the home guard was raised on the basis of jobs. Detachments were set up in factories, plants and schools. At meetings the people angrily spoke of the enemy's insidious plans and of their desire to defeat him in battle. Next to the speakers were tables where people registered for the home guard. All in all, 14 battalions were raised, given very short training, and immediately assigned to defense positions in the immediate approaches to Mogilev. They fought side by side with the troops and commanders of the 61st Rifle Corps, displaying amazing steadfastness and courage.

When the threat to the city on the site of the Dnepr bridge became real, a home guard battalion was moved there. P. Ye. Terent'yev was its commissar. Trenches were dug in the park on along the steep banks of the Dnepr and earthen and cement pillboxes were built. The enemy mounted a number of attacks against this line, to the very last day and hour of Mogilev's defense.

The Mogilev home guard detachments fought together with the troops of the 388th Rifle Regiment also at Buynichi, a suburban settlement. In a single day, in the course of a fierce battle, they destroyed and set on fire with

molotov cocktails 39 enemy tanks. This was a hot day! They were visited by war correspondents K. Simonov and P. Troshkin. The latter was able to photograph the still-smoking cemetery of Wehrmacht tanks. P. Troshkin's photographs and K. Simonov's essay on the amazing courage of the defenders of "D city" (Mogilev) were published in IZVESTIYA on 20 July 1941. . . .

The home guard of the Mogilev Pedagogical Institute were occupying positions on the steep banks of the Dnepr, on the site today's city park. In the first days of the war, which coincided with the period of examinations, the students manned the position and, circumstances permitting, rushed to the institute to take their examinations and tests in history, political economy, geography. . . . When the front line came very close to the city they faced their most important test--that of loyalty to their fatherland.

The enemy's ring encircled the city tighter and tighter. On 16 July the Hitlerites captured Smolensk and advanced further, to Moscow. Yet here, on the banks of the Dnepr, the "Belorussian Madrid" continued to fight. That is how its defenders referred to Mogilev.

In the area of Pashkovo the home guard of a battalion commanded by Capt K. G. Vladimirov, accomplished a truly legendary feat. They fought their last battle on 24 July. The Hitlerites were trying at all cost to crush the resistance of the home guard. One attack followed another. However, yesterday's workers, despite heavy losses, continued to hold their defense line. When they ran out of ammunition and the enemy continued to press them, they mounted a bayonet assault. Without shouting "Hurray," terrible in their angry silence, they marched to their final battle. . . .

In Mogilev, in the railroad station area, which, once, in that distant 1941, was covered by a home guard battalion commanded by Capt K. G. Vladimirov, there is a street named after him. The regional museum has carefully stored documents, photographs, weapons and personal items of the fallen heroes. One of them is a half-burned copy of Nikolay Ostrovskiy's "Kak Zakalyalas' Stal'" [How the Steel Was Tempered]. It was found in an empty shell casing while clearing the rubble from a dugout. The following had been written on one of the first pages:

"We are four infantrymen: the Russian Fedor Mezvanov, the Ukrainian Nikita Pilipenko, the Mordvin Vasily Yemkin, and the Kazakh Yusupov. We shall die but not retreat. The homeland will not forget us!"

Unfortunately, an essay cannot even begin to describe the 23 days of the heroic defense of the city or narrate in detail the exploits of the Soviet troops, home guard women, old people and adolescents. As Ivan Petrovich Voyevodin, former oblast military commander, has written in his memoirs, everyone in Mogilev was a soldier.

Several years ago the book by Paul Karell, "Hitler's War Against Russia," came out in the FRG. We find even in this frankly anti-Soviet book a

number of forced admissions which speak of the courage of the Soviet people in the struggle against the fascist aggressors. Here are some lines on the battles by the Dnepr in the summer of 1941:

"Fierce battles raged on in Mogilev, which remained in the back of the German forces. . . . In the morning of 26 July the Russians succeeded in blowing the wooden bridge between the eastern and western parts of the city and the bridge was almost totally destroyed. Thus in the literal meaning of the word the Russians burned their bridges behind them. They continued to fight even though their situation was hopeless. They fought to the last bullet. . . . The number of officers among the captured Russians was amazingly small. They had either been killed or been able to break out of encirclement. The German army had to pay a stiff price for a city which was already behind the front line. . . ."

That is what our enemies write on the courage of Mogilev's defenders. The admission is quite eloquent. . . .

Having obeyed the order of the Soviet command to hold the city to the last possible moment, the depleted units of the 61st Rifle Corps and the home guard detachments undertook, and succeeded in, piercing through the enemy's ring. It was already late autumn when the remainders of the 61st Rifle Corps, having preserved its battle flags, finally came out of encirclement. It was under one of them, the flag of the 110th Rifle Division, that the home guard fought at Moscow's Kuybyshev sector.

Three years later, the battle fate of this division took it back to the walls of Mogilev. With other units it fought to liberate the city from the enemy.

Memory

The battles fought in the past at my native city are only a small particle of the gigantic battle. I shall not undertake to gage the size of the contribution which the defenders of Mogilev made to the defeat of Hitler's "blitzkrieg." However, I am firmly convinced that their sacrifice was not made in vain. For three weeks they pinned down and bled white several elite Wehrmacht divisions. In those most difficult days, deep within Russia, and in all the corners of our fatherland, the great forces of the people were being raised, strengthened, and readied for battle.

Gradually, they were tempered with anger and rage, they strengthened and expanded like a powerful flood. Not only regular units were raised: in tens of cities a home guard was created--in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Odessa, Sevastopol, Stalingrad, Tula, Gor'kiy, Ivanovo, Yaroslavl'

As in Mogilev, young boys not yet of draft age, and those too old to be drafted, volunteered for the home guard. Many among them were students, VUZ and technical school teachers, and personnel of people's commissariats

and other state institutions. There were many women and young girls among the home guard. They became medics, signalers, anti-aircraft personnel and snipers.

A special purpose military unit (identified No 9903) began its combat life in Belorussia. It was entirely made up of volunteers who had decided to fight behind the German-fascist forces rushing to the east. In the autumn of 1941 it was deployed at Moscow. In small groups of 10 to 15 men they crossed the front line, engaged in reconnaissance, mined roads and crossings, and destroyed communications. Subsequently, many of them developed into big partisan units and formations as was the case, for example, with the sabotage-reconnaissance group headed by Konstantin Zaslavov. Occasionally, however, an entire group or some of its members would disappear without a trace in carrying out combat assignments behind the front line. . . .

One of the volunteers in this army unit was Vera Voloshina, a student at the Moscow Cooperative Institute. Following a short training, together with a group of boys and girls, she was sent behind enemy lines, in the Kalinin area. After two weeks of combat operations and a brief respite in a partisan base came a new assignment. This time it was in the Naro-Fominskii area. One of the novices assigned to the group was Moscow secondary school student Zoya Kosmodem'yanskaya, whose first combat assignment this was. Vera Voloshina helped her to become accustomed more quickly to the war circumstances and taught her friend how to fight. Even behind enemy lines the girls tried to be together. . . .

It so happened that neither of them came back from their combat assignment, disappearing behind German-fascist lines. In January 1942, however, when the Moscow area had been virtually cleaned of the enemy, the entire country learned of the exploit of the partisan Tanya, tortured by the Hitlerites in Petrishchevo. Her real name turned out to be Zoya Kosmodem'yanskaya. For many years the fate of Vera Voloshina remained unknown. It was only in 1938 that the author of this article was able to find out that, like Zoya, she too had been captured by the Hitlerites, tortured and then hanged in Golovkovo Sovkhoz, Naro-Fominskii Rayon, about 10 km from Petrishchevo. . .

Schools, streets and pioneer palaces have been named after Vera Voloshina and Zoya Kosmodem'yanskaya. They have been made permanent members of student groups and labor collectives. Recently, two small planets discovered by Soviet astronomer T. M. Smirnova, were named after after the two comrades in arms. Something new became known several weeks ago. On the initiative of the crew of the "Zoya Kosmodem'yanskaya" of the Black Sea Maritime Shipping Administration, one of the ships under construction will be named after Vera Voloshina. . . .

I could cite many examples of heroism and military valor shown by the home guard. In the same volunteers unit 9903 within which Vera Voloshina and Zoya Kosmodem'yanskaya fought, two sabotage-reconnaissance groups consisting entirely of girls, were set up. The commander of one of them, Yelena

Fedorovna Bolosova, who died in Belorussia in September 1942, was awarded posthumously the title of Hero of the Soviet Union.

Allow me to emphasize, yet once again, that no one forced the girls I described to fight. As they had done, they could have continued to work in factories and plants, or even attend their VUZ's and technical schools. No one would have blamed them for this. However, their hearts ordered them to take up arms to protect the homeland with their bodies. The way to this was quite similar for both of them--the rayon Komsomol committee, the home guard, the front. . . .

Listening to the stories of war veterans and reading books on the home guard, I thought with admiration about the people who rushed to the front even though their prewar profession and entire way of life had been quite remote from military affairs. Thus, for example, many scientists from the Moscow State University, the Higher Technical School imeni Bauman, and other VUZ's in the capital joined the home guard, were given brief military training, and, subsequently, firmly fought on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War.

One of them was the dean of our philosophy department, Professor Fedor Ignat'yevich Khaskhachikh. We, the students of the postwar years, read his book "Osnovy Dialekticheskogo Materializma" [Foundations of Dialectical Materialism] with a special feeling. We knew that he had voluntarily joined the home guard and was a political worker in a division. He died on 5 November 1942 in combat--on the front line--killed by an enemy shell as he addressed the troops on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Great October Revolution.

We knew that our dean had been asked to remain at the university in Moscow, for even during the war studies and scientific work went on. However, he chose the front roads, for he neither wanted nor could live otherwise. . .

. . . . When we say "the armed people" we have in mind tens of millions of our compatriots who hammered out the victory in the front and the rear. Even the women and adolescents who stood behind the machine tools of defense plants in the Urals and in Siberia, replacing the men by the steel smelting furnaces, in the fields, and even the mines, they too were part of the fighting people.

Naturally, Hitler's Wehrmacht was bled white, crushed, and made to surrender above all by our regular army. The war does not tolerate dilettantes. The fascist warriors were soldiers who had mastered complex weapons to perfection--artillery and tankmen, fliers and seamen. The plans for military operations were developed by Soviet military commanders who knew their work to perfection. Occasionally, it was more difficult for the home guard: there was lack of knowledge and military professionalism. However, there was no shortage of steadfastness, dedication and hatred and scorn for the enemy. Adding to this combat experience, more reliable soldiers would have been hard to find.

Military units consist of draftees. The home guard went to fight obeying the call of their hearts. A phenomenon such as the home guard of the land of the Soviets had never before existed in history, even though the very concept of the home guard had been born previously in Russia and home guards had fought Napoleon's forces and participated in the liberation of Bulgaria from the Turkish yoke. Naturally, never had such an extent of volunteering ever been noted as in the Great Patriotic War. Two million men joined the ranks of the home guard. By the autumn of 1941 they totaled 60 divisions.

Many of these divisions had a glorious combat road, tempered in battle, and became guards units. It is regrettable that, so far, this topic has not been sufficiently studied. No more than a few serious scientific studies may be found on the home guard. The topic demands its artistic and creative interpretation.

These were truly splendid people, who fulfilled their supreme civic duty to the end in the ranks of the home guard. They had the true nobility of the spirit. How pitiful are those who, in the days of severe trial, stood aside from the fate that befell our people. . . .

Last summer I witnessed a difficult and very touching scene during the seating of the Soviet Society for Cultural Relations with Compatriots Abroad (the Rodina Society). We welcomed a delegation of Russian people who were in America as a result of a variety of vicissitudes. We spoke to them about our fatherland and its difficult and proud ascent and the war we experienced. Suddenly, one of the guests, a still young man, began to cry so violently that for a long time we were unable to calm him down. Living abroad, he stood aside from the fate of the homeland and gave it no help in those difficult times.

As though anticipating the possibility of such an encounter, Leonid Leonov, the noted Soviet writer, once said that, "Anyone who failed fully to share his people's sadness cannot fail to feel rejected when the people are happy."

Such was precisely the case of our guest from America.

A four-story house, remaining from prewar times, stands in Mogilev by one of the squares. More accurately, the walls have been retained, as the house burned twice during the war. Today nothing in its appearance seems to remind of the past. Yet, should you look carefully, you would see above the windows and balcony doors, through the dark paint, the clear reddish frozen tongues of the flames which once raged here.

Who isn't familiar with the power of fire or has not observed its terrible destructive force? In the past, however, I neither assumed nor thought that a fire could leave such profound ineradicable traces.

Even the stones of the remaining houses in Mogilev preserve the memory of the past war. It must remain within each one of us equally ineradicable. Our duty is to carefully protect, to carry with us throughout our lives, the glory of the people and to pass it on to the generations which will follow us.

5003

CSO: 1802

INVINCIBLE FRATERNAL ALLIANCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 82-92

[Article by Paul Verner, CC SED Politburo and CC SED secretary]

[Text] The 35th anniversary of the liberation from Hitlerite fascism by the Soviet Union was extensively celebrated in the German Democratic Republic. All the citizens of our country honored the memory of the courageous soldiers of the Soviet Army who, displaying unparalleled heroism at the decisive front of World War II, defended in the Great Patriotic War the first socialist state in the world, inflicted a crushing defeat to the fascist Wehrmacht and its allies, and, together with the other forces of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, liberated the peoples from fascist barbarism.

In a spirit of deep respect for the heroes, we bow our heads to all those who gave their lives for this noble objective. Their honor and glory will endure through the centuries.

The victory of the Soviet people and their great army over the most reactionary and cruel dictatorship of monopoly capital, won under the tried leadership of Lenin's party--the CPSU--will be preserved forever in the memory of peace-loving mankind.

The confident march of history after the days of May 1945 offers convincing proof that the definitive defeat of the fascist aggressor at the place from which he began his destructive campaign on the peoples of Europe, was of the greatest universal-historical significance. Since then history has developed along a new channel. The victory of the Soviet Union over fascism and the anti-fascist liberation struggle inspired the forces of progress and helped to energize their struggle for peace, democracy and socialism. The world socialist system came into being. The countries which fought for their national liberation threw off the yoke of colonialism and mounted the struggle for economic independence. The revolutionary workers' movement in the capitalist countries strengthened noticeably.

Thanks the liberation from fascism, our people as well were offered the historical opportunity to undertake a radical reorganization of their

social life. Together with other antifascists, social democrats, nonparty trade union leaders, and bourgeois democrats, the communists, who had not only survived the period of domination of the terrorist fascist regime, but had participated in the clandestine antifascist struggle, or else had returned to the homeland from exile, used this opportunity to create a new anti-fascist-democratic system. The founding of the German Democratic Republic on 7 October 1949--the first state of workers and peasants on German soil--crowned this stage of revolutionary changes in the former Soviet Occupied Zone in Germany.

When the first German state of workers and peasants was born, its first president and loyal son of the German working class, the tried internationalist Wilhelm Pieck, stated: "Today we are at a turning point in German history. Thanks to the tireless work of the best forces of the German people and the great help which the Soviet Government has given us, we are taking the first steps on the path to the statehood of the German people. Through conscientious, loyal and friendly cooperation we must prove that we are capable of resolving the great historical problems and that in the future we will be able to confidently accept the verdict of history."

In a message to the leaders of the GDR, dated 13 October 1949, J.V. Stalin, USSR Council of Ministers chairman, described the founding of the GDR as a turning point in the history of Europe and emphasized the existence of a peace-loving and democratic German state, together with the existence of a peace-loving Soviet Union, excludes the possibility for new wars in Europe.

At that time few were those who realized the entire significance of this farsighted view. Yet, 30 years of existence of the GDR fully confirms its accuracy. Today hardly any realistically thinking politician in the world could deny that the GDR is an important factor in international politics.

Following the liberation of the German people from fascism by the great Soviet army in 1945, the founding of the GDR on 7 November 1949 played a decisive role in the development of the revolutionary process of transition from capitalism to socialism on German soil. Using the great historical opportunity which developed thanks to the defeat of fascism and the presence on German soil of units of the armed forces of the first socialist state in the world, our working class, headed by its revolutionary party--the SED, created as a result of the merger of the Communist Party of Germany and the German Social Democratic Party, made radical social changes. It was able to do so since, by the end of World War II, the Communist Party of Germany was the only political party in Germany with a scientific program for abolishing the domination of imperialism and establishing an anti-fascist-democratic system with a possibility for a transition to socialism.

The 11 June 1945 Communist Party of Germany appeal and the "Principles and Objectives of the SED" formulated a program for profound social changes. Its implementation was helped by the implementation of the progressive,

revolutionary and humanistic aspirations of the German people in the GDR. Thanks to this the age-old struggle waged by all progressive forces for a democratic and peaceful German state was successful. The objectives substantiated by Marx and Engels were realized on German soil. The rich historical experience acquired in the course of the difficult struggle waged by the German working class for a new society, free from exploitation, became reality.

In the course of the social changes the SED was guided by the Leninist theory of the socialist revolution, creatively applying to the specific conditions of our country its general laws, first tested in practice in the Soviet Union.

Relying on Lenin's instruction of involving the broad masses in the revolutionary process, the SED helped in the implementation of the leading role of the working class at the stage of antifascist-democratic changes. Allied with the toiling peasantry, the intelligentsia, the urban middle classes, and part of the nonmonopoly bourgeoisie, it abolished the power of imperialism, created revolutionary-democratic state organs, and implemented extensive anti-imperialist measures in all social realms. It was thus that the decisive prerequisites were created for a successful transition to a socialist revolution, which, thanks to the increased power and prestige of the Soviet Union and the consequent favorable change in the ratio of forces in the world, could be carried out peacefully.

The founding of a socialist state on German soil was entirely consistent with the historical process of transition from capitalism to socialism in our epoch, whose beginning dates from the Great October Socialist Revolution. Allied with the toiling peasantry and the other toiling strata, the working class established and strengthened its political rule. It created a socialist state of workers and peasants as a form of dictatorship of the proletariat, representing and implementing the interests of the entire people.

It was thus that the main problem of any revolution--the problem of power--was resolved in favor of the working class and its allies. This was the most important prerequisite for the transition from an antifascist-democratic to a socialist stage within the single revolutionary process, for definitively consolidating the antifascist-democratic changes and, at the same time, for beginning the building of the foundations of socialism. In the course of the socialist revolution the SED did everything possible to strengthen the state of workers and peasants and to develop socialist democracy.

Following the expropriation of the big landowners, carried out in the course of the democratic land reform, on the basis of Lenin's cooperative plan and the experience of the CPSU, the SED made socialist changes in agriculture. Thanks to the changed ratio of forces the active participation of the middle and prosperous peasantry in such changes became

possible. In the course of the socialist revolution the SED insured the preservation and, furthermore, the strengthening of the extensive alliance between the working class and the various toiling strata and their parties and mass organizations, which had been created in the period of antifascist democratic changes. It is continuing to cooperate with them to this day, in the course of building a developed socialist society.

The peace in Europe was considerably strengthened following the uprooting of the foundations of imperialism and fascism--the culprits for the war--from the territory and the founding of the first German state of workers and peasants. The GDR appeared and developed at the meeting point between socialism and imperialism in Europe, in the area of the two confronting antagonistic social systems, where the problem of war and peace is particularly acute. It was precisely here that imperialism pursued its cold war policy with particular zeal. Under conditions of direct confrontation with imperialism and with an open border, our state was forced to defend its positions in the struggle against economic sabotage and blockade, plunder of material values, purposeful enticement of the manpower, diplomatic boycott, and counterrevolutionary actions.

On the one hand, this struggle between the two systems had a major influence on the course of the socialist revolution on our country. On the other, the building and strengthening of socialism in the GDR contributed, and still does, to the growth of the power of the socialist comity and to strengthening the peace in Europe. Peace, secured by the Soviet Union and the socialist comity, remains an important external prerequisite for our progress as a socialist state, and as in the past the efforts of the GDR to strengthen socialism are a contribution to securing peace in Europe.

Imperialism did everything possible to bring the GDR back to its bosom, to the imperialist system, in order to "throw back" socialism in Europe and broaden even further the realm of action of its policy threatening the peace and social progress. In 1950, soon after the founding of our republic, Dulles, who subsequently became U.S. secretary of state, openly expressed the hope that, annexing the GDR, the FRG would be able to assume a "leading strategic position in central Europe" with which to would undermine socialism in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and other countries. That same Dulles called for a "comprehensive strategy" and "struggle on a global scale" against socialism. As we know, these plans were not destined to be implemented, for the Soviet Union was the true bulwark of peace and socialism and the historical process on German soil, embodied in the GDR, became irreversible.

The development of the GDR indicates that its establishment narrowed the realm of imperialist domination in Europe once and forever. The republic successfully repelled the attacks on the socialist system launched with the use of all the means of counterrevolutionary policy under the revanchist slogan of reunification on a capitalist basis.

The measures taken by the GDR to strengthen its state border with the FRG and West Berlin, carried out with the support of the Warsaw Pact members in August 1961, had a positive influence on the preservation of peace in Europe on a long-term basis. They definitively indicated to the reactionary imperialist politicians the limits of their spheres of domination. The stability of the western border of the GDR and of the border between socialism and capitalism in central Europe is the basic prerequisite for durable peace on the continent. The measures simultaneously adopted to strengthen it made it possible to continue with the building of socialism without imperialist economic and political interference, which previously had caused us tremendous harm.

The firm alliance with the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries was and is of prime significance in the founding and successful development of the GDR as the outpost of socialism in central Europe. Throughout the entire existence of the GDR it proved to be a source for successes in building and strengthening of socialism and a reliable shelter from the attempts of reactionary forces to undermine social progress.

"The inviolable fraternal union with the Soviet Union and the firm consolidation of our republic within the socialist comity has been, and remains, the reliable base of our progress in the building of socialism and in our foreign political activities. Our socialist alliance is one of an entirely new type. It is based on identical socioeconomic and political foundations, identical Marxist-Leninist ideology, common communist objectives and proletarian internationalism," said Comrade Erich Honecker at the Ninth SED Congress.

The founding and development of the GDR are most closely linked with the new stage reached by the global revolutionary process, whose beginning was marked by the victory of the Soviet Union in World War II. The revolutionary changes in the GDR were a structural part of the democratic and socialist revolutions in Europe and Asia which brought about the creation of a world socialist system. For the first time in history a German state appeared which laid solid foundations for peace, friendship and cooperation with its eastern neighbors, who in turn actively supported its strengthening.

In accordance with Ernst Thälman's behest, who promoted in the German communists the ability to determine whether a person is a revolutionary based on his attitude toward the Soviet Union, the SED and the GDR continued the tradition of proletarian internationalism and solidarity between the revolutionary German workers' movement and the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties. A qualitatively new political foundation was laid under these traditions. Friendship with the Soviet Union and with all nations was raised to the level of state policy. The GDR's participation in the Warsaw treaty and its joint armed forces, its membership in CEMA and the friendship and mutual aid treaties with the socialist states strengthened the international positions of our republic and its sovereignty. This

made it possible systematically to resolve important problems in the course of social changes. In turn, the GDR is making a contribution within its power to the further growth of the power and prestige of world socialism.

The strength of the ties between the GDR and the socialist comity is a guarantee for successes in the creation of a developed socialist society. Our republic is comprehensively contributing to the implementation of the joint policy of the Warsaw Pact members for the implementation of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

While considering the period which followed the Eighth SED Congress (1971), the most fruitful in GDR history, we realize that the steadfast strengthening of our alliance with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries was, and remains, the decisive foundation for all our successes. Within that period we were able to break the diplomatic blockade stubbornly maintained for over 70 years by the NATO countries. Thanks to the USSR-FRG treaty, the Quadripartite West Berlin Accord, the agreements signed with the FRG, Poland, the GDR and Czechoslovakia, and the agreement between the GDR and the West Berlin senate, the results of World War II and of postwar development and, above all, the inviolability of our borders, were codified on an international legal basis. By 1971 the GDR had been recognized by 13 socialist and 17 young national states. Today it maintains diplomatic relations with 129 countries as a full member of the United Nations and its specialized organizations, and is constructively participating in international life, contributing to the maintenance of universal peace and security.

In the course of the existence of the GDR the working class and all working people, actively participating in building the first socialist state on German soil achieved outstanding successes, led by the SED. Only such a state could guarantee them social insurance and confidence in the future, true freedom and democracy, and the full exercise of human rights.

At the present stage of development of our society, in accordance with the decisions of the Ninth SED Congress, problems of the further building of a developed socialist society in the GDR and thus the creation of the basic prerequisites for a gradual transition to communism are being resolved. The SED program adopted at the ninth congress considers the building of developed socialism a historical process of deep political, economic, social, spiritual and cultural changes. It states that, "The building of a developed socialist society requires the planned development, on a high level, of all its advantages and motive forces, and all sides and realms of social life, production forces and production relations, social and political relations, science and public education, socialist ideology and culture and the sum total of working and living conditions and conditions governing the defense of the country."

Building socialism, the SED is always guided by V. I. Lenin's thesis, repeatedly confirmed through practical experience, that problems of

economic development assume particular significance in the establishment and building of a new social system. The SED has always proceeded from the fact that economics is the main arena for the class confrontation. The economy offers means for social progress and development of all realms of social life. That is why economic progress has a most profound influence on social progress, on the political, economic, scientific and technical, and cultural accomplishments of the socialist state, and on our contribution to strengthening the socialist comity and the world revolutionary process. The significance to the contemporary stage of our development of this interrelationship was emphasized by Comrade Erich Honecker at the 19th CC SED Plenum (April 1979): "In the course of the further building of a developed socialist society in the GDR the main problem is to enhance the economic power of our country. Progress in all realms of life decisively depends above all on this."

Thanks to the purposeful policy pursued by the party, the adamant creative efforts of the people, and the firm relations with the socialist comity, the GDR has a stable and planned developing national economy, a powerful modern industry, and intensive agriculture. The growth of our economic potential is expressed in the fact that in the period of three decades (1949-1979) while maintaining a virtually unchanged number of people engaged in the production area of the national economy, the produced national income rose by a factor of 7.6. Industrial output rose by a factor of over 11. Presently, in a single month, our output equals that of the entire 1949. Therefore, with one-quarter of the population of the former imperialist German Reich, today the GDR outstrips it in terms of industrial output by a factor of more than two.

The stable and dynamic economic growth created possibilities for the use of steadily rising material and financial funds in the interest of improving the foundations of the production process, resolving other national problems, and systematically upgrading the material and cultural living standards of the people. This is consistent with the principle of inseparable unity between economic and social policy codified in the SED program.

The 1970's were the most successful period for the GDR and the other socialist countries. Thus, compared with 1970, the 1979 national income rose in comparable prices, 52 percent; 94 percent of this growth was achieved through higher labor productivity. With a view to strengthening the material and technical base, between 1971 and 1979 391 billion marks were invested in the national economy, 198 billion of these in industry alone--essentially for the development of the power and raw material base. Compared with 1970, last year's gross crop output was approximately 10 percent higher. The size of the cattle herds is rising steadily. From 1971 to 1979 the GDR built or made capital repairs of about 1.25 million apartments. This is roughly the number of apartments built over a 19-year period from 1952 to 1970. The solution of the housing problem, as a social problem, by 1990, is the core of our socioeconomic program and we have made considerable progress along this way.

Other important structural components of our sociopolitical program are the special benefits granted working mothers and large families, the building of children's institutions, improving the education and health care systems, developing culture and sport, and the state concern for labor veterans. The incomes of previously low-paid categories of citizens is being systematically raised by raising minimum wages and pensions. Thus, last year there was another considerable increase in pensions. The successful implementation of this program is expressed also in the ever greater and comprehensive utilization of public funds which rose from 25.6 billion marks in 1970 to 48.8 billion in 1979.

The results of the economic and social policy pursued following the Eighth SED Congress confirm the accuracy of the interconnection between economic and social progress, obvious to all. The direct correlation between material and cultural living standards, on the one hand, and economic achievements and production effectiveness, on the other, is becoming ever more obvious.

In the course of this process, along which a purposeful ideological activity is pursued in raising the republic's citizens in a spirit of socialist morality and a systematic implementation of the socialist principle "from each according to his capabilities and to each according to his work," with every passing day the working people can see that conscientious work is yielding results and that life is improving thanks to their industriousness. The active participation of the toiling masses in management and planning is a determining characteristic of socialist democracy and the exercise of the power of the working class and its allies.

The experience of the socialist revolution in the GDR convincingly proves that the general laws governing the transition from capitalism to socialism and to the building of socialism, discovered by Marx, Engels and Lenin, and confirmed and enriched through the practice of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, retain their full significance in their creative application under the conditions of an industrially developed country with intensive agriculture. The principles of Marxism-Leninism and the general laws governing the socialist revolution are our reliable compass at all the stages of the building of socialism, headed by the SED.

The policy of further establishment of a developed socialist society, aimed at promoting the welfare of the people, is inseparably linked with the steadfast improvement of socialist production relations which prevailed in the GDR at the beginning of the 1960's, the systematic development of production forces, changes in the nature of labor, development of socialist democracy, and intensification of the leading role of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party.

The increased complexity, interweaving and scale of economic, social, spiritual and cultural processes require a steady enhancement of the level of party work and economic management and planning. The objectives laws

governing social development formulate new requirements for strengthening the material and technical base of socialism and enhancing the level of the planned organization of social labor.

In recent years our party implemented a number of important measures with a view to creating optimum conditions for the development of the creative activity of the working people. It is a question, above all, of achieving new scientific and technical results and applying them in the national economy within the shortest possible time, so that through considerable production intensification we make ever more extensive use of the qualitative factors of economic growth. One of the most important measures consistent with ripe social requirements is the creation of powerful combines, covering virtually all industrial and construction enterprises in the GDR. The motive forces and advantages of large-scale socialist production are manifested most clearly in the work of such combines. The decisions of the Ninth SED Congress on the systematic and unified continuation of economic and social policy are the keys to further successes. In this case we must take into consideration that in the second half of the 1970's the GDR national economy encountered considerable difficulties as a result of a number of changes in reproduction conditions. They were due to the substantial growth of outlays for the development of domestic raw material and energy resources and the exceptional price increases of raw materials on the world market. The deep changes in the system of foreign economic relations demand of our national economy, industry above all, considerably to increase the production of finished goods. We consider the further strengthening of the GDR's economic potential a mandatory prerequisite for the purposeful pursuit of our policy of enhancing the material and cultural standards of the people.

The successful development of our socialist state proves the superiority of the socialist social system over the capitalist system shaken up by crises, inflations, unemployment and social insecurity. Socialism offering a historical alternative to the exploiting capitalist society and strengthens the confidence of the people in their guaranteed social stability, social insurance and clear future.

Ever since its founding the GDR has been an inseparable component of the socialist comity. It is linked with the ties of unbreakable friendship, above all, with the Soviet Union. The steadfast strengthening of the alliance with the USSR and the other fraternal socialist countries is an inviolable foundation of SED and GDR policy.

The fraternal union between the Marxist-Leninist parties of the two countries, the CPSU and the SED, is the foundation for the fraternal cooperation between our peoples and states. The alliance between the ruling parties is a prerequisite for the steadily intensifying governmental, economic, scientific and technical, spiritual and cultural cooperation. The Ninth SED Congress emphasized that, "In the future as well the primary task and, furthermore, the foundation for the international activities of

our party and the foreign policy of our state will be based on the further intensification of extensive cooperation with the CPSU and the Soviet Union."

In the 1970's the alliance between the GDR and the USSR rose to a new level. A concentrated manifestation of this fact was the 7 October 1975 Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Aid Treaty. Its long-term nature is expressed above all in the orientation toward a rapprochement between our peoples and states in the course of the further building of socialism and communism.

This is consistent with the stipulation which Comrade L. I. Brezhnev voiced at the 25th CPSU Congress: "Together with the blossoming of each socialist nation and the strengthening of the sovereignty of the socialist states, their interrelationships become ever closer. Ever greater common elements appear in their policies, economies and social lives. A gradual equalization of development levels takes place. This process of gradual rapprochement among socialist countries is today entirely clearly manifested as a natural process."

On the basis of the 7 October 1975 treaty the SED and CPSU are successfully guiding the cooperation between the two countries in all fields of social life. The regular meetings between the general secretaries of the central committees of our parties are of particular importance. Each such meeting is a "major stage on the way to the further strengthening of interaction among fraternal countries in the solution of domestic and international problems," the CC CPSU communication on the meetings in the Crimea in 1979 stated.

Like the other fraternal parties, the SED proceeds from the fact that the all-round cooperation between each CEMA-member country and the USSR--the leading force of the socialist comity--is the central problem of socialist economic integration. The successes achieved by our republic as a result of the intensified cooperation and ever-closer interweaving of the national economies of CEMA-member countries make it possible to increase its contribution to the further development of such cooperation with every passing year.

This is also manifested in the growth of foreign trade relations between the GDR and the CEMA-member countries. Currently they account for over two-thirds of its entire foreign trade. The foreign trade between the GDR and the USSR rose from about 0.2 billion rubles in 1949 to over 8 billion in 1979. The Soviet Union, which accounts for 36 percent of the GDR's entire foreign trade, is its biggest trade partner. In turn, our republic is the biggest trade partner of the USSR. In 1979 its share in Soviet foreign trade was 10.1 percent. The GDR supplies the USSR, above all, with machine tools, chemical equipment, railroad cars, ships, ship equipment and a large number of consumer goods. Imports of raw materials and energy from the Soviet Union at below world prices play a decisive role in the GDR's

economic development. With its extensive deliveries of machines, equipment, systems and industrial consumer goods, the USSR is making a substantial contribution to the development of our material and technical base and to insuring supplies for the population of our country.

The GDR is actively participating in the building of bilateral and multi-lateral integration projects in the Soviet Union and other CEMA-member countries. It is a question of important joint projects such as the Soyuz Gas Pipeline, completed last year, the cellulose combine in Ust'-Elim, the asbestos combine in Kiyembaya, currently being commissioned, and other projects.

Specialization and cooperation as well play a major role in socialist economic integration. Currently over 30 percent of GDR's trade with the other CEMA-member countries is based on corresponding agreements. In 1979 the GDR was the signatory of about 500 treaties on international socialist specialization and production cooperation. About one-fifth of them were of a multilateral nature. The basic purpose of scientific and technical cooperation is to upgrade labor productivity, and to channel, to an ever greater extent, the results of scientific and technical developments toward upgrading the effectiveness of jointly implemented production programs. The share of specialized and cooperated goods in GDR machine and equipment exports to CEMA-member countries currently accounts for over 40 percent, one-half of which is to the USSR.

The USSR-GDR production specialization and cooperation program for the period through 1990, signed in Berlin, during the celebrations of the 30th anniversary of the GDR, by representatives of the governments of the two countries, in the presence of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, is of major importance.

The basic purpose of this program is to use the material resources and the scientific and technical potential of both countries, on the basis of reciprocal advantages, in the interest of jointly resolving national economic problems of far-reaching consequences and insuring the even more effective utilization of the advantages of the socialist international division of labor.

Assuming the power, and successfully building socialism under the guidance of the SED and allied with the other toiling strata, the GDR working class has made a substantial contribution to the global revolutionary process. It has always been aware of its responsibility to the international workers' movement and to all peoples in the struggle for peace and security, and has invariably fulfilled its international duty. "The SED will continue to do everything possible," emphasizes Comrade Erich Honecker, "so that, in the spirit of the Marx, Engels and Lenin doctrine, it may make its contribution to the unification of the socialist nations, the communist parties, the international workers' movement and all revolutionary forces and peoples fighting imperialism and for social progress and socialism."

The problems we must resolve in the 1980's have not become simpler. However, the GDR communists realize the entire extent of their responsibility.

The victory over fascism, achieved through the main contribution of the Soviet Union and its great armed forces, made a profound impact on the course of world history. For the past 35 years, despite numerous dangerous military conflicts, the peoples of the world have been protected from the threat of third world war. This is, above all, to the credit of the systematic peaceful policy pursued by the Soviet Union, Lenin's party and its Central Committee, headed by Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman. This is the contribution of the countries who are members of the Warsaw Pact, which, this May, along with the anniversary of the victory over Hitlerite fascism, celebrated the 25th anniversary of the conclusion of the Warsaw Pact treaty which laid the beginning of the defensive military alliance of the socialist comity. Shoulder to shoulder they are firmly watching over the peace and the gains of socialism.

The aggressive imperialist circles, the United States above all, are hindering the establishment of a lasting peace. They are trying to regain their lost positions. Urging on the arms race and heating up the cold war atmosphere, they are refusing to accept the realistic proposals of the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity aimed at detente and disarmament. The tendency toward adventurism, inherent in imperialism, does not exclude sudden turns in international circumstances. The powerful actions of the nations must result in wrecking the implementation of NATO's decisions to deploy medium-range missiles in Western Europe and the war preparations being made by the most aggressive imperialist circles. In the days of the 35th anniversary of the liberation from Hitlerite fascism, we are reminded of this by the still-living millions and millions of victims of World War II.

The German Democratic Republic is making an active contribution to the strengthening of socialism and to securing the peace within the framework of the coordinated foreign policy of the socialist comity.

S003

CO: 1802

GREAT POWER OF THE REVOLUTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 93-100

[Talk between Fidel Castro Ruz and a group of Soviet journalists on 19 January 1961]

[Text] Between December 1960 and January 1961 the first delegation of Soviet journalists--representing PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA, TASS and the radio and television--visited Cuba and participated in the celebration of the second anniversary of the Cuban revolution. They met with Comrade Fidel Castro Ruz, prime minister of the Cuban Revolutionary Government, who spoke of the economic-political situation and the prospects for the country's development. At that time the circumstances were quite tense: The United States had broken relations with Cuba and was threatening direct aggression.

The meeting between the Soviet journalists and Comrade Fidel Castro took place on 19 January 1961 on a small island in the area of Cienaga de Zapata. The prime minister came from the mountain area of Escambray, where units of the people's militia were eliminating counter-revolutionary gangs operating in the mountains.

The talk was recorded and the minutes were given to the journalists by the prime minister's office. All guests participated in the talk. For the sake of convenience, however, it was presented as though a single journalist who, speaking Spanish, was asking Comrade Fidel Castro questions and translated his answers. Subsequently, only part of the talk was used by the journalists in their publications.

Today, 19 years later, when we celebrate the 20th anniversary of the restoration of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Cuba, the publication of the text of

this talk is of unquestionable interest to our readers. It shows how accurate Comrade Fidel Castro's predictions were, and how well confirmed they were by history.

It is necessary to point out that today U.S. imperialism has once again resumed its bankrupt policy of threats, provocations and blackmail toward Cuba, once again heating up tension in the Caribbean. In this connection as well it would be useful to recall some details from the past.

Journalist: I have two questions. The first: Could describe to us briefly the current political circumstances in Cuba? The second question is somewhat romantic: Could you tell us what Cuba will become in three or four years unless there is not aggression?

Castro: We consider the political circumstances with great optimism. You have in mind domestic policy, is that not so?

Journalist: Yes.

Castro: Very well. The revolution enjoys very great support among the people. Above all, it is supported by the absolute, virtually unanimous majority of the working people.

The working people could not play a decisive role in overthrowing the tyranny. During the war, geographic and military reasons led to failures in the face of a tyrannical military machinery. For this reason we had to begin the struggle in rural areas. Most cruel repressions were taking place in the cities and the active participation of the working people was quite limited by the severe political persecution of the working class. Nevertheless, the full victory of the revolution was made possible.

Imperialism was unable to maneuver. It tried to replace Batista. The working class, which supported the revolution through a general strike, defeated all maneuvers and the power shifted into the hands of the rebel army. Subsequently, in the course of the further process of strengthening and development of the revolution, the role of the working class proved decisive.

It was very difficult to consolidate the revolution and to surmount all obstacles created by the interference of imperialism on our shores. This stage was more difficult than that of seizing the power. Today the revolution relies mainly on the support of the working people--workers and peasants.

The peasant population may be classified, to a greater or lesser extent, into the following basic categories: members of cooperatives, workers in people's farms, and small farmers. The agricultural and fishing cooperatives, which rally about 140,000 peasant families, are giving the

revolution their firmest support. The living conditions of 200,000 families of workers in the people's farms have been exceptionally improved. For example, in the Pueblo de los Pinos, El Rosario, and El Corojo farms, all families have many amenities: housing with electric lighting and everything else, as well as a high income. This is a major force in the countryside supporting the revolution.

Finally, Cuba has about 100,000 families of small farmers. They rented the land and were exploited by the landowners. They benefited from the revolution: They no longer have to pay rent. Furthermore, this year we shall give them loans totaling 80,000 pesos. Such loans will be given to 80 percent of the small, poor farmers.

Cooperatives have been created essentially in centers for the production of sugar cane. The production of meat, poultry, hogs, milk, rice, cotton and other crops, and of food products is essentially in the hands of the people's farms.

The groups I mentioned--members of cooperatives, workers in people's farms and small farmers--account for 90-about-95 percent of the Cuban rural population. The policy pursued by the revolutionary government is providing these groups with substantial direct benefits.

For example, you visited the Mansanillo Fishing Cooperative. These fishermen lived in small unhygienic huts, earning a marginal and very poor living. . . . I do not know whether you saw their old homes. Currently 506 homes have been built. All fishermen's families have their houses with their electric light, they have schools, water, boats, stores. . . . They have all this. The conditions in which they previously lived are totally different from the present ones.

Journalist: We visited the area and it appeared to us to be quite comfortable and healthy.

Castro: We are adopting measures concerning the fishermen in other settlements as well. In April we shall hold a big fishing festival in the Mansanillo Fishing Cooperative. We shall gather all fishermen from all fishing cooperatives to show them the way they will live.

Fish production rose 25 percent in one year. Better fish purchase prices were set and all fishermen are employed. This year the fish catch will double.

Understandably, these fishermen who lived in a state of great poverty, neglected by everyone, are ready to sacrifice their lives for the revolution.

You probably visited several cooperatives and settlements. For example, did you visit the settlements near Mansanillo, in the area of the rice paddies? Were you there?

Journalist: Yes.

Castro: Did you see the settlements under construction in Mansanillo? Did you visit Gramma, Bartoloma Maso, and the people's farms? Did you?

Journalist: Yes.

Castro: Housing is being built in the people's farms along with schools and hospitals similar to those you saw. All these workers lived in very poor huts, in great poverty. They had no jobs. Today their jobs are guaranteed. Look: Wages as stipulated by the law, free housing, free electric light, free water, free medical aid, and free medicines; the clothing, shoes, and food of their children attending school will also be free, paid by the national economy. I shall later explain to you what a people's farm is.

Did you see along the way the Camilo Cienfuegos Cooperative?

Its workers have today or will have everything which the landowners had in the past. In the past only in the home of a landowner could a bathtub, water and a toilet be found. The landowner alone had a cement-built house. The children of the landowner alone attended good schools and the landowner alone used the sports stadiums and the entertainment facilities.

Journalist: Could we say that the Cuban working people will enjoy the same living conditions as those of the landowners?

Castro: Today all this goes to the workers. If you have seven children of school age, your children will receive shoes and food. In all cases, whatever the number of children, the wages of large families will be adequate. The people's farms have medicines, physicians, everything.

Do you think that these workers who will live the way the landowners lived would allow him to convince them to abandon all this? Will they begin to fight for the American companies, for their return? Will they ask for the return of the landowners?

Journalist: They told us that, "Only when we are dead." "We shall fight to the death."

Castro: Well, you see, for example, this place, Cienaga de Zapata. Thousands of charcoal-making families lived in the area between Cienaga and the sea. They had no transportation and the buyers purchased their charcoal at very low prices. They had no teachers, physicians, housing or stores. Today they have roads, they have teachers and physicians, and they sell their charcoal at triple the price, since there is no middleman. They pay for their goods at very low prices. They too will have housing.

Many of their children work in tourist centers. In the past this was an entirely neglected area. Today it is visited by tens of thousands of

people. Do you believe that these charcoal makers will fight for the interest of Americans and landowners?

Here, on the island, there were 120,000 workers employed in the big estates and the sugarcane plantations, working three to four months a year, hungry, unemployed for months, and, when the sugarcane harvest began, their indebtedness was equal to their earnings from the new crop. They had no land to plant food crops and neither they nor their children ever had milk.

Today there are 120,000 families are the owners of the sugarcane. They have land for planting their crops. Each cooperative has over 100 milk cows. All cooperatives have milk and cooperatives offer steady employment. Many areas in sugarcane, previously unharvested, will be harvested now. The landowners kept 150,000 hectares of land in sugarcane as a reserve, not harvesting it. This year the sugarcane of these 150,000 hectares as well will be harvested and the land will be used to plant corn and food crops. The cooperatives will be given loans to purchase machinery and for the construction of housing, to be repaid out of their profits.

The life of the worker in such cooperatives has changed radically. In the past he was subjected to the excesses of the managers, soldiers, and merchants. He was constantly humiliated and lived in constant fear. Today this man is walking with his rifle, no one tricks him, nobody steals from him, his children have teachers, they drink milk, he has year-round employment and will have a home. Do you believe that such cooperatives would support or defend American landed estates?

The small farmers paid for the land leased 30, 20 or 10 percent of their output. Those who lived in the mountains could neither read nor write. They had no teachers. Today there are many teachers throughout the mountains. We are building hospitals in all mountain areas and will be giving work loans to everyone.

Previously that same peasant had no working capital with which to harvest his crops. He would come down from the mountain to the valley, work for one peso a day, buy salt, fat, sugar and vegetables, such as manioc and caladium, would go back and work the rest of the week planting coffee and cocoa trees.

However, such trees produce fruits only each three to four years; at the end of the week, he would go back to the valley, once again work for a peso a day, and go back. Finishing the planting of cocoa or coffee trees on his plot, the plot would quite frequently be taken away from him.

As of this year, that same peasant has begun to earn 40 pesos monthly, credited to him for four years. In four years, once the coffee and cocoa crop is harvested, he will undertake the repayment of the loan. He may remain at his place the entire time, without going to the valley to earn a peso a week. Do you believe that such a peasant would defend the interests of imperialism and the landowners?

Who is left? A handful of landowners and merchants--middlemen--political agents who had sinecures, the rural policeman, the managers and no one else. They have not enough power to oppose the revolution. Their policy was quite clear and the present benefits are entirely obvious and noticeable. They cannot fail to attract the broad masses of our countryside, the young people, the thousands and thousands of young people belonging to the poor strata, whom we are training, organizing, and sending to school with scholarships.

In the past the poor could not attend the university. Now they have university scholarships. This is yet another force entirely loyal to the revolution.

All urban families paid quite high house rentals, consuming one-third of their income. The revolutionary government lowered the rents by one-half and gave the right to the people to purchase their own homes and no longer pay rent. In five years most of them will no longer be renting.

In the past a family did not dare even to drive a nail in the house. This was forbidden by its owner. The tenant was unwilling to pay for breakdowns and the landlord was not willing to do so. Now everyone is pleased. Should a family decide to add a room to the house, it may do so. All repairs or improvements are allowed. The income previously paid to the landlord is now paid to the state to build more homes for homeless families.

All these families are quite pleased. Do you think that they would begin to fight for having their rent doubled once again or be expelled from their homes?

As you may see, in all areas the working class is fully supporting the revolution. The peasants are giving their full support to the revolution and so are the young people. What could imperialism rely on in fighting the revolution? It could rely on disorganized and demoralized people. In our country, however, the people are organized, brimming with moral spirit and armed to the teeth.

A very good political circumstance has developed.

Something I have forgotten. . . . There are 50,000 children attending school in premises previously housing barracks. Furthermore, this year there will be no single illiterate person left in Cuba.

Blacks account for a considerable share of the Cuban population. Previously, the Cuban blacks were not hired in factories. Black teachers were not given premises to teach in or allowed access to beaches. Blacks could work only as cooks and servants. Today all black teachers are employed and all young blacks can attend any kind of school. All black workers can work in any factory. A black worker could be employed in any institution or go to any beach. Discrimination has been eliminated. Do you think that this

Cuban black will begin to fight for imperialism, the landowners and racial discrimination?

Landowners and exploiters considered the Cuban woman an object for the satisfaction of their whims. Today the Cuban woman has rights. The women have their own organizations and can engage in any type of activity. They work in factories, have access to everything, and enjoy social equality. Would the women begin to fight for the imperialists and landowners?

No one in Cuba, with the exception of a privileged minority, would like the restoration of the previous order in the country. The power of the revolution is strong, quite strong, and the people have full confidence in the future. The prejudices and lies disseminated by imperialism for many years through the movies, newspapers, journals, television, cultural institutions and puppet shows, and advertising have been eliminated. Let me tell you this: If after 50 years of lies imperialism was unable to prevent the Cuban people from finding the truth and understanding it, how could imperialism now, when it has neither newspapers, radio stations, journals, news agencies, cultural organizations, puppet shows or motion pictures, how could imperialism make the people believe the lies it spreads?

Most of the landowners have fled. Most of the big industrialists have fled. Most of the big merchants have fled. Most of the members of the intelligentsia serving imperialism have fled as well. Finally, the American Embassy with all its spies has gone home. Imperialism has been left no facilities here. Today the positions of imperialism are quite weak. Here imperialism cannot have at its disposal institutions such as a professional army, which was frequently used to secure the power and rout the people. There is no military caste headed by American officers. There is no military mission. The professional army has been destroyed. Imperialism has no means for promoting a coup d'etat, for it has no weapons for changing the domestic political situation. Imperialism is helpless in Cuba.

Journalist: Everything we saw in the course of our trip around the island is entirely consistent with everything you have told us. Our general view entirely coincides with what you have told us.

Castro: I tried to allow no exaggeration. Everything we said could suggest what our country will become in four to five years. We are already beginning to experience manpower shortages.

Therefore, the problem of unemployment will disappear entirely. Agriculture will be developed rapidly. How? Through machines which we shall receive from the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. This year we shall use in agriculture another 4,000 tractors purchased from the socialist countries. This year we have already begun to build the first factories also purchased from the socialist countries.

This year we shall harvest the entire sugarcane crop, since the socialist countries have guaranteed us a market for four million tons of sugar. This will enable us to do the following: The land allocated for sugarcane, which is very good, will be used in the future not only for the maximum planting and harvesting of this crop, but also for making our agriculture more comprehensive. This means that agriculture will offer year-round employment, for having harvested one crop we shall plant another. In the past we grew sugarcane almost exclusively. After it was harvested there was no more work for the people in the rural areas.

Now we intend to reorganize our agriculture using the latest accomplishments. We plan to mechanize it. Thus, for example, we have enrolled 1,000 peasants in a school to learn artificial cattle insemination, so that, in six months, all herds in the people's cooperatives may be artificially inseminated. We shall do this above all with purebred cows raised for beef and milk, selecting the best breeds.

We shall plant millions of fruit trees to give us a tremendous quantity of tropical fruits for export. Thus agriculture, which always been the basis of our economy, will be given exceptionally good development possibilities.

We shall work among the small farmers, who as I pointed out previously received no assistance whatever; yet, with the help we shall give them, they will be able to increase output a very great deal.

With the help of specialists from the USSR and other socialist countries, implementing the work of our planning workers, we intend to formulate and implement a broad industrialization program.

Now we are trying to insure the maximum utilization of production capacities in industry. We have reached in Cuba a maximum level of output and maximum level of employment. Some enterprises employed 100 workers before the revolution and 600 now.

We have already begun to implement a program for the training of technicians. Currently 6,000 students are undergoing technical training.

Journalist: Where do these students live?

Castro: In the houses of the big landowners, in the best districts of our city, in houses which now belong to the revolutionary government. In particular, we have placed 6,000 in the beautiful Cubanacan residential district.

They are attending workshops and classrooms in the premises of country clubs. Now these young people will live in houses located at a shorter distance. Had we had to build all this anew, it would have cost us over 50 million pesos. Without spending a single centavo, we shall have the

most beautiful academy of fine arts in the world. This represents proper use of invested capital.

Even though I would not like to expand on this topic, I must say that currently we are setting up 200 centers for the retraining of house servants in Havana. Throughout the country we are creating 200 children's circles and the same number of circles for workers' education. We have many other such plans.

The revolution has a great organizing power. Now the people are directly participating in the implementation of various plans and achieving the objectives with a lesser amount of energy and lesser resources. The point is that the revolution gave them a major impetus. The revolution in which a constant and ever-growing is being added, leads to the fact that the impetus is becoming ever stronger, regardless of our lack of past experience. When we came down from the mountains we immediately plunged into the very thick of this entire set of problems. We felt like being in the midst of a forest full of all kinds of treacherous surprises. However, we knew our forest well and we plunged into it. Over the past two years we have learned something and found out a great deal. In revolutionary times the people learn faster than at any other time. Furthermore, we can use everything you, in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, have learned. To us this is a great lesson.

Furthermore, we have now realized that there is no force in Latin America which could block the revolution. I am certain of this.

Journalist: We heard your speech at the United Nations and we know that you worked very hard writing it. Our question is, were you able to take a brief rest back from the UN General Assembly?

Castro: How so to rest?

Journalist: To rest, physically to rest.

Castro: So far the Americans have not given me the chance to rest. Actually, when would we be able to rest, really to rest?

Journalist: When we win our victory. The sooner the better.

Castro: When Latin America will be free from imperialism and imperialism falls.

Journalist: We are presenting you with a book. We have been told that you already have a copy of it. However, this is a special edition. Its author dedicates it to his readers, and we as readers would like to present you with it--its author. Here is the dedication, signature and date.

Castro: Well. I must tell you that I feel quite flattered by the fact that these speeches were published in the Russian language and . . .

Journalist: And are enjoying great popularity.

Castro: This is a reward to us, an honor given us--to know that we have so many friends in the Soviet Union interested in our revolution. I regret that these speeches are not very good. I hope to be able to improve them.

Journalist: Allow us to present you with a bust of Lenin. Were you to put it on your desk . . .

Castro: I already have such a bust, but I shall place this one here, in the best location.

I have come to admire Lenin more and more with every passing day. The more we learn about his life and activities, and in general about him, the better we understand the nature of the revolution and of all the great difficulties which he had to surmount. Above all I admire Lenin for his accomplishments and his legacy.

Whenever I see an approaching Soviet tanker I think of Lenin. Whenever I see a Soviet tractor shipped to us, I think of Lenin. Whenever I see a Soviet truck, I think of Lenin. Whenever we receive something from the Soviet Union we think of Lenin and feel our gratitude toward him.

As a student I always kept a book by Lenin on hand. When we attacked the Moncada Barracks, we carried with us books by Lenin. During the trial they showed us these books as proof of the charges, to shame us. The tyrants asked me whether I had a book by Lenin? I answered that I did, that this was a book by Lenin and it was our book, that we read Lenin, and that whoever does not read Lenin is an ignorant person.

We have always been very interested in Lenin's works and in the midst of the revolution they are of even greater interest to us.

Recently I reread Reed's book "Ten Days Which Shook the World." I read it during the revolution, not as in the past, not as I had read it before the revolution. The reading of this book triggered a definite desire to learn more about what took place in the Soviet Union in order to better understand a great deal of what took place in our country.

Journalist: We believe that you read Lenin well.

Castro: Thank you very much.

Journalist: In order not to imitate American journalists in this matter we have decided to let you take a brief rest.

Castro: We could continue tomorrow . . .

Journalist: We would be quite grateful and pleased.

Castro: Now we could take pictures.

Journalist: Very well. Do you have a message to the Soviet people?

Castro: Well. Yet . . . the point is that it is very difficult to find words to express the entire sympathy and gratitude we feel for the Soviet people. I cannot express all this with words.

Journalist: In turn, we could say that the Soviet people feel a profound love for the Cuban people and are sympathetically following the development of the Cuban revolution. All of us, Soviet journalists present here, intend to write a great deal about the life of the Cuban people since the victory of the revolution.

Castro: Very well. In turn, we are very pleased that the Soviet people are feeling this love for us, for the Cuban people. This is a great love which could be compared only to the one we feel for you.

Journalist: In conclusion, we would like to wish you the best for the success of new Cuba in all fields of life.

Castro: Thank you very much. I too would like to send greetings to the Soviet people and confirm my wish to have the possibility to visit the Soviet Union soon and to see everything you have been able to accomplish.

Journalist: You will be welcomed with all this love you deserve.

Castro: Thank you very much.

Journalist: Thank you very much for your kindness.

5003

CSO: 1802

THE ANTI-MARXIST MOVEMENT IN THE PRC

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 101-112

[Article by V. Lazarev]

[Text] The anti-Maoist movement is running high in China. We are not referring to the maneuvers of those Beijing leaders who, while remaining orthodox Maoists, sometimes allow themselves obscure hints that Mao Zedong was not without sin. We have something else in mind--a real, broad mass movement which is not always clearly discerned in items about China, being overshadowed by reports on the interfactional struggle for power in the top echelons of the leadership.

V. I. Lenin teaches that "politics begins where there are millions; not where there are thousands, but where there are millions, only there does serious politics begin" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 36, pp 16-17; Vol 38, p 220).

Guided by these criteria of Lenin's let us try to shed factual light on the overall picture of the anti-Maoist movement and to reveal the social and political conditions under which it is developing.

I

The anti-Maoist movement in China arose long ago, together with the birth of Maoism. Before the victory of the Chinese revolution it was manifested primarily within the CCP--in the struggle of the true communist-internationalists against the petty bourgeois nationalist views and actions of Mao Zedong and his supporters. Even at that time this struggle went beyond the framework of the party, affecting the interests of various strata of the population, but it began to acquire even broader scope with the Maoists' transition to the implementation of a special course in domestic and foreign policy profoundly contradicting Marxism-Leninism and the hopes and aspirations of the people's masses.

The Mao group's attempts to pursue "their own line of building" in the second half of the fifties suffered failure after failure, bringing the

working people ever new hardships and deprivations. The authorities responded to the rise in the people's dissatisfaction with Maoist policy with repressions and purges and political campaigns against dissidents; a reactionary coup in the form of the Cultural Revolution was carried out in the PRC. However, neither persecutions nor the endless "brainwashing" halted the working people's resistance. Nor was it broken by the establishment of the military-bureaucratic dictatorship regime in the country.

The eruption of popular dissatisfaction on 5 April 1976 in central Beijing, in which about 100,000 people took part according to official Chinese figures, was a milestone in the development of the anti-Maoist movement. The authorities used force against them--the police, guard troops and paramilitary detachments (the so-called "People's Volunteer Militia"). Many people were killed and wounded and even more arrested. The April uprisings were the knell for Mao Zedong, who died 5 months later.

In October 1976 the new leaders, headed by Hua Guofeng, removed from the ruling clique their rivals for power--the so-called "gang of four": Wang Hongwen, vice chairman of the CCP Central Committee; Zhang Chunqiao, member of the Central Committee Politburo Standing Committee; and Politburo members Jiang Qing (Mao Zedong's widow) and Yao Wenyuan were arrested.

From the end of 1976 admissions that there was widespread unrest in the country began to appear in Beijing leaders' speeches, the PRC press and Chinese radio broadcasts. Here Hua Guofeng and his colleague placed full responsibility for them on the "four" and their supporters with a view to adding weight to the accusations leveled at them and justifying the new wave of repressions.

On 22 December the same year the CCP Central Committee newspaper RENMIN RIBAO wrote in an editorial that by the time of Mao's death "the destiny of our party and our state were hanging by a thread." On 25 December Hua Guofeng spoke of the threat of "a big regression, a big split and a big civil war." In his first (and so far only) article laying claim to theoretical generalizations, in May 1977 Hua Guofeng again discussed the "universal civil war" in the PRC which threatened to "crush the dictatorship of the proletariat" (that is, the Maoist regime--V. L.). Later, in August, at the 11th CCP Congress he again spoke of the danger of "heavy bloodshed" and a struggle "to the death."

Feelings in the country could also be judged by statements by Li Xiannian, vice chairman of the CCP Central Committee and vice premier of the PRC State Council, in March 1977 when he talked with the Englishman D. Hamilton. According to him "last year many plants stood idle. Some workers had weapons at the plants. . . . Unrest reigned on the streets. . . . Some land (in the villages--V. L.) was redistributed among families." He also spoke of the "severe punishment" of the culprits, of "the penalty inflicted on those who are being executed in the provinces" and the fact that since Mao's death all China "has become agitated."

Although the main blame for this turn of events was placed on the "four," regardless of how official propaganda attempted to explain the reasons for the upheavals, the very fact that they had been admitted confirmed the existence of deep ferment among the Chinese people and the working people's dissatisfaction. This was borne out by items from the Chinese information media.

Back in September 1976 a telegram sent to Beijing by the leadership of Jiangsu Province mentioned the activity of "class enemies sowing confusion among the masses" and the need "to strike against those who are fabricating political slander and writing reactionary posters" aimed personally against Mao Zedong and the party Central Committee headed by Hua Guofeng. In November the same year Chinese radio stations reported a tense situation in Fujian, Hubei, Jiangxi, Hunan, Shanxi and Henan provinces and the deployment of army subunits there in institutions, factories and plants, educational establishments and villages. At the same time broadcasts by Chinese provincial radio stations became known reporting attacks on administrative and party institutions in Wuhan City and Yunnan and Shandong provinces and other places, executions in Hubei Province and fierce clashes in Sichuan, where "the precious lives of many class brothers were sacrificed in this veritable civil war."

Evidently a real "war on rails" was played out in the PRC. "On some railroad sections . . . class enemies have been activated," RENMIN RIBAO reported in March 1977. At the important Xu Zhuo rail junction unrest had been observed since 1974. It developed into "stormings" of party committees, the seizure of leading cadre workers and the use of force against them. Trains were stopped, shipments halted, and rolling stock and railroad installations damaged. In this connection RENMIN RIBAO called for "the resolute suppression of the counterrevolutionaries . . . who are attacking Chairman Mao, Chairman Hua and the party Central Committee, which he heads." This was direct evidence above all of the political nature of the unrest. Throughout the country, the same newspaper wrote, attempts were made to suppress the people organizing accidents and disasters, burning and stealing property and inciting workers to strike, and military control was established over the country's main railroad centers. Nonetheless the "war on rails" continued. In June 1978 speeches were still being delivered about "bringing order" to transport. In September 1979 the all-China conference of security directorate chiefs stated that "there are quite a lot of problems related to keeping order . . . on the mainline railroads."

From March 1977 Chinese press reports on the unrest began to take the form of victorious dispatches about the "solution of questions" locally. The "solution of the Shanghai question" was the first of this series. It transpires that after the defeat of the "four" in this, the country's largest city, the threat of "armed insurrection" arose. It emerged that "clandestine command points" had been organized there, "plans for combat operations" outlined, slogans formulated and passwords established. One

command point was at Shanghai's (Chahungo) textile equipment plant and had its own radio.

It was following this that the expression "the Shanghai question" appeared in RENMIN RIBAO. The point is that according to foreign new agency reports over 250 large-scale clashes had taken place in Shandong Province. As the provincial party committee first secretary admitted, 1,700 party and military cadre workers were killed or wounded in the clashes, and 17 prefecture [yuezdnyye] CCP committee secretaries were replaced; about 30 percent of railroad lines were put out of commission and motor vehicle communications were cut off for 4 months. In Qing Dao City chaos arose and 80 percent of plants and factories ceased production.

Throughout 1977 the Chinese information media reported the aggravation of the situation in the southeast of the country, primarily in Fujian Province. RENMIN RIBAO wrote of "counterattacks" against Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai and Hua Guofeng, attacks on airfields, the "storming" of party committees at various levels and of security organs, murders of cadre workers, massacres and robberies (they were organized by the starving poor). As a result of the unrest there was a sharp fall in agricultural production and demands were heard in the communes for the land to be returned to those who work it. Calls to "follow the path of encircling the cities with the countryside" and "go out to the mountains and wage guerrilla warfare" were disseminated. The local authorities had to put the "iron fist of dictatorship" into operation and "outline a battle plan for the forthcoming period."

The the "Yunnan," "Liaoning," "Anshan," "Anhui" and other "questions" surfaced in the press.

The Dazibao--"large-character newspapers"--served as an additional source providing a fuller idea of China's internal situation. They got this name because initially their authors wrote them on old newspapers in large characters so that they could be seen against the background of the former text. These statements and reports, usually handwritten in single copies which were hung up in crowded places, do not, of course, define the public opinion of the country as a whole. But they are of important significance for ascertaining the population's mood, since under PRC conditions they were virtually the only safety valve through which voices in disagreement with the existing order could break through. As a demobilized soldier wrote in May 1979 in a Dazibao, he had "no other means" of "making his difficulties known."

In recent years Dazibao have increasingly become mouthpieces for criticism of Maoist policy. Thus a Dazibao distributed in Guangzhou City (Canton) in the form of a letter to Hua Guofeng pointed to the deterioration in the people's lives and categorically demanded that immediate steps be taken to insure that the working class could take part in the organization of socialist production and manage public property and that a system of social

security be established for people who had lost the ability to work. In Beijing authors of a Dazibao were indignant that "our peasants are still pulling their plows themselves."

In April 1978 the "large-character newspapers" demanded a thorough investigation of the events which occurred on 5 April 1976 in Tiananmin Square. A mournful exclamation was heard from their pages: "How many people were arrested, how many were tortured to death!" They reported that in 1976 the "5 April movement" gripped the whole country and involved "several hundred million people." At the same time it was noted that arrests are not ceasing in the PRC, that "the masses are still subjected to persecution . . . that in the political and economic spheres there is a full selection of 'gang of four' arguments which have become even more developed than in the past" and that "the revolution has failed."

Since the fall of 1978 the Dazibao have sharply criticized the activity of Mao Zedong and demanded a fundamental change in the situation in China: "In the People's Republic socialism has become a Chinese feudal-fascist system. The right to life, democratic rights and human rights have become empty words and the constitution a scrap of paper designed to deceive and stultify the people." The authors called on the population to rise up to fight the existing order.

"After the fall of the 'gang of four' the wise leader Hua Guofeng and, in the opinion of some people, the even wiser leader Vice Chairman Deng Xiaoping promised diplomacy and prosperity," another leaflet read. "But the system of power which suppresses the people remains intact. . . . The people have no opportunity to determine their own destiny. Others enjoy the fruits of their labor. . . . What sort of historymakers are they? They are more like slaves. . . . Is this the path to socialism? Of course not. It is only a feudal-monarchist system decked out in socialist robes."

A Dazibao posted in Beijing on 15 February 1979 asked: "What caused the present dissatisfaction?" And replied, directly addressing the present leadership: "It is not only the reactionary policy of the 'gang of four,' but also the antipopular policy which you are continuing to pursue even now. . . . Who is really creating harmful consequences? It is the deadlocked rulers whose erroneous policy is reducing people to an existence of semi-starvation, it is the butchers and murders who, for the sake of the power struggle, do not stop at sacrificing people's lives and leading the country to the verge of economic collapse. . . ." The authors of the Dazibao advocated totally eliminating the "system of people's communes . . . which has led to universal impoverishment," abolishing the "bureaucratic regime" now existing in China and replacing it with a "democratic system" based on the principles of the Paris Commune.

The PRC's foreign policy has also not gone unheeded by the Dazibao. They state that the Chinese people want eternal friendship with the Russian people and with the U.S. and Japanese peoples; they proclaim the demand "that

our country's government enter into negotiations with the Russian government or accept proposals which the Soviet Union has already made." The Chinese aggression against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam was sharply criticized. Here it was stressed that as a result of the attack on Vietnam "China has lost its international prestige and isolated itself from the international community" and that the Chinese people pinned great hopes on the CCP Central Committee's "new policy" but were profoundly deceived in this hope when they learned of the aggression against Vietnam. The Dazibao urged that the real situation in the United States should not be ignored and that the U.S. political system should not be whitewashed: "How can we pin hopes for democracy in China on U.S. President Carter? Surely the head of U.S. imperialism cannot be interested in the cause of the Chinese people's socialism and its development, unless it be to use China against the USSR." "Let the peoples of China and the United States hold out a hand to each other," one author wrote in March 1979, "but we have no desire to create a single front with the United States against anyone."

Dazibao have also voiced pro-Maoist, anticommunist, reactionary arguments. There is nothing surprising in that since manifestations or dissatisfaction in China are of a spontaneous nature. That is why Dazibao have been written by both opponents and supporters of Maoism, bearers of progressive convictions and proponents of the most reactionary views, representatives of the population and people sent by the authorities and various factions engaged in internecine warfare. However, in our view, it would be wrong to reduce the significance of the Dazibao merely to the function of an instrument of the power struggle between leaders and groups, as the foreign press frequently does. This approach is refuted by the content of many Dazibao which have touched on fundamental socioeconomic and political problems and raised the question not of correcting particular aspects of Maoism, but of rejecting it completely.

Forms such as spontaneous demonstrations and rallies have emerged increasingly frequently in the anti-Maoist movement in the PRC. Thus, on the evening of 1979 workers from the silk weaving factory went out onto the streets of Shanghai to protest against their extremely low wages and harsh working conditions and against the fact that they were "always living in want." In breaking up the demonstration the police opened fire.

At the same time several thousand peasants who had come to Beijing from all provinces of the country, including Tibet, organized a march in the region of the Chinese party leadership's residence and carried placards bearing the word: "We do not want to starve. We do not want to suffer. We want the safeguarding of human rights and democracy." On 14 and 15 January new demonstrations by peasants trying to present complaints to the supreme party and administrative authorities, but stopped from doing so by servicemen, rocked the capital. The demonstrators said that they were in despair, they could not find protection anywhere, tyranny reigned locally and people were persecuted as before. On 27 January peasants raising clenched fists and shouting "We want to eat!" "Give us clothing," and "We want equality!"

--gathered outside the House of People's Congresses while inside 30,000 guests headed by Hua Guofeng were celebrating the Chinese New Year (according to the lunar calendar).

On 27 December 1978 a demonstration of youth representatives who had come to Beijing from Yunnan Province took place. They marched through Tiananmin Square demanding the abolition of forced labor. In their leaflets they announced that they represented 50,000 people who had been forcibly sent from the cities to remote regions. In early February 1979 major unrest erupted in Shanghai among young people demanding work and the right to return to take up permanent residence in their native city. They blocked the city's transport and rail traffic and used force to break into administrative institutions and attacked officials and cut off electricity supplies. Demonstrations under the slogan of freedom for "literate young people" to return to their birthplaces also took place in other cities. In Xian over 30,000 youth representatives declared a hunger strike. In Anhui Province in the summer of 1979 dozens of students on two state farms succumbed to despair and committed suicide.

According to Japanese press reports at the end of 1978 mass demonstrations by representatives of local ethnic groups against nuclear tests in the region were held in the Xinjiang-Uighur Autonomous Region. The Beijing government was accused of planning the complete destruction of ethnic minorities with the aid of these tests.

The wide scale of the unrest and disorder, which is acquiring nationwide dimensions, the great diversity of the means of expressing dissatisfaction, the participation therein of the basic strata of Chinese society, the political content of the demonstrations and their undoubted thrust against Mao Zedong and the present leadership which has inherited his policy--all this attests that an anti-Maoist movement is developing in China. Of course, it is diverse and heterogeneous. It is based on the broad masses' dissatisfaction with their situation, which frequently arises unconsciously as a spontaneous protest. The movement is unorganized; so for you cannot feel in it the existence of any nucleus, still less a proletarian, Marxist-Leninist nucleus. That is why it can be used (and undoubtedly is used) both by the leaders and factions in the internecine squabble for power and cosy nooks in the Maoist regime's system and by the vestiges of the classes overthrown by the Chinese revolution. But in this case it is its anti-Maoist orientation which is most important to us. And it is in precisely this direction that the movement is strengthening, like a sea wind before a storm.

ii

Stressing, at the 1969 international conference of communist and workers' parties, the importance of analyzing the class content of events in China, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted that the Beijing leaders' course jeopardizes the Chinese people's socialist gains. These words encapsulate one of the main problems of present-day Chinese society.

The Maoists express the aspiration of the reactionary section of the Chinese petty bourgeoisie. Mao Zedong and his supporters turned the PRC from a socialist path and tried to direct its economy and policy in their own way--a petty bourgeois, nationalist way. That is why the Maoist course accords with the interests of neither the working class, nor the working peasantry, nor the people's intelligentsia, who oppose it. There is a clash between the aspirations of the broad working masses striving for a secure, free life, and the policy of the ruling clique which dooms the Chinese people to endless sacrifices and deprivations and is squandering national resources on militarization, subversive activity against world socialism and the steering of a hegemonist foreign policy course. It is this contradiction which nurtures the anti-Maoist movement.

China's present and future depend primarily on realistic options for resolving the contradiction between the interests of the broad working masses and the Maoist course. The most effective and least painful way out for Chinese society lies in breaking resolutely with Maoism and returning to a policy which is really based on Marxism-Leninism and to cooperation and solidarity with the socialist world. If the Beijing leaders understood this they would have the working people's support. However, the leadership which has taken over from Mao Zedong's group is not breaking with Maoism: its ideological platforms consist of an amalgam of Mao Zedong's aims and propositions; its program for the country's internal development is Maoist in terms of its nature and goals, which are aimed at turning China into a militarist superpower and although in some respects Maoist concepts are now being corrected, this is not the case in the sphere of its foreign policy, which remains antisocialist and great-power nationalist and subordinated to the task of establishing world hegemony.

It is true that the post-Mao Zedong leadership has begun to pay more attention to the economy. But it is also true that its economic policy comes down to replacing some Maoist lines with others, also Maoist. The first session of the National People's Congress of the Fifth Convocation (February through March 1978), noting the presence of a "Great Leap Forward situation" in the country, issued the directive to "build up our economic and defense might at an accelerated rate." It approved the basic provisions of the 10-year plan for the development of the PRC national economy for 1976-1985, which was nothing other than a repetition of Mao's attempt in the fifties to implement the "Great Leap Forward." The only difference was that now the "Leap Forward" was more stretched out in time (from 3 to 10 years) and the indicators were more modest, but that did not alter the voluntarist essence of the undertaking. That is why the result was a natural one. The 10-year plan failed before going into operation (according to the official Beijing story the period 1976-1978 went to restore the economy).

The second National People's Congress session (June through July 1979) enshrined the actual renunciation of the 10-year plan, national economic development rates were reduced for 1979 by comparison with the previous two

years and a course was proclaimed toward "readjustment" for 1980-1981. But "readjustment" is also an old "idea" of Mao's which he applied after the failure of the "Great Leap Forward" at the end of the fifties. The coincidence here is revealed not only in the form but also in the internal content. It consists in returning to an idea once again preached by Mao Zedong--achieving a boost to the national economy through the development primarily of agriculture and light industry.

While the session was working, reports circulated in the world press about the speech delivered by Li Xiannian, vice chairman of the CC CCP and vice premier of the PRC State Council, at a closed conference (Beijing has not denied these reports on a single count). Li stated that "economic crisis threatens China." Nonetheless, despite the very grave economic situation, the Beijing rulers are continuing the Maoist line toward the country's accelerated militarization, steering it with even greater zeal than did Mao Zedong: According to the 1979 budget China's military expenditure has increased almost 20 percent.

The hegemonist goals of Chinese policy remain in their entirety: While Mao in the fifties set the task of "subduing the globe," now Beijing promises mankind that "the 21st century will be the century of the Chinese" (the newspaper ZHONG GUO QING NIAN BAO, June 1979). Enormous funds are put into acts of banditry like the armed attack against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, support for the remnants of the bloody Pol Pot clique in Kampuchea and acts of provocation against Laos and other states bordering on the PRC. Expenditure is growing on pro-imperialist foreign policy, antisocialist, anti-Soviet propaganda and subversive work against world socialism and the international communist and national liberation movement.

Meanwhile the urgent social problems in China are not only not being resolved, but are being aggravated still further. The second session of the National People's Congress, after a 20-year break, cited some figures for the PRC population's living standard. They were lower than even the most skeptical estimates made by the most implacable critics of Maoism abroad. To judge by these figures, there can be no talk of any real improvement in living standards, but merely of maintaining people's actual existence (see KOMMUNIST, No 3, 1980).

The Chinese authorities have decided to raise purchase prices for the main types of agricultural produce and somewhat reduce taxes in the countryside. According to Hua Guofeng this will produce an increase in incomes in the countryside "unprecedented in the history" of the country--an increase of approximately 13 billion yuan. However, in per capita terms incomes will increase by only 15-16 yuan a year, that is, something in the region of 50-60 kopeks a month. The situation of the urban population is actually deteriorating since retail prices for food have increased 20-30 percent since November 1979, while the subsidies promised to a "certain section" of workers and employees do not reach 10 percent of their monthly income. And perhaps even more important, according to the press the fear, fostered by

Mao's "ideas," that the life of ordinary people will become more prosperous retains its influence in Beijing (the capital newspaper BEIJING RIBAO, May 1979) [sentence as published].

Unemployment is another very acute problem. At the second session of the National People's Congress Hua Guofeng admitted that the employment problem is now of tremendous importance and the number of people expecting work exceeds the number of jobs. His calls to expand employment by developing cottage crafts and repair work, the trading network and the service sphere and by organizing so-called "cooperative enterprises" created by "relying on one's own efforts" will naturally not resolve the problem. In the USSR unemployment has been abolished once and for all on the basis of the industrialization of the entire country and the creation of large-scale industry. In China, however, capital construction is being reduced and heavy industry development rates are falling.

Under Mao Zedong all these questions were also on the agenda, but they were felt less painfully. Mao did not even promise to improve the Chinese people's lives, but urged and forced them "not to fear hunger, not to fear death." The new leadership, to obtain the population's support, has been obliged to promise to improve the working people's living standard, but this promise is not being fulfilled.

The discrepancy between the present leadership's verbal promises and its actual policy is becoming an additional source of dissatisfaction which is intensifying the acuteness of the contradiction between the Maoist course and the working people's interests.

Beijing's major gamble on aid from the imperialists in modernizing the country could prove to be one more major source of the people's dissatisfaction. Since 1978 the Chinese rulers have mounted frenzied activity to place orders for supplies of equipment, technology and weapons from the capitalist countries. However, the lack of funds to pay for them was soon revealed. That is why Beijing has begun to seek credits and loans from the imperialist monopolies. But the imperialists remain imperialists: They will extort the maximum profits. China will have not only to return the credits and loans, but also to pay interest on them. All this will inevitably lead to the intensification of the Chinese working people's exploitation and thus to the growth of their resistance to the present leadership's policy.

K. Marx and F. Engels, exposing the motives of the creators of Bakunin's "little model of barracks communism," pointed out that these motives consist in becoming the owners of the public wealth and reaping the fruit of the exalted and ambitious desire they are so eager to impose upon others: "Work a lot to consume little!" (See K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 18, p 415). This is the innermost secret of the Maoist regime on which its very existence is based. The Beijing ruling clique, in appropriating the fruit of the labor of the multimillion-strong people, is

wasting funds principally and mainly on satisfying its great-power nationalist and militarist desires and on pursuing an expansionist policy.

On this social foundation the anti-Maoist movement in the PRC will inevitably grow laterally and in depth whatever obstacles Beijing's ruling clique may erect in its path.

From its very emergence the anti-Maoist movement in the PRC has developed in a situation of very harsh persecution. The Mao Zedong group, recarving the Chinese people's lives in its own manner, made extensive use of brutal repressions against both active and potential opponents of Maoism. Faced with the alternative of either breaking with Maoism or toughening the military-bureaucratic regime and turning it into a terrorist dictatorship to mercilessly suppress the broad working masses and to hold on to power at that price, the Beijing ruling clique has taken the latter course.

After Mao Zedong's death his successors, consumed by the desire to pulverize their political rivals and acquire prestige among the people, began, at times, to tell the truth about the situation in China; not the whole truth, certainly, just some of it. Admissions appeared (in the form of the exposure of the crimes of the "gang of four") that in the RRC, as the journal HONG QI and the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO wrote, "harsh persecutions were carried out and a fascist dictatorship implemented," "acts of tyranny were committed during arrests and detentions," "human lives were toyed with," "fascist terror" had raged, torture was used and a "kingdom of fear" existed.

In June 1978 the new first secretary of the Tianjin Municipal CCP Committee, discrediting his ousted predecessor, told a mass meeting that fascist methods had been used in the city and that physical and moral torture, falsification of prosecution cases and repressions had been employed, resulting in the deaths of innocent people. In July 1978 RENMIN RIBAO wrote that the "spearhead of the dictatorship of the proletariat" had been directed "against the people's masses" and that "the most brutal methods of repression, characteristic of a feudal fascist system," had been employed. As one Chinese author defined it, "trial by quotation" similar to the medieval religious courts had been established in China. In GUANGMING RIBAO for 26 October 1978 he wrote that "a few distorted or falsified remarks have been enough to condemn people to death."

It should not be thought that all this applied only to the "Cultural Revolution" period. Repressions and persecution of real and imaginary opponents of Maoism continued through the years and still have not ceased. A Dazibao posted in Beijing at the end of November 1978 said: "From 1966 to 1976, from the start of the Cultural Revolution to the death of Mao Zedong, China was ruled by a fascist regime. . . ." Another pamphlet called for a struggle against "feudal fascism since the Great Cultural Revolution." In yet another the author recalled that Chinese had been jailed and persecuted merely for wrapping something in a newspaper bearing a portrait of Mao or accidentally smashing a plaster bust of him.

The Dazibao constantly voiced endless complaints of persecution and repression, of shattered human lives. Thus in July 1974 a group of authors appealed to the central authorities to save one Shen. After the "Cultural Revolution" this former serviceman had fallen into disgrace and had been jailed. During his years of imprisonment, so doctors established, Shen's lungs had become 75 percent rotten, his weight had declined from more than 60 kg to 30 kg and he had shrunk by 4 cm. A meeting to review Shen's case was held 4 July 1974 in the city of Changsha, but after a discussion that lasted only one hour, he was returned to jail.

In April 1975 Zhang Zhixing, communist and staffer of the Liaoning Provincial Party Committee Propaganda Department, was brutally executed. Since the time of the "Cultural Revolution" she had been in jail, where she had been tortured and tormented, and before the execution, so RENMIN RIBAO recounted 11 June 1979, the executioners cut her throat so she could not shout revolutionary slogans. She is now acknowledged to have been innocent and, with unparalleled hypocrisy, has been declared a heroine and a model to be imitated.

In 1973 Liu Zhen, former second secretary of the Beijing Municipal CCP Committee and a party member since 1927, was still wearing the shackles into which he had been clapped in 1968; "his clothing stank and was covered with crusted bloodstains." Even after this he was kept prisoner until his death, although he was by then an invalid and suffered from a serious form of tuberculosis.

A vivid general picture of the "fascist dictatorship inside and outside the party" was painted in September 1978 by Ren Zhongyi, first secretary of the Liaoning Provincial Party Committee: ". . . People did not dare speak out. Anyone who dared express an opinion different from their viewpoint (that of Lin Biao and the "gang of four," of course--V. I.) became the target for cruel harassment and pitiless blows and was subjected to inhuman physical torture and political persecution that extended even to members of his family and friends. It was a reign of fear, and no one felt safe."

So what has changed since the new leadership became established in power?

Let us turn to the most terrible evidence of the use of violence against the population--the plain facts of executions. In March 1977 alone there were reports of the execution of 9 people found guilty of political crimes in the city of Wuhan, of more than 20 officials of provincial CCP organizations in Fujian Province, and of 26 people in Shanghai. Executions also took place elsewhere. Most of the nine people executed that same month in the city of Hangzhou were accused of political offenses, of organizing armed groups and circulating subversive literature; they included two women. Information emerged in April on executions in the cities of Canton, Shanghai, Wuhan, Hangzhou, Changsha and Shenyang. In the city of Kunming (the center of Yunnan Province) 23 people received the death sentence in September of that same year, 5 reports on executions, each of

"counterrevolutionary activity." In October Britain's SUNDAY TELEGRAPH wrote that "the total number of people executed in China in 1977 is several thousand."

Reports of executions have leaked out of the PRC more rarely since 1977. But executions are an integral part of the authorities' proclaimed campaigns to "restore order." Hua Guofeng told Japanese businessmen that his "government suppressed disorders" that had gripped certain areas of the country; addressing the meeting devoted to the first anniversary of Mao Zedong's death, he stated that "dictatorship over class enemies has been considerably strengthened." At the time RENMIN RIBAO urged continuing "the resolute offensive against the class enemy, with an iron rod," and "clenching tightly the iron fist of dictatorship." In the provinces, at mass meetings relayed by radio, speeches were made saying that "malevolent elements" should be executed. According to the testimony of the aforementioned British newspaper, senior officials in Heilongjiang Province openly told foreigners of a sharp increase in the number of executions on Hua Guofeng's accession to power.

The 11th CCP Congress called for "public security work to be strengthened" and issued instructions for "the chastising sword of dictatorship organs to be turned" against counterrevolutionaries (in the Maoist interpretation-- V. L.) and for blows to be struck "with circumspection, accuracy and ruthlessness." Further executions came on the eve of the National People's Congress session in February 1978. "Despite recent measures directed toward liberalizing the Chinese regime, politically-motivated arrests continue," Britain's THE TIMES wrote, "and there have been many executions in the past two years."

The upsurge in the anti-Maoist movement since the end of 1978 has been accompanied by a new wave of repressions. And here the Chinese leadership has played an underhand double game. Its official representatives and the press have expatiated on the need to develop democracy and observe the constitutional rights of the PRC citizens, but meanwhile the authorities have surreptitiously made increasingly widespread use of punitive measures, including the most extreme. It will be recalled that on 29 December 1978 in Shanghai the police opened fire on workers who had gone out into the streets to protest at low wages and grim working conditions. In January 1979 the Beijing authorities issued orders for the prosecution of groups criticizing Mao Zedong and defending civil rights. In response, the Dazibao urged: "Resist the police!" "Punish the responsible persons in the security organs!" "Release the arrestees immediately!"

In connection with peasant demonstrations Hua Guofeng convened a "special conference" at which he stated: "The overwhelming majority of people who come to Beijing are good. Their complaints must be carefully heeded and they must be given real help in solving existing problems." However, simultaneously in the capital, 10 through 20 January 1979, mass "meetings to pass sentence" were held. As Beijing radio reported, several people

were sentenced to death at them and were immediately shot, while others were condemned to life imprisonment. Officially, they were "counterrevolutionaries and criminals."

In mid-February 1979 RENMIN RIBAO published an article saying: "At the present time an extremely small number of people . . . are inciting the population to create disturbances, are again resorting to the invasion of institutions that took place during the Cultural Revolution period, and are creating obstacles to the movement of transport, as a result of which the maintenance of normal public, production and worker order has suffered greatly." Then yet another conference was held on the question of complaints from the population. But now it struck a different note. The first secretary of the Beijing Municipal Committee instructed the relevant organs to "tackle in the right way" work with complainers and to "deal with the utmost strictness with persons "inciting the masses to create disturbances."

On 6 March, at a meeting of Beijing party, state and military workers attended by many thousands of people, Deng Xiaoping attacked those who were particularly active in militating for democracy. On 30 March he delivered yet another speech against "excessive calls" for the democratization of life in the PRC and called for those who criticized the Chinese leadership and the "thoughts of Mao Zedong," "right-wing elements." On 31 March, following Shanghai's example, a "notification" threatening arrest and imprisonment for attacks on the "thoughts of Mao Zedong" and the CCP leadership was published in Beijing also. The circulation of Dazibao, placards, slogans and other materials criticizing Mao and the current leaders, and also the posting of any Dazibao outside the place specially set aside for the purpose, were banned. Stronger patrols of police and servicemen and also special teams washing Dazibao off the walls of houses appeared in the streets of the capital.

BEIJING RIBAO started a new rubric entitled "Propagandize, Observe and Implement the 'Notification,'" which describes in detail the "exploits" of the police and security service agents in suppressing disturbances, features their assurances of their determination to suppress all "illegal" actions and offers recommendations to "strike blows against the subversive activity of harmful elements." RENMIN RIBAO, the CCP Central Committee organ, issued a warning that violators of the authorities' instructions would be "arrested and hailed for reeducation and correction through physical labor."

After the massive roundups in April-May 1979, a campaign of persecution of "counterrevolutionaries" opposed to Maoist "socialism" and to the "Four Modernizations," which are essentially designed to turn China into a super-power that would dominate the whole world, began throughout the country. Reporting another conference at the Ministry of Public Security, RENMIN RIBAO stressed in May that the ministry' organs "must in no circumstances sit idly by."

The Beijing elite's policy remains at bottom Maoist. And so the anti-Maoist demonstrations have continued. Soon after the Second National People's Congress session, despite the strictest bans and repressions, hundreds of unemployed young people in Shanghai held a demonstration outside the city "revolutionary committee" which lasted for three days running. New Dazibao protested at the arrests and charges of "counterrevolution" on the basis of denunciations by the local authorities, and the fact that the arrestees had no opportunity to defend themselves against the charges. Tens of thousands of people continued to arrive in Beijing on foot from the provinces, bearing requests for help in getting rid of poverty, for the review of cases in which they had been deprived of their rights, for permission to live and work in their native cities and so forth. Dazibao described the Chinese Constitution as a collection of "empty words," although it formally guaranteed freedom of speech and demonstration. "If you use the first right, you will be accused of making incorrect attacks, and if you use the second right, you will be accused of organizing the masses to create disturbances: You will be arrested, beaten and tortured," another Dazibao said, concluding: "Any slogans of progress are meaningless unless this feudal and autocratic dominance is eliminated. . . ."

Since August 1979 demonstrations by peasants, railroad workers, unemployed demobilized soldiers and young people have resumed outside the Chinese leadership's residence in Zhongnanhai. Simultaneous rallies during which demands have been voiced for political democracy to be developed and for civil rights to be safeguarded have again occurred on Tiananmen Square. New Dazibao have directly criticized both Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping over the fact that the government is ignoring the Chinese people's aspirations and have reiterated calls for an end to the alinement with the forces of imperialist reaction, "the holding of free elections" and "the removal of Chairman Mao from the mausoleum in Beijing." "We do not want the peoples of China and the USSR, China and Vietnam to shed blood, we do not want war to break out once again between China and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam," the Dazibao have proclaimed. "We want it to be our lofty duty to promote peace among all states. The relaxation of tension is the main trend in the modern world."

In response to working people's actions the authorities are again intensifying repressions. A series of trials began in October 1979 in the PRC. Their first victim was Wei Jingsheng, one of the authors of the Dazibao, who was sentenced to 15 years for "handing military information" to foreigners regarding the Chinese aggression in Vietnam and for "conspiratorial activity against the dictatorship of the proletariat."

In December the Chinese leadership decided to use the army to impose order. The commanders of troop subunits received orders "to make every effort to eliminate disturbances." Military patrols were introduced in cities. But that was not all.

In February 1980 a CC CCP Plenum resolved, in order to help eliminate factors making for instability, to order the Chinese National People's

Congress to annul the provisions of Article 45 of the PRC Constitution regarding the citizens' right to "express opinions, set forth views, hold debates and post Dazibao." At the same time RENMIN RIBAO proclaimed that "the death penalty is a necessary measure at the present stage." Moreover, in March the authorities announced that a 1957 State Council resolution on "labor reeducation" entitled administrative organs to detain virtually anyone in special camps without trial or investigation remained in force. According to data published in Italy's L'EUROPEO magazine, there are more than 900 such camps in China, and the number of detainees is more than 10 million.

The Chinese people are not surrendering and are continuing the struggle for a better life.

That is, in broad outline, the political situation in present-day China from the viewpoint of the attitude of millions toward Maoism. It confirms the idea that a mass anti-Maoist movement exists and is growing in the country. Of course, it would be wrong to exaggerate the strength of this movement at its present stage (although its scope clearly had a bearing on the Maoists' recent posthumous rehabilitation of Liu Shaoqi, a prominent party and state figure who fell victim to the "Cultural Revolution"). The very fact of the movement's existence certainly does not mean that the PRC is on the point of an explosion that will sweep away the military-bureaucratic dictatorship, although that possibility cannot be altogether ruled out, for, in Lenin's figurative expression, we do not and cannot know which of a thousand sparks will prove capable of kindling a conflagration, in the sense of a special awakening of the masses (see Lenin, op cit, Vol 41, p 85).

China's future belongs not to Maoism, but to scientific socialism. "Nowadays," Comrade M. A. Suslov said at the All-Union Conference of Ideological Workers, "the prestige of the teaching of Marx-Engels-Lenin is higher than ever and the might of its ideological impact and the strength of real socialism's example are greater than ever." The influence of these factors will certainly have an impact on the situation in China also. This influence will ultimately prevail and will lead the Chinese people onto the path of victorious socialist building, and friendship and cooperation with the USSR and the other socialist countries.

CSO: 1802

IN THE LABYRINTH OF THE 'MASS SOCIETY'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 113-120

[Article by G. Oganov]

[Text] . . . She is a famous European figure, with great insight, dressed in expensive silk, wearing precious stones, among Persian rugs, ancient engravings and French tapestries hanging in her living room-office, reminding of an exotic bird in a gold cage. She looks closely at the visitor through thick, fashionable glasses drastically contrasting with this entire baroque spender and accessories of long-gone times. No, she is not a bird in a gilded cage or a wax figure in Madam Tussaud's Wax Museum in London, but a very contemporary person.

A conversation with her would be curious. She remembers the figures of budget appropriations, knows the names of existentialist philosophers and could discuss the secrets of parapsychology and the decoding of the genetic code. No, she no longer predicts the future on cards or with coffee grounds as her numerous predecessors have done in the course of several centuries of European history. She does not look at the palm of your hand and predict your immediate future from the lines, or tell you your past. In general, she is less of a seer than she is a futurologist with a mystical-parapsychological inclination: Her services are not used by junior clerks dreaming of promotion or sales ladies dreaming of a successful marriage. Coming to her for advice and recommendations are big lawyers working on the cases of the powerful on this earth, successful company directors, famous authors of best sellers, and ambitious members of Parliament. Naturally, problems discussed have nothing to do with some pitiful provincial suitors or a few pennies to be added to one's salary. They deal with financial upheavals and political circumstances, changes of cabinets, and international monopoly deals involving billions.

The "intellectual" seer we have described is a collective picture. In Paris, London, Dusseldorf, Munich and far across the ocean, fashionable salons of seers, astrologers and palmists are flourishing, operating with modern means, having reformed their ancient profession in accordance with . . . the century of the scientific and technical revolution. The

addresses of these salons are known, and interviews with the high-placed seers are published in respectable weeklies such as STERN, DER SPIEGEL and PARIS MATCH. Most importantly, they have steady customers. . . .

Is this a paradox? These are double-dyed businessmen who believe neither in God nor in the devil, but only in his majesty the gold ingot, people whose every action is calculated, even marriages and philanthropic actions, and whose most reliable criterion of the truth is profit and success in business. Yet, suddenly, they need a seer! . . . Even if it is a seer using "most modern" means, computers rather than the traditional black cat.

There is no paradox here. Adventure, the gamble, risk, winning or losing, are mandatory companions of the life and activities of any Western capitalist, financial magnate, businessman and bourgeois political leader. This applies even more so to the "novices" who have not as yet stolen millions but are aspiring to do so. Bribing, suborning, usurious interests, bankruptcies, raising and lowering prices, you either gobble up your neighbor or are gobbled up by him, with all moveable or real property, with an entire life, as though playing roulette in this world of "free enterprise." Whirl around, defraud, gamble, lie, cheat, betray, show no mercy or leniency to friends or rivals. The game goes on! Whirl around if you want to become a big noticeable fish in the school of the "mass society," in this game. Yet, wherever there is a game or a roulette wheel, there is also mysticism, passion and disease--"grab any opportunity by the tail," any success.

What is expected of the seers and astrologers here is not the shaking of foundations, but only the attractive embellished confirmation of the "truths" professed by business. Perhaps this is a case of some initial irrationality in the contemporary capitalist world, triggered by a variety of fears and forebodings of an apocalyptic catastrophe of current bourgeois life. Or else could it be a peculiar fetishism consistent with this life, mentioned by K. Marx himself?

Actually, I thought of today's fashionable modernized seers of the West, using the facilities of the scientific and technical revolution, after seeing a strange self-restriction typical of the bourgeois sociologists who are trying to explain or perhaps merely describe the crisis phenomena in the spiritual life the capitalist world. Almost unanimously they reject from their field of vision anything pertaining to class or anything social in their consideration of the trends which imbue the political life, economy and culture of contemporary Western society. "I do not wish to know about this! . . ." Exceptionally sensitive in terms of the world of feelings, emotions or refined mental games, they turn blind when it becomes a question of the class, the social roots of one or another phenomenon: "I do not wish to know about this! . . ."

While the contemporary Western seer may consider matters "broadly" and may have long abandoned the primitive deck of cards, most seers-futurologists

with professorial degrees, are unwilling to look at anything other than the lines on someone's hands. It is as though the world with its social upheavals, dynamics of revolutionary development, and irreconcilable class antagonisms, does not exist.

Characteristic in this sense is an attempt which has been revived in recent years to theoretically "put together" the heterogeneous phenomena inherent in contemporary capitalism: the so-called "mass society" doctrine. The idea of the "mass society" or the "theory of the masses" as it is also known, stands out among the many fashionable sociological concepts created by bourgeois social thinking of the 1950's-1960's, most of them futurological, such as the "technetronic era," "postindustrial society," "super-industrialism," and so on. It could not be described as the latest theory, for it was mentioned initially as early as the 1920's. However, its recognition came far later, when the ruling elite saw in the "mass society" concept the chance to counter the merciless Marxist class analysis with something seemingly more scientific and somehow "trustworthy." This concept was as timid as Cinderella among her flashy "sisters." No, it did not claim to predict the future or proclaim with the pretentiousness of mystical prophecies a certain truth, in the final instance, or some kind of firm tenet of faith. It is emphatically nonconceptual. It merely notes the facts.

We must point out that this has its strong side--naturally, not scientific, but from the publicity-speculative viewpoint. The seeming objectivity (for indeed the broad masses are reaching to an ever-greater extent the foreground of social life, playing an ever more active role in the destinies of modern societies), the appearance of studying the facts at a specific stage tricked even very experienced bourgeois sociologists, such as D. Bell, S. Lipsett and others. They consider the adoption of the "mass society" doctrine as a possible even inevitable "dysfunctional" criticism of contemporary bourgeois society. This applies to criticism which, in the view of these bourgeois scientists, is "far reaching." The more so since at a specific stage "mass society" theoreticians such as E. Fromm, I. Hove, R. Mills, D. Riesman, and others, have subjected a number of important aspects of contemporary capitalism to rather extensive criticism from liberal-democratic positions.

Actually, it became clear quite soon that the propaganda advantages of the use of this "doctrine" were quite considerable and that the supporters of capitalism should not neglect them. This particularly applies to those who are burdened with the difficult duty of being concerned with the stability of the existing order and preventing or suppressing (best of all, nipping in the bud) any mass democratic movement, not to speak of revolutionary ferment. According to their explanations, this accursed "mass society" was to be blamed for all the troubles and cataclysms of the 20th century, having shifted around all emphases and having violated the customary deployment of forces, the hierarchical "harmony" of bourgeois class society.

One could even say that this unusually purposefully chosen term--"mass society"--assumes an almost mystical independent value in the eyes of the bourgeois ideologs who put it into circulation. It only offers the possibility to reject the burdensome requirement of providing the existing society or system with any kind of social substantiation, based on the study of definitions of various aspects of life with unusual ease, but to allow the researcher to follow false traces, eliminating any possibility find the forces responsible for one or another trend of social development, for the crying social injustice ruling this society, or for economic and political excesses. The very concept of the "mass" has been deliberately deprived by the bourgeois theoreticians of its specific class content. It is amorphous and vague. The propaganda "merits" of this approach are obvious and, not astoundingly, the doctrine of the "mass society" has been applauded by those who are trying to maintain the current state of things.

The bourgeois ideologs consider that the most valuable feature of this concept is applied social omnivorousness, if one may say so. In the early stages of the application of the "mass society" doctrine, for example, it was frequently used, frightening the bourgeois, to describe some kind of frightening "socialist paradise" in which all individuality has been abolished by a gray mediocrity, and an uncivilized dictatorship supporting the violent crowd. This has been the latest contribution of bourgeois political science to the permanent campaign of anti-Soviet and anticommunist lies and slanders through which imperialist reaction, for many decades, has been waging a psychological warfare against the Soviet Union and real socialism, "bashfully" labeling it ideological warfare.

We must point out that this application of the "mass society" has frequently failed. It was dealt a memorable crushing blow with the launching of the first spaceship in the world--the famous Soviet *sputnik*--making it clear that the society of "gray mediocrities" had outstripped the most "progressive" and developed capitalist countries in most complex technological areas and in the intellectual level of the cadres.

History is not short of ironical situations. The fact that the Western sociologists quite rapidly discovered some features of their theoretically computed "mass society" not somewhere far away, but in their own home, in the United States above all, consistent with certain trends of social reality, could be considered the mockery of fate. It is precisely here that they were forced to realize the depersonalization of the individual in the sinister melting pot of the capitalist society, individuality converted into an amorphous mass, a crowd, a mathematical total of standardized "human radars" which receive signals from the outside and, with the efficiency of automatons, carry out preprogrammed rational actions--rational from the viewpoint of specific big-business interests. It was precisely in the United States that they realized how the ordinary American citizens, after undergoing all the stages of indoctrination, suppressed and humiliated, as Lenin said, by "urban capitalist civilization" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol. 12, p 57) become a certain "community of alienated" and into a potential reserve for the reaction--the

notorious "silent majority"--to which the double-dyed American politicians so greatly like to appeal.

We must point out that unlike the paid capitalist propagandist, the most serious Western sociologists are truly concerned with the crisis of bourgeois civilization and, particularly, with the moral groundlessness of the bourgeois way of life, the lack of spirituality and even inhumanity of the "Western way of life," and the decay of culture in the capitalist society. They bitterly point out the dramatic and rapidly intensifying gap between the value system which developed at the "better times" of the bourgeois society and the factual way of life which discredited, swept off and trampled on these values. Many such scientists (including G. Marcel, the Catholic philosopher and author of the book "The Degradation of Man") have questioned the moral justification of today's society, which was unable to preserve man as an internally free being, having changed his personality and imposing upon it stereotypes and the programmed "choice" which is both necessary and advantageous to the powers that be.

While accurately describing the symptoms of the disease and horrified by the purulent ulcers of the contemporary capitalist world, and even predicting its catastrophe, these Western scientists, nevertheless, do everything possible to avoid the formulation of a necessary scientifically substantiated diagnosis. Starting with O. Spengler, a bourgeois capitalist raised "crisis theoretician" and author of "The Decline of the West," bourgeois philosophers and sociologists have been demonstrating their absolute inability to achieve total awareness of the social foundations of a variety of crisis phenomena. They prefer to look for the reasons for the decline of Western civilization, loss of objectives, acute cultural crisis and extreme decadence in art only in the spiritual area, isolated from other realms of life and specific historical reality and, as pointed out by a student of the problem, they would like to "find the fate of culture within culture itself."

This trap is both old as the world and new. It has always been characteristic of bourgeois awareness "not to note" the true meaning of capitalist exploitation and the real source of income and profits of "free enterprise." In the 1960's, however, some particularly zealous defenders of capitalism were inspired by "technotronic" illusions, "daringly" proclaiming that Marxism had "exhausted itself," that the technological achievements of the contemporary production process reduced to naught the class struggle, and that, finally, that which has been described as the "American dream" for the past 200 years would come about.

Today the West would rather not mention such optimistic prophecies, for over the past decade the social ulcers and contradictions of contemporary capitalism have become ever clearer. Therefore, the ostrich sticks his head in the sand. Even a noted U.S. contemporary bourgeois sociologist like Daniel Bell, who "acknowledges" that class contradictions play a certain role in the conflicts occurring in the political and spiritual life of

the developed capitalist countries, nevertheless tends to draw the main attention of the students not to the area of class-economic interests, but of the "symbolic-expressive realm of cultural problems," considering such conflicts as nothing more than a clash between "traditions" and "contemporaneity."

Thus, it is the bourgeois "crisis theoreticians" themselves who create the magic closed circle which their restlessly seeking mind and sharpened intellect cannot break. It is within this magic circle that they face a flood of contradictory and mostly negative facts of bourgeois reality whose interpretation, within the type of frame of mind they have, would be impossible, a situation which frequently leads to profound pessimism.

Unquestionably, this pessimism became considerably intensified soon after the end of World War II. This was due to a number of reasons, not the least among which was the failure of the concept of "Pax Americana," proudly proclaimed by the bards-political experts of American imperialism, confident of their power and infallibility, comprehensively supported by the ruling circles. The idea of "running the world," so dear of the hearts of American moneybags, i.e., of world domination by the United States, which appeared to them at the beginning of the cold war and the U.S. monopoly of the atom bomb, to be not only attainable but even inevitable, proved to be groundless as a result of a headlong historical development. The awareness of this groundlessness did not come immediately and far from everyone accepted it: the imperialist mind simply refused to accept facts conflicting with the idea of the global domination of the dollar and the total superiority of Americanism over anything else in the world. Today we are witnessing the attempts of the Carter Administration to restore the "leading role" of the United States on the basis of a most unceremonious dictate, blackmail and unequivocal threats.

The hopelessness of the foreign political strategy pursued by the United States, based on the notorious principle of operating "from a position of strength," was, nevertheless, one of the most impressive manifestations of the intensification of the general crisis of capitalism, directly related to the processes which led the United States into political, economic and moral decline.

This particular topic is discussed by Sidney Lens, an American research historian, in his book "The Forging of the American Empire, 1971," published on the eve of the U.S. Bicentennial.

Lens discusses in detail the way leading to the creation of a global empire by the United States, the imperialist expansionism of American monopolies, and the development by the United States of a variety of political, economic, military and diplomatic forms of oppression of other countries and peoples. Between the end of the 1950's and the beginning of the 1960's, when it seemed that the United States had become the sole leader of the West for ever and ever, and its main police force, the first symptoms of discontent displayed by the allies and the initial consequences

of the intensified militarization of the American economy began to show up. The gigantic production machinery of the American economy, which controlled a considerable share of the world markets, began to wear down under the burden of tremendous military outlays covering an entire quarter of a century, steady balance of payments deficits, astronomical national debt, and lessening of gold reserves. According to the author, the decline of U.S. global domination began with the defeat of American imperialism in the "dirty war" it launched in Vietnam. According to [Lens] the process will continue to intensify and, paralleling the historical destinies of powerful empires of the past, will result in the total failure of "Pax Americana" and the decline of the United States itself.

An equally pessimistic conclusion is drawn by Cornell University Professor A. Hacker, author of the book "The End of the American Era." The United States no longer has the strength to manage society, he writes. The old institutions have become obsolete, while no new institutions are appearing. This may have irreversible consequences: "In a state of desperation" American imperialism may resort to the ultimate means--"the use of the absolute weapon."

Unable to grasp the broad social picture of events or see the historical prospects, and at the same time becoming ever more strongly convinced of the catastrophic development of the existing society, a number of bourgeois philosophers have reached a state of conceptual nihilism, rejection of civilization in general, and refusal to acknowledge the positive role of culture.

Yet, we must point out that life offers a number of quite convincing, eloquent and irrefutable facts confirming the hostility of contemporary capitalist society to the aspirations of the individual trying to realize his historical possibilities, as well as the sum total of the class interests of the broad popular masses. Their volume is snowballing with the further aggravation of crisis phenomena in the economic and spiritual life of the capitalist countries. The ever rising unemployment, uninterrupted inflation, intensification of processes of alienation and the paralleling growth of crime and drug addiction, the undermining of the foundations of the family, and the decline of mores are no longer single isolated phenomena, but permanent upheavals which have become part and parcel of the so-called "free world." In addition to other political tasks, the purpose of the variety of intricate mystifying theories and bourgeois propaganda fabrications concerning socialism, is to distract the working people in the Western countries from their acute and chronically insoluble problems.

Let us emphasize that it is precisely the pressure of such facts and the irrefutable proofs offered by daily reality that force the bourgeois propagandists to look for a variety of means to "explain" them, for such problems cannot be resolved merely by distracting the attention and laying the blame on someone else. That is why, as early as the 1960's, a number of theoreticians resumed their attempts to provide a certain global

"summation" of the nonclass interpretation of "modern society" contaminated by a variety of social diseases which it is unable to cure. The very formulation of the matter, which ignores the obvious differences in the social system and the consequent differences in the trends of sociopolitical and economic development of current societies, indicated that the objectives of such an "integral" approach were quite distant from a search for the truth.

What are these objectives and how are they interpreted by the supporters of this "doctrine"? Before answering the question, let us draw attention to the unexpected conclusion reached by some supporters of the "mass society" idea. As a result of clever manipulations of statistical data on the growth of wages, savings, stock ownership, and so on, they proclaim that in the contemporary capitalist society, in the United States for example, today it is not the moneybags, the financial oligarchy or the military-industrial complex who are the true ruling power--but the masses. It is they, the farmers in Oklahoma, oil workers in Texas, construction workers in the remote far west, petty store owners in Minnesota, clerks in Washington, Chicago, Cleveland and Cincinnati, sales people, school teachers, janitors and bus drivers, all of them not only voting, "freely electing" congressmen and presidents, but are also consumers and some of them, in addition, have bank accounts. Therefore, the majority of them are no longer exploited and oppressed, but are the rulers of America and it is precisely to them, the "silent majority" that both big business and the White House listen.

This being the case, the "19th century" idea of the class struggle should be rejected and the problem of the confrontation between the two worlds, the two social systems, and the two civilizations--bourgeois and socialist--should be reconsidered. The most "initiative-minded" bourgeois liberal theoreticians ask whether such a "primitive" confrontation has not become obsolete, as though inviting us to participate in the refutation of "dogmas," and asking whether the time has not come, in general, to proclaim that capitalism and socialism are merely two historical varieties of a single contemporary "mass society"?

This conclusion could be described as paradoxical only if taken seriously. In turn, this would be possible only by adopting an extremely naive approach. It would be easy to notice in this "paradox" one of the reincarnations of the old concept, long cherished by bourgeois ideologists, of the so-called "convergence" which stipulates a "rapprochement" between the opposite socioeconomic systems as they develop. In the final account, according to this logic, the opposite systems would "lose" their differences and, under the influence of a number of factors, mainly of a technical-economic nature, would "merge" at a given point, thus originating a hypothetically new system. Allegedly, in this case capitalism would be able to restrain somehow its already common greed, become far more sensible and cope with some other of its typical unpleasantnesses, while socialism would smoothly "evolve" in the direction of this respectable and pacified annointed "new" capitalism. . . .

This idyllic picture is backed by the authority of sociologists and political experts who are developing in the contemporary West a great variety of aspects of magical transformations of this type, long and aptly described by the people as turning a sow's ear into a silk purse. Some try to prove that capitalism has become considerably "softer," as is the case with West German social democrat J. Steffen in his book "The Structural Revolution." "The antagonistic contradictions of the old capitalism . . . have become structural contradictions thanks to the activities of the state and its apparatus," he asserts. Also resurrected are the previously notorious (and violently mocked even then) "theories" of so-called "people's capitalism."

Others go even farther, "predicting" a miraculous metamorphosis of private ownership without any revolutionary interference whatever. Harvard Professor John Galbraith, the famous American economist and sociologist, proclaims the formation of a certain "technostructure," based on modern capitalism, uniting talented and active specialists in the technotronic century--scientists, managers, technicians--who, allegedly, would take over the management of monopolies, banks and concerns, providing modern production management. According to the same logic, the capitalists would voluntarily stand aside, yielding to technicians and scientists control over their property and, their power.

Others again, such as, for example, Daniel Bell, no less firmly approach the problem from the other end, and in general proclaim the future near disappearance of the working class from the social arena; allegedly its productive functions will go entirely to scientists and technicians, while all that would be left to the working class would be to be present at its own self-liquidation. Thus, in the eyes of the most respected public, a sociological miracle would take place: the advent of the long-awaited "postindustrial" paradise in which there would be neither monopolists nor a proletariat, and therefore no actions by the exploited masses or this horrible class struggle which are shaking up the West. . . .

The only thing requiring an explanation is a secondary trifle: Where will the "self-liquidated" workers--metal and construction workers, miners, petroleum workers, machine tool operators, and electricians--go? Will they be added to the already multimillion-strong army of unemployed in the capitalist world, or be deep-frozen, awaiting a better time in the future to be awakened. . . .

Actually, from the strictly factual viewpoint, such science fiction is quite similar to the notorious "Memoirs of the Future" by the fake scientist Eric von Deniken, who, quite profitably for himself, is exploiting the ambitious curiosity of the contemporary philistine thirsty for sensations and predisposed toward mysticism. In any case, these ideas are nothing but random assumptions and pseudoscientific hypotheses about the future. For the present, however, this perhaps curious yet always scared philistine is being told that he lives in the "mass society" and that this must be taken

into consideration. This phenomenon is substantiated by a variety of arguments of equally unscientific value.

The first argument is demographic. The population explosion throughout the world over the past decades is a universally known fact. This has not occurred in the underdeveloped countries alone, as was only recently believed to be the case. In itself, this population growth does not change the nature of the society, its social nature, as the bourgeois sociologists are claiming, even though it creates a number of new problems, including some quite urgent ones, in all realms of life.

The second argument is economic. The comprehensive industrialization which covers no longer merely industrial and agricultural production, but spiritual life as well, is pointed out. Capitalist urbanization is growing at a headlong pace with all accompanying deformities. The achievements of the scientific and technical revolution have brought about an unparalleled scale of automation and conveyor-belt output; today the electronic computer and the sensor are more widespread than the wheelbarrow and the hammer, and never before has mass, assembly-line production been so representative of society as today.

The third argument is social-personal. In their view, man is fully integrated in contemporary society (conscientiousness should have made the bourgeois sociologists to specify: Western society). He exists in society not as a sovereign individual, and even less so as a unique personality, but as a statistical unit. The standardization of life standardizes, depersonalizes millions of people. The scientific and technical revolution with its latest technologies completes this depersonalization, converting man into a simple appendix to the machine, the conveyor belt, or the push-button panel, depriving him of everything human. Mass production is consistent with the phenomenon of mass, i.e., assembly line, standardized consumption, including the consumption of spiritual goods.

These fears, by themselves, are largely justified. They reflect certain characteristics of specific reality, even though such reality comes close to stupid science fiction, daily noted by the authors of the "mass society" concept. Additional observations and conclusion could be added. Above all, however, some seemingly far-from-accidental errors should be deleted.

One such symptomatic "error" is the assertion made by bourgeois sociology of a weakening and even elimination of capitalist exploitation which, allegedly, may have taken place in recent years in the most developed capitalist countries. This "miracle" was achieved by some mythical averaging of the way of life in which the broad masses, allegedly, have access to what previously, before the age of the scientific and technical revolution and the postindustrial society, was the exclusive privilege of the establishment, of the capitalist elite. This conclusion is based on an obvious misrepresentation of fact. The "concessions" extracted from the capitalist predator in the course of a fierce class struggle, and changes in labor

conditions triggered by the development of production forces and the scientific and technical revolution, are presented by these scientists as features of a miraculous transformation of capitalism into a liberal-technocratic-democratic system, and capitalist relations into a kind of "social partnership."

This is an old tune! Let us recall that Eduard Bernstein, the originator of revisionism himself, was blabbering in his time about the "equalization" of the living standard of workers and capitalists. He even won the approval of Zubatov, the head of the czar's Okhranka, for his "flexible" thoughts. Zubatov's instinct as a provocateur suggested to him that this was a very promising idea for encouraging and disseminating Bernsteinianism with a view to fighting Bolshevism--a true enemy of autocracy and capitalism. Today's Bernsteins and Zubatovs also identify each other readily and the old opportunistic lie, dressed in modern clothing, is taken up by the right-wing social democratic politicians and reformist ideologists with the condescending-patronizing approval of the big business bosses.

Even more indicative is another equally deliberate "error" (whose deliberate nature is unquestionable): the striking universalization of this concept and the extension of observations and conclusions drawn within one society (capitalist) to another (socialist). This universalization is erected on a very weak foundation. Its supporters assume that the fast population growth and the development of the scientific and technical revolution, which became particularly strong in recent decades, are so self-evident and self-satisfying, that all other circumstances are simply unsubstantial. Yet, the later includes basic factors, such as the opposite nature of the two social systems and the main distinctions of essential spiritual values, moral priorities and purposes of the two societies.

The Western supporters of the "mass society" concept and the bombastic prophets of "class reconciliation" are doing everything possible to present matters as though in such a society the conflicts between labor and capital are "eliminated" by themselves. It is precisely this assumption that contains the classical error of bourgeois-liberal thinking, which is trying to reconcile the irreconcilable. Logic indicates that any agreement with such an approach is of great service to the exploiting class. This is not the first time that we come across such attempts. ". . . The most common error," Lenin wrote, "is the bourgeois-reformist claim that monopoly or state-monopoly capitalism is no longer capitalism and that it could be described as 'state socialism' or something similar" (Lenin, op cit, Vol 33, p 68). As we may see, the passion for theoretical-propaganda misrepresentations has not abated in the least in the intervening decades.

Describing its society as "mass," some of the most liberal bourgeois theoreticians justifiably regret its prevailing atmosphere of alienation, egotism, anti-social attitudes, lowered intellectual standard of social life, and impoverishment of the spiritual world of the members of society. What is characteristic here, however, is that the theoreticians pretend

that as a system, capitalism is not to be blamed for all these changes. The masses themselves are being blamed for this, allegedly rushing like "wild horses" into previously inaccessible temples--management, culture, and so on. Furthermore, according to Paul Tillich, "Man is divided within himself. Life acts against itself through aggression, hatred and despair. . . . The self-destruction instinct is imbedded in everyone of us. . . ."

In such views truth and error and truth, error, and lie present such a strange mixture that their regular "consumption" leads to a level of moral and intellectual disorientation on which such theories and concepts precisely rely.

No, the masses are not a herd of mustangs, while the capitalist order, if a comparison with any social system is necessary, is not in the least an even superficially pious temple. . . . Furthermore, the idea is entirely false that it is simply as a result of their "mass character" that the masses have become a dominating force in the capitalist countries. This is inspired nonsense. The noted American journalist Walter Lippman was indeed right in pointing out that a process of "intensification of feelings and degradation of sense" is taking place within bourgeois propaganda.

Actually, unquestionably, there is a sense, even though it is concealed and secret. Once again it is found in this persistent desire to distract, to give a wrong direction to the search, in order to keep the masses in a state of subservience and obedience. Naturally, capitalism would not be capitalism without consoling itself with the ephemeral hope of perpetuating its specific relations and customs and not trying, at all cost and by all possible means, to preserve its rule. To achieve this, however, it must subordinate man at all cost, capture his emotions, motivations and thoughts --and "establish a grip" on the human individual.

To a certain extent, this task is facilitated by the inclusion in ideological propaganda of the concept of the "mass society"--a society in which class conflicts have been "erased," drowned and covered, and in which, as Lenin pointed out, "The mass adapts subconsciously" (Lenin, op cit, Vol 1, p 136) to the existing social relations and the "way of life" offered by the bourgeoisie.

It would be no exaggeration to point out that "ideally" the rulers of the contemporary capitalist world dream, if not of developing a new human species, entirely in the spirit of the sinister horror thrillers, at least of developing a type of man-robot, an individual whose views, needs and aspirations have been preprogrammed in the interest of big business. If not through the mysteries of genetic engineering, this could be achieved thanks to the systematic, continuous ideological indoctrination. This would be a person tolerating the existing order of contemporary bourgeois society with its mores, believing that the meaning of his life lies in accessible enjoyments, and consumerism, frequently thoughtless yet raised to the maximum level of satisfaction, fearing "Red troublemakers" and doing

everything possible to avoid unpleasant situations and, particularly, involvements in social conflicts and in the political struggle. In other words, obedient, submissive, adapted, and easily managed person--in a word, the ideal slave of the capitalist system or, to use a "more flexible" Western term, a model, well-intended member of the "consumer society."

Nathan Glazer, professor of sociology and political science, calls for curbing the ordinary Americans: "The more they are given, the more they want." One must, the professor insists, be able to say "No!" Another scientist, the American neo-Freudian Norman Brown, is more lenient toward his compatriots. He calls for "freeing" (a truly fashionable expression!) the human mind from the burdens of historical awareness and historical creativity. In general, he teaches, man should stop being a historical being. History, whose lessons are not pleasing to the power of the rich, is, according to Brown, simply a gigantic accumulation of errors: Man must live thoughtlessly rather than make history. He must enjoy what he has, rather be paying the old debts. This system sentences culture itself, the treasury of historical experience. This is because culture concentrates within itself the "tyranny of historical consciousness," for which reason it is alleged, man must "begin everything from the beginning." However different all these lofty scientists may be from one another, their down-to-earth applied essence is clearly visible: the aspiration to provide the most suitable conditions for manipulating human awareness in the interest of capitalism.

For the same purpose sociologist Patrick Cadell suggests in a confidential report to the U.S. President the "making of a new ideology," consistent with the situation. Since no such new ideology has been created ("unfortunately, the precise formulation of such an ideology exceeds the boundaries of the intellectual capabilities of your obedient servant," Cadell honestly warns), let the President emphasize style, and gain popularity with minor, yet sufficiently dramatic gestures. . . . Shameless? Yes, but at least honest.

The only thing that capitalism would like to conceal from those who are still asking embarrassing questions and have not as yet unlearned how to think--whether scientists, clerks, farmers, engineers or workers--is the fact that with all its genetic and acquired prophetic characteristics, the society described as "mass" is not something universal, but conversely a purely specific creation of the capitalist system, the enfant terrible whose real parents would like to reject. Need we prove how ephemeral such hopes are? Need we mention that no incantations exist or have been invented able to eliminate classes within the capitalist world with the waving of a magic wand, surmount most profound contradictions in its development and ignore its fierce antagonisms?

Therefore, the crisis development of a class antagonistic society in the contemporary capitalist world has faced the masters of Western civilization and the bourgeois ideologs with a number of problems, one of the most vital

among which is to keep the masses, experiencing the pressure of cruel exploitation and ever-rising insecurity in the future, in a state of subordination and obedience, adapting them to the "consumerism" norms. The rulers of this society are hardly concerned with happens in this case with the human personality, and the moral degradation which results from its adaptation to such "norms."

This was confirmed yet once again when in the beginning of 1980 the Administration in Washington raised the country to a state of chauvinistic intoxication and hysteria, turning, in the interests of the most reactionary circles and above all the military-industrial complex, back to the cold war. Carter seems to have adopted Cadell's advice--"gaining popularity through dramatic gestures"--and, in the heat of the electoral campaign, has begun to wave "the big stick" around, threatening the world with a restoration of the policy "from the position of strength" and punishment for the disobedient. The foreign political aspects of this turn are a separate topic. Let us note here merely the openly antinational nature of this "outbreak of emotions," of this militaristic and dangerous course.

Contemporary capitalism, having acquired rich experience in manipulating the material and spiritual needs of the people, is relying on the political blindness and social indifference of the "two-legged human herd," thankful for basic nutrition and living in a state of musty conformist appeasement. Strictly speaking, this is entirely consistent with the ideal bourgeois concept of the practical functional purpose of the so-called "mass society," interpreted as a unification on a national and, even better, supra-national scale of a countless number of "mass people"--consumers who live, work and multiply with the only real objective of producing goods for the capitalist plutocracy and consuming them in ever-rising quantities, sacrificing all their essential forces at the altar of capitalist profits.

5003

CSO: 1802

OUTSTANDING PAGE IN THE HISTORY OF SOVIET ECONOMIC THOUGHT

MOSCOW KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, My 80 pp 121-125

[Review by Prof L. Abalkin, doctor of economic sciences, of the book "Izbrannyye Proizvedeniya. 1931-147" [Selected Works, 1931-1947] by N. A. Voznesenskiy, Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 606 pages]

[Text] The political economy of socialism is one of the youngest and rapidly progressing sciences. Its history begins with the fundamental theoretical summations brilliantly formulated by the founders of Marxism-Leninism.

On the basis of their theoretical legacy, creatively developing it, socialist political economy gathered strength and matured along with the development and strengthening of the new system, organically linked with the substantiation of the tasks of economic policy and methods for planned economic management. All its successes and accomplishments are the product of collective thinking. However, this circumstance should not lead us to ignore the contribution which individual Marxist scientists have made to the process of collective creativity. Among them Academician Nikolay Alekseyevich Voznesenskiy, the noted party and state figure and major scientist, occupies a proper place.

The separate publication his selected works is a noteworthy phenomenon in the country's scientific life. The work includes major theoretical articles published in the journal BOL'SHEVIK and the newspaper PRAVDA, speeches and reports, including the speech delivered at the 18th party congress and the report at the 18th All-Union Party Conference, and a report on the postwar five-year plan for the restoration and development of the USSR national economy. The crowning feature of the book is the major work "The War Economy of the USSR During the Patriotic War."

The collected and chronologically presented materials vividly reveal the outstanding accomplishments of the Soviet people, proving the advantages of planned economic management. It is easy to see behind the figures characterizing the growth of the socialist economy and the specific computations used in analyzing the expanded reproduction process in the prewar

and first postwar five-year plans, the gigantic organizational activities of the party and the dedicated work of millions of workers, kolkhoz members and members of the Soviet intelligentsia.

At the same time, the author traces the process of development of socialist political economy and the molding of the theoretical views of the author himself. The main thing learned by attentively reading works written at different periods is the ever clearer interpretation of the objective nature of the laws operating under socialism and the systematic growth of realism in the understanding and assessment of economic phenomena.

The spirit of the times is shown in the articles, speeches and reports by N. A. Voznesenskiy: The sharpness of class battles, the contradictory nature of the international circumstances, and, naturally, the urgency of one or another task formulated by the very course of the country's economic development. This is both natural and legitimate. A true scientist can never be separated from the world by a soundproof wall or create in the notorious ivory tower. Therefore, assessing N. A. Voznesenskiy's various works, it is important to take into consideration the time of their writing and their relation to the implementation of the economic policy course formulated by the party at that stage.

Despite the entire wealth and variety of theoretical problems considered in the work--covering virtually all basic problems of the socialist political economy--the approach to their solution is invariably distinguished by some common features. This includes above all constant references to the theoretical legacy of the founders of scientific communism, which N. A. Voznesenskiy considered a live and inexhaustible source for creative inspiration, and a key to the solution of problems raised by life. It also includes the inseparable link between theoretical research and life and the practice of socialist economic management. Finally, it includes a clearly manifested and deliberately pursued class approach to the study and assessment of economic processes, Bolshevik zeal and intolerance of any violation of Marxist-Leninist theory.

The works collected in the book resurrect for the readers one of the most interesting pages in the living history of Soviet economic thinking. However, their significance is not reduced in the least to being monuments of the past. Many ideas developed in these works have firmly become part of the basic foundation of contemporary science. Some of them are still topics of discussions and arguments. The very fact that they have not become part of the past, but are our contemporaries, speaks a great deal of the nature of the development of this science and the need for the thorough study of the history of thinking in order to understand contemporary problems.

The first works included in the book were written in 1931. This was a heroic period of struggle for the ahead-of-schedule fulfillment of the First Five-Year Plan. The existing national economic ratios were being

eliminated and a number of industrial sectors were being recreated. An offensive had been mounted against the vestiges of exploiting classes in the countryside. It was precisely at that time that, in opposition to elemental forces and lack of organization, and as a link in the process of production socialization, there was a "factual" (V. I. Lenin) birth and assertion of the idea which runs through N. A. Voznesenskiy's entire work--the idea of the plan as a law governing the dynamics of the Soviet economy.

Also traced to the beginning of the 1930's is the important landmark in the formulation of the political economy of socialism, linked with the decisive elimination of the previously ruling concept that political economy was a science dealing exclusively with a market-capitalist economy. Lenin's remarks on N. I. Bukharin's work "Ekonomika Prekhodnogo Perioda" [The Economy of the Transitional Period], remarks published toward the end of the 1920's, had exposed the total groundlessness of such concepts. On the basis of these remarks the Soviet economists undertook the intensive development of problems of socialist political economy.

The major theoretical article "On the Problem of the Socialist Economy," published by N. A. Voznesenskiy in several issues of the journal BOD'SHEVIK, is of considerable and still topical interest. It contains a clear formulation of the subject and method of socialist political economy. The author submits his plan for the study of the basic problems of this science, representing one of the initial attempts to develop the inner logic of the political economy of the new social system.

N. A. Voznesenskiy considered socialist production relations in their appearance and development the topic of the political economy of socialism. Emphasizing its international nature, already then he pointed out that, starting with the experience of the building of socialism in the USSR, this science should and could indicate some basic features of the socialist economy which will be repeated in all countries. The approach to the study of production relations called for determining the basic stages of the transitional economy and the socialist economy.

The stages singled out by N. A. Voznesenskiy in the development of socialism as the first phase of the communist production method, represents one of the first and exceptionally fruitful attempts to determine the level of maturity of the socialist society. In this article he singles out three stages (the form and editing suggested by the author have been retained): The first is characterized by laying the foundations of the socialist economy and is, at the same time, the final, the concluding stage of the transitional period; the second is related to the completion of the socialist socialization of labor and of productive capital, the essential elimination of classes and contradictions in industry and agriculture; the third and final stage is the development of the socialist society in the course of which the material base for the higher phase of communism is created and the "birthmarks" of capitalism are eliminated (including the old class differences, and the division between mental and physical labor). Unfortunately, at that time these ideas were not developed further.

N. A. Voznesenskiy considers production relations in their entire wealth and variety. He writes of the need to distinguish within their structure "production relations expressing the process of socialization of labor and production relations characterizing relations of ownership of productive capital" (p 102). The task of the political economy of socialism is to study the sum total, or the system, of production relations. This is a necessary prerequisite for its connection with reality and with the solution of problems facing the science of practical socialist economic management.

The only method which we could use in the study of the socialist economy, the author states, is dialectical materialism. Here we must take into consideration the characteristics of the application of this method to the study of economic processes and phenomena. On the basis of this approach, the only true one from the standpoint of science and historical truth, N.A. Voznesenskiy raised the question of the study of the internal contradictions within the socialist economy, and of the unity between the logical and the historical methods used in the study of socialist production relations. The consistency or the inner logic of the problems "must reflect the development of reality itself, i.e., the systematic development of the socialist society" (p 65). This statement is topical to this day in connection with the frequent cases of a purely speculative approach to the study of the economic system of socialism, the attempts to introduce and structure a pertinent system of laws and categories through the logical development of a certain abstract idea, and the endless arguments on this general idea as an initial category without even making the slightest effort to move ahead.

N. A. Voznesenskiy considered the need to focus on the study of the economic policy of the victorious working class one of the most important characteristics in the application of the method of dialectical materialism in the study of the socialist economy. The theory of the socialist economy, he wrote, cannot be understood "without a study of the economic policy of the proletarian state" (p 83). N. A. Voznesenskiy tried to interpret the new role of the socialist state and draw, on this basis, corresponding conclusions in terms of the subject and method of the socialist political economy. He was far from proclaiming that the political superstructure was the subject of this science. He tried to prove in his works that "the proletarian state is the organized expression of the domination of socialist production relations" and that "this is the material base and objective significance of political economy" (ibid).

A sense of measure must be applied in the study of new processes and phenomena in social life. Otherwise there is always the danger of being carried away, of becoming one-sided. Unfortunately, no one is immune to this disease. Nor did N. A. Voznesenskiy escape it in the 1930's-1940's. One of the first to acknowledge the effect of economic laws under socialism (one of his pithy statements made as early as 1931 is that "there are some sages who say that socialism does not recognize economic laws (p 76)), he

also stated that the state of proletarian dictatorship creates, defines and strengthens them.

The appearance of phenomena (how frequently in the history of science it has misled researchers!) and the insufficient development of the methodological arsenal of socialist political economy hindered the study of the objective nature of economic laws. The greatly enhanced role of the subjective factor under socialism was considered as its independence of economic laws and even as its ability to create its own separate "planned" economic laws. The inability to distinguish between the objective nature of economic laws, on the one hand, and the uncontrolled method of their application, on the other, was used as a "methodological" justification and substantiation of such views.

Today no researcher in socialist economics rejects the objective nature of its laws. However, the inability to distinguish between the nature of the laws and their means of action (uncontrolled or planned) creates, to this day, certain difficulties in the study of the mechanism of their action and utilization specific to socialism.

The study of N. A. Voznesenskiy's works, written in different periods, makes it possible to determine the development and gradual refinement of his views regarding the problem of economic laws. He always considered the plan (planning) a law governing the dynamics of the Soviet economy. In his latest and most mature work, however, "The War Economy of the USSR in the Period of the Patriotic War," Nikoly Alekseyevich considered planning essentially as a means or mechanism for the deliberate utilization of the objective laws governing production and distribution. ". . . Are there economic laws of production and distribution which must be considered in socialist planning, both in a peacetime and wartime economy?" he asks. He answers: "Unquestionably, such laws exist, they cannot be ignored. Only the knowledge of economic laws makes it possible to use them in the interest of socialism" (p 572).

Socialism is indivisible from planned economic management. This has been confirmed most convincingly by historical experience. Laying the foundation for a socialist economy, creating a powerful defense potential and mobilizing the country's resources in the period of the Patriotic War--the most severe trial facing the Soviet people--and the postwar restoration and development of the national economy would have been impossible without the organizing role of the plan.

However, things are not limited merely by the purely economic aspect of the matter. We must not forget even for a minute that in its time the struggle for the plan was one of the most important manifestations of the class struggle against the petty ownership and private capitalist elements. It was precisely all this that contributed to raising the socialist plan to the level of a "law governing the dynamics" of the Soviet economy.

In the course of the further development and maturing of the political economy of socialism the difference was proved between the objective law of planned and proportional development and the plan as a method for the utilization for the objective laws, as the most important link in the economic mechanism of the socialist society. However, the automatic application of a contemporary measure on the theoretical content of the preceding stage does not reveal the entire complexity and dialectics of development of scientific thinking.

In those years emphasizing the specific role of the plan and its consideration as an economic law was the type of step or stage which led to an awareness of a qualitatively new type of functioning of the socialist economy compared with the capitalist. It was not as yet the full truth, but a step leading to it.

We must also bear in mind the fact that at the initial stage in the development of the new science many categories had not as yet been separate from each other. For this reason the name "plan" was given both to the specific state plan for the development of the national economy, as well as planning as an objective production relation. It was only the increased maturity of the subject itself, the accumulation of historical experience, and the strengthening of the methodological foundation of this science that made the corresponding division of concepts and their streamlining possible.

Considering trade as a starting point, in this article N. A. Voznesenskiy convincingly proved that Soviet trade is radically different from the turnover of goods in the capitalist society. In the Soviet economy, he wrote, a commodity is not a universal form of wealth. State enterprises cannot be sold or purchased. Manpower is not a market commodity. For this reason, Soviet trade is not a form of turnover of capital and added value. "The turnover of Soviet commodities (and, respectively, money) expresses entirely different production relations" (p 283). This article represents one of the initial attempts to analyze the functions of money under socialism, singling out accounting and determining production costs and outlays, the purchase and sale of goods based on Soviet trade, the means of payment and savings and socialist accumulations (see pp 291-299).

The article "The War Economy of the USSR in the Period of the Patriotic War" provides a most complete analysis for that period of the law of value and of the problem of its utilization in the planned management of the national economy. The law of value in the socialist economy is, according to the author, reorganized and the most elementary laws governing the cost of production, distribution and exchange of goods are at the service of state planning (see pp 574-575). In the Soviet economy the state plan uses the law of value for the reaching of the necessary ratios in the production and distribution of social labor and product, both subordinated to the strengthening and development of the socialist system (see p 573).

The distinguishing characteristic of N. A. Voznesenskiy's theoretical views, as we pointed out, was the aspiration to convert the political economy of socialism into a scientific foundation for planned economic management. This was reflected in his understanding of its functions and tasks. He considered the political economy of socialism a theory on the expanded reproduction of socialist production relations (see p 114), and the development of theoretical problems of the new long-term plan (see p 60).

Even though, in my view, such approaches and assessments contain an unquestionable element of exaggeration, nevertheless, it is important to this day to remember (important, for this is occasionally forgotten) that political economy is not only a means for knowledge but a powerful weapon for the transformation of the world and for improving economic relations. It performs this task the better the more profoundly it penetrates into the essence of the laws of economics and the more completely its conclusions are reflected in planning decisions.

In the process of the advancement of the mechanism of planned management, political economy fulfills a specific conceptual and methodological role. Without predetermining answers to specific problems, it shapes an overall concept of the country's long-range socioeconomic development, based on the knowledge of objective laws and the forms of their manifestation at a specific historical stage. It operates as a methodological foundation for the entire system of economic sciences.

N. A. Voznesenskiy plays an important role in the history of Soviet economic science as a student of major problems of the theory of planned management of the national economy. Many concepts formulated and substantiated by him at different times are quite consistent with the problems considered today in planning theory and practice. They include problems of the long-term (general) plan for the development of the national economy, substantiation of the role of reserves as a necessary prerequisite for the proportionality of public production, manifestation of the unity and interconnection between the plan and cost accounting, role of distribution according to labor and personal material incentive, study of the advantages of the brigade organization of labor and cost accounting, and others.

Naturally, the contemporary reader would seek in vain in this work ready-made answers to how to resolve today one or another practical problem. Science had not proclaimed the role of a compilation of prescriptions covering all practical cases. As to the study of the history of science, its knowledge enriches the culture of their researcher, refines his analytic skill, and broadens his outlook. Furthermore, knowledge of the past enables us better to appraise our progress in the solution of one or another problem.

Assessing from the level of contemporary achievements the scientific contribution made by the author to the development of the political economy of

socialism, naturally, we could note that far from everything has been able to withstand the test of time. This too is natural. Therefore, it would hardly be necessary to defend or justify everything he has written. N. A. Voznesenskiy's theoretical legacy does not need this.

The publication of N. A. Voznesenskiy's selected works does great and unquestionable credit to the personnel of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CPSU Central Committee and Politizdat.

In the case of reprinted works it would be difficult to formulate any claims concerning content. In this case nothing could be added or deleted. We believe, however, that the publication would have benefited considerably through the addition of an itemized index to the articles, which would reveal more fully and extensively the place and role of the author in the development of the political economy of socialism.

Let us also hope that this book will not remain an individual, even though exceptionally important event, but will mark the beginning of extensive planned work on recreating the history of the establishment and development of the political economy of socialism.

5003

CSO: 1802

DEVASTATION OF THE SOUL

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 125-127

[Review by Al. Romanov of the book "Burzhuaznaya Massovaya Kul'tura. Teorii. Idei. Raznovidnosti. Obraztsy" [Bourgeois Mass Culture. Theories. Ideas. Varieties. Models] by A. V. Kukarkin, Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 350 pages]

[Text] Capitalism is most cruelly subjecting to cultural plunder not hundreds of thousands, but millions and millions of people. The state apparatus in countries still dominated by capitalism, the churches, traditions and the very way of life are protecting lack of education, ignorance, backward mores, and religious superstitions shared by the working people.

Therefore, what is this "mass culture" which is steadily and persistently asserted by the rulers of the Western countries and praised by their press, radio and television?

The book under review is an attempt to answer the question. It consists of six chapters, each of which begins with an analysis of various works by bourgeois specialists in "mass culture" problems, published in the West in recent years. The study helps to understand the nature, means, objectives, and consequences of the application of "mass culture" to the daily life of the working people in the West, and to strengthen in the readers the resolve and readiness to counter hostile ideological diversions under our circumstances.

The author analyzes the works of know Western philosophers, sociologists and art experts. They include University of California Professor Leo Lowenthal, who traces the origin of contemporary bourgeois "mass culture" to feudal times, but fails to mention the spiritual crisis of the capitalist society; Canadian Professor Marshall McLuhan, described in the West as the "oracle of the electronic age" (p 48), apparently on the basis of his extravagant desire to restrict the motive forces of bourgeois "mass culture" exclusively within the area of technical information media with the obvious purpose "de-ideologizing" it, and concealing its truly class

nature; University of Chicago sociological Professor Edward [Shells], who has replaced the concept of "capitalism in its imperialist stage of development" with the popular formula of the "mass society"; Nicola Chiaromonte, Italian philosopher, and literary and art expert; and Theodore Adorno, German art expert, philosopher and sociologist.

Unquestionably, the works of Walter Benjamin, the German sociologist, culture theoretician and active anti-fascist, and Sidney Finkelstein, the American Marxist philosopher and literary worker, on whom the author bases his work, unquestionably facilitate the exposure of the class nature of "mass" and elitist culture.

The author describes the most characteristic features of bourgeois "mass culture," including the purposeful utilization by the ruling circles in the capitalist countries of all forms of the motion picture, television, theater and stage arts with a view to the devastation of human souls and implanting in the masses a reactionary outlook imbued with anticommunism and anti-Sovietism. Violence is made aesthetic, banditry is idealized, expansion and aggression are romanticized, and the ideas of national intolerance, racial hatred, and colonialism are extensively disseminated under the cover of sentimentality, pseudonationality, and antihistoricism. Actually, this is the purpose of all varieties of mass culture, starting with the trite romantic novel, cheap melodrama, and motion picture dealing with a catastrophe, and ending with pornography on the screen, sex novels, naturalistic description of murders, strangulations, and police atrocities, and manifestations of the cult of naked force, cruelty and barbarism. As the author justifiably notes, even the supporters of those who identify culture with business do not conceal the fact that "some contemporary shows" in the West remain outside the mind, emotions, and in general art (see p 51).

Discussing in the chapter "Frameworks of Entertainment and Ideological 'Recruitment'" the situation in the "mass genres" of such "art"--literature, motion pictures, and television--the author particularly emphasizes the social, the political meaning of the total permissiveness they advertise which draws the attention of the population from acute social problems such as rightlessness, unemployment, hunger, and the threat of fascism. This is precisely the purpose not only of the distortion of historical truth in so-called "historical" films and novels--cheap mysteries--and not only the praise of policemen and private investigators in films and novels on modern topics (after Conan Doyle, the author informs us, in English, French and German alone about one million detective novels and stories have been written (p 273)), but the praise of the "strong personality," hired killers, well-paid throat cutters, and all kinds of supermen--"athletic giants with thick necks and firm jaws" (p 34). All they have are muscles and fists. These are "white-skinned animals" possessing inordinate strength, courage, dexterity, and luck. Anyone of them, the author writes, "could kill a leopard or rummage through the pockets of dead man to take his wallet and force a clever thief to return stolen money. Or else,

getting an inheritance from a sentimental diamond smuggler, he dreams of his own diamond mines" (p 301).

The making of films on mythological, biblical or religious topics has also been organized on an assembly line basis. We must agree with the author that "the liking of art which speculates on religious prejudices or on the 'dark' basis of the human psyche or on various forms of 'religious faith without religion,' or emotional-psychological belief in the supernatural is unquestionably a symptom of social spiritual depression with a rather broad decadent minor range from a feeling of insecurity and concern to awareness of total historical hopelessness" (p 323).

The social nature, reactionary ideological direction and political tendentiousness of bourgeois "mass culture" are irrefutable phenomena. However, we must bear in mind that it is steadily evolving toward ever more active servicing of the political, militaristic and expansionistic objectives of the ruling cliques. "Here," the author states in the final part of the book, "the latest maneuvers of bourgeois propaganda are coming ever closer to the unseemly methods of 'psychological warfare.' The myth of the 'Soviet menace' is being intensively disseminated, together with a demagogic stir about 'human rights,' and all possible anti-Marxist innovations, be it 'neo-liberalism' or 'neo-conservatism,' petit bourgeois 'new philosophy,' 'neo-technocratism' or the concept of opportunistic 'neo-Marxism,' are all used for intensifying the offensive against the theory and practice of scientific socialism and the ideas of peace, humanism and social progress' (p 335). This is the essence of bourgeois mass culture and the purpose assigned to it by imperialism in the contemporary ideological struggle in the world arena.

A. V. Kukarkin's book is not a first study of bourgeois "mass culture" in the area of Soviet art studies. However, the topical nature of the difficult task the author has set for himself makes it noteworthy.

One of the shortcomings of the book is the arbitrary titles of some of the chapters: "Sociology," "Philosophy," or "Aesthetics." Actually, each of these chapters contains social, philosophical and aesthetic problems. We believe that no other way would be possible, for these problems are indivisible whenever we deal with phenomena in the arts.

Let us also point out that the "brevity of definitions," mentioned by the author in one of the first footnotes to the introductory article, does not justify his use "in some cases" of a number of "semi-forgotten terms" or words borrowed from other European languages. Many foreign words could have been replaced without particular difficulty with modern Russian terms which would have made the reading substantially easier, the more so since many of them have long been used in our artistic vocabulary. The use without any particular necessity of words such as "apokatastasis," "artifacts," "hipsterism," "comic strip," "arty-ism," "suspense," "sponsor," "camp," "image," "synesthesia," and so on, reduces to a certain

extent the literary merits of this interesting work. Even the word "epitome," so frequently repeated in the chapter headings, even though rarely used in our country, could easily have been replaced with the word "presentation." This would have eliminated the need for a special "appendix" to the book consisting of a list of foreign terms, the use of which is extremely inconvenient while reading the book.

5003

CSO: 1802

BOOKSHELF

Moscow **KOMMUNIST** in Russian No 8, May 80 pp 127-128

[Text] Lenin, V. I. "Voprosy Stroitel'stva Sotsializma i Kommunizma"
[Problems of Building Socialism and Communism]. Second expanded edition.
Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 384 pages.

Lenin, V. "O Kul'ture" [On Culture]. Collection. Politizdat, Moscow,
1980, 336 pages.

Lenin, V. I. "O Literature i Iskusstve" [On Literature and Art]. Sixth
edition. Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, Moscow, 1979, 827 pages.

"V. I. Lenin, KPSS o Rabote Partiynogo i Gosudarstvennogo Apparata"
[V. I. Lenin and the CPSU on the Work of the Party and State Apparatus].
Second expanded edition. Prepared for printing by K. M. Bogolyubov, V. A.
Orlov and F. P. Petrov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 800 pages.

"V. I. Lenin, KPSS o Sotsialisticheskoy Sorevnovanii" [V. I. Lenin and the
CPSU on Socialist Competition]. Compiled by O. I. Ternovoy. Second
revised and expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 512 pages.

"Chetvert' Veka Sovmestnoy Bor'by za Delo Mira, Sotsializma i Kommunizma"
[One Quarter of a Century of Struggle for the Cause of Peace, Socialism and
Communism]. Conference of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw-
Pact Members in Warsaw on 14-15 May 1980. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 63 pp.

"Sovershenstvovaniye Khozyaystvennogo Mekhanizma" [Perfecting the Economic
Mechanism]. Collection of documents prepared by the editors of
EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA. Pravda, Moscow, 1980, 320 pages.

Arkhangel'skiy, V. A., Zubko, M. V., and Yakovlev, Ye. V. "V Te Burnnyye
Gody" [In Those Tempestuous Years]. Izvestiya, Moscow, 1980, 400 pages.

Burstin, E. "Chili Pri Al'yende: Vzgl'yad Ochevidttsa" [Chile Under Allende:
A Witness' View]. Translation general editor M. F. Kudachkin. Politizdat,
Moscow, 1979, 278 pages.

- Gatovskiy, L. M. "Voprosy Razvitiya Politicheskoy Ekonomii Sotsializma" [Problems of the Development of Socialist Political Economy]. Nauka, Moscow, 1979, 488 pages (Problems of the Soviet economy).
- Goncharov, V. M. "Kamarada Viktorio (O Viktorio Kodovil'ye)" [Comrade Victorio (On Victorio Codovilla)]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 303 pages.
- Gor'kiy, M. "V. I. Lenin." Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 95 pages.
- Gramsci, A. "Izbrannyye Proizvedeniya" [Selected Works]. Translated from the Italian. I. V. Grigor'yeva, K. F. Miziano, and G. P. Smirnov editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 422 pages.
- Delyusin, L. P. "Spor o Sotsializme" [Debate on Socialism]. From the history of China's sociopolitical thought at the turn of the 20th century. Second revised and expanded edition. Nauka, Moscow, 1980, 151 pages.
- Zabotin, P. S. "Preodoleniye Zabluzhdeniya v Nauchnom Poznani" [Surmounting Errors in Scientific Knowledge]. Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 191 pages.
- Zarodov, K. I. "Ekonomika i Politika v Revolyutsii" [Economics and Politics in the Revolution]. Some contemporary problems in the light of historical practice. Mysl', Moscow, 1980, 245 pages.
- Karapetyan, L. M. "Nauchnoye Upravleniye i Demokratiya" [Scientific Management and Democracy]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 152 pages.
- Kashlev, Yu. B. "Razryadka v Yevrope" [Detente in Europe]. From Helsinki to Madrid. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 142 pages.
- "Konstitutsionnyy Status Lichnosti v SSSR" [The Constitutional Status of the Individual in the USSR]. Edited by N. V. Vitruk, V. A. Maslennikov, and B. N. Topornin. Yuridicheskaya Literatura, Moscow, 1980, 256 pages.
- Kosolapov, V. V. "Nauchno-Tekhnicheskaya Politika Obshchestva Razvitogo Sotsializma" [The Scientific and Technical Policy of the Developed Socialist Society]. Politizdat Ukrainy, Kiev, 1979, 239 pages.
- Lifshits, M. "Karl Marx." Art and social ideal. Second edition. Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, Moscow, 1979, 471 pages.
- "Lichnost' v XX Stoletii" [The Individual in the 20th Century]. A study of bourgeois theories. Editor in chief M. B. Mitin. Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 260 pages. (Critique of bourgeois ideology and revisionism.)
- Longo, L. and Salinari, C. "V Trudryye Gody" [When Times Were Hard]. Recollections and thoughts of a communist fighter. Abridged translation from the Italian. A. A. Krylov general editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 304 pages.

"Massovaya Informatsiya v Sovetskom Promyshlennom Gorode" [Mass Information in a Soviet Industrial City]. Experience in conducting a comprehensive sociological survey. B. A. Grushin and L. A. Onikov general editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 446 pages.

"Metodologicheskiye Problemy Sovremennoy Nauki" [Methodological Problems of Modern Science]. Collection compiled by A. T. Moskalenko. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 295 pages.

Mitrofanov, A. S. "Kibernetika i Khudozhestvennoye Tvorchestvo. Filosofskiy Problemy Kiberneticheskogo Modelirovaniya" [Cybernetics and Artistic Creativity (Philosophical Problems of Cybernetic Modelling)]. Moscow University Press, Moscow, 1980, 216 pages.

Mchedlov, M. P. "Sotsializm--Stanovleniye Novogo Tipa Tsivilizatsii" [Socialism -- Establishment of a New Type of Civilization]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 263 pages.

"Ocherki Istorii Dnepropetrovskoy Oblastnoy Partiyonoy Organizatsii" [Historical Outline of the Dnepropetrovsk Oblast Party Organization]. Editorial collegium. I. V. Vasil'yev chairman. Promin', Dnepropetrovsk, 1979, 614 pages.

"Problemy Marksistkoy Dialektiki kak Teorii Poznaniya" [Problems of Marxist Dialectics as Theory of Knowledge]. Essays on theory and history. Editor in chief V. A. Lektorskiy. Nauka, Moscow, 1979, 357 pages.

"Sovershenstvovaniye Khozyaystvennogo Mekhanizma" [Perfecting the Economic Mechanism]. Second edition. Compiled by A. N. Kovalev and M. I. Panova. B. I. Gostev and A. F. Rumyantsev general editors. Pravda, Moscow, 1980, 272 pages.

"Soldaty Slova" [Soldiers With Words]. Stories by Veteran Soviet journalists. Volume two. Compiled by V. A. Myakushkov and N. P. Stor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 262 pages.

"Sotsialisticheskiy Obraz Zhizni" [The Socialist Way of Life]. No 2. Collection of articles by scientists from the socialist countries. A. P. Butenko general editor. Compiled by A. S. Tsipko. Progress, Moscow, 1979, 180 pages. (Socialism: Experience. Problems. Future.)

Tazhurizina, Z. A. "Aktual'nyye Voprosy Istorii Ateizma" [Topical Problems of the History of Atheism]. Moscow University Press, Moscow, 1979, 208 pp.

Ul'yanovskiy, R. A. "Politicheskiye Portrety Bortso' za National'nyuy Nezavisimost'" [Political Portraits of Fighters for National Independence]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 176 pages.

5003
CSO: 1802

OBITUARY OF OLEG DMITRIYEVICH SOKOLOV

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 80 p 128

[From the editors]

[Text] Professor Oleg Dmitriyevich Sokolov, doctor of historical sciences, member of the editorial collegium and editor of the history section of KOMMUNIST , 59, died suddenly on 15 May 1980.

We lost a staunch party member, impassioned propagandist, tireless research scientist, and conscientious worker.

In the Great Patriotic War Oleg Dmitriyevich served in the ranks of the Soviet Armed Forces. Subsequently, he held leading Komsomol and party positions. In 1952 O. D. Sokolov became editor in chief of the oblast Komsomol newspaper.

After graduation from the CC CPSU Academy of Social Sciences, for the next 20 years he worked as KOMMUNIST editor, rising from consultant to editor and to section editor.

O. D. Sokolov was the author of many editorials and editorial articles and other materials published in this periodical. He also wrote a number of monographs and articles on the history of the working class in our country, the creative legacy of the outstanding Marxist historian M. N. Pokrovskiy, and other historiographic topics. They represent a noticeable contribution to the development of Soviet historical science and have triggered broad readership response.

Oleg Dmitriyevich Sokolov was the bearer of the Badge of Honor Order and the recipient of medals for services to the homeland.

The editors of KOMMUNIST and anyone who had the opportunity to work with Oleg Dmitriyevich will always remember him as a loyal communist, reliable comrade, and knowledgeable and highly skilled journalist.

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

5003

CSO: 1802

END

165

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

9-4-80

GD