

JPRS 77341

6 February 1981

# USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 16, November 1980

**FBIS**

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

## NOTE

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

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

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

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

## PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

6 February 1981

**USSR REPORT**  
**TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMPUNIST**

**No. 16, November 1980**

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

**CONTENTS**

Information on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum.....	1
L. I. Brezhnev's Speech Delivered at the CC CPSU 21 October 1980 Plenum.....	2
Draft State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR and the USSR State Budget for 1981.....	11
Soviets and the Development of Socialist Statehood (V. Kuznetsov).....	12
Joint Struggle of the Workers and National-Liberation Movements Against Imperialism and for Social Progress (B. Ponomarev).....	31
Economic Mechanism and Economic Law (V. Laptev).....	48
Perfecting the Organization of Construction (G. Karavayev).....	59
Barricades of Elberfeld (V. Mikhaylov).....	74
One Genius Next to Another (G. Volkov).....	83
On the Anniversary of the Great October Revolution (Ho Chi Minh).....	101
No Utopia But Real Experience (Marietta Shaginyan).....	103

In November 1918	
(A. Bortunov).....	124
In the Name of the Cause of the Working Class	
(Jan Galandauer).....	133
To Work Like Lenin	
(Unattributed book review).....	139



**PUBLICATION DATA**

**English title** : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 16  
Nov 1980

**Russian title** : KOMMUNIST

**Author (s)** :

**Editor (s)** : R. I. Kosolapov

**Publishing House** : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

**Place of Publication** : Moscow

**Date of Publication** : Nov 1980

**Signed to press** : 3 November 1980

**Copies** : 890,000

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

**INFORMATION ON THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLENUM**

Moscow **KOMMUNIST** in Russian No 16, Nov 80 p 3

[Text] The regular CPSU Central Committee plenum was held on 21 October 1980.

The following reports were submitted to the plenum: "On the State Plan For the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981" by Comrade N. K. Baybakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosplan, and "On the 1981 USSR State Budget and the Execution of the 1979 USSR State Budget" by Comrade V. F. Garbuzov, USSR minister of finance.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, delivered a major speech at the plenum.

The following took part in the debates: Comrades Ashimov, B. A., chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers; Demirchyan, K. S., Communist Party of Armenia Central Committee first secretary; Savin, S. N., head of a fitters and electricians brigade at the Voronezh Radio Parts Plant; Medunov, S. F., first secretary of the Krasnodarskiy Kray CPSU Committee; Usubaliyev, T. U., Communist Party of Kirgiziya Central Committee first secretary; Filatov, A. P., first secretary of the Novosibirskiy Oblast CPSU Committee; Fedorov, V. S., USSR minister of petroleum refining and petrochemical industry; Grishin, V. V., first secretary of the Moscow City CPSU Committee; Romanov, G. V., first secretary of the Leningrad Oblast CPSU Committee; Rashidov, Sh. R., Communist Party of Uzbekistan Central Committee first secretary; and Shcherbitskiy, V. V., Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee first secretary.

The CC CPSU plenum passed a corresponding decree on the discussed items, carried by the press.

The Central Committee plenum promoted Comrade M. S. Gorbachev, CC CPSU secretary, from candidate member to member of the CC CPSU Politburo.

The Central Committee plenum elected Comrade T. Ya. Kiselev, Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee first secretary a CC CPSU Politburo candidate member.

This marked the conclusion of the work of the CC CPSU plenum.

5003

CSO: 1802

L. I. BREZHNEV'S SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE CC CPSU 21 OCTOBER 1980 PLENUM

Moscow KOMBUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 80 pp 4-11

[Text] Comrades! Today we must discuss the draft plan and budget for 1981, the year of the 26th party congress and the first year of the new 11th Five-Year Plan. This makes it incumbent upon us to approach the problems under discussion on the basis of broad party positions.

Naturally, the results of the 10th Five-Year Plan are the starting base of the draft plan. The previous years have confirmed the correctness of the economic strategy formulated by the 24th and 25th party congresses. The economic and defense potential of our country rose considerably. A big new step was taken in the development of the entire national economy and in the solution of major and important social problems. In a word, the current five-year plan will assume a worthy place in the history of the heroic actions of the Soviet people, who are confidently following the path to communism (lengthy applause).

As you know, the party has focused practical work in the economic area on raising the living standard of the people. In the five-year period 329 billion rubles more than in the Ninth Five-Year Plan were allocated from the national income for purposes related to prosperity. The real incomes of workers, employees and kolkhoz members rose.

Payments and benefits from social consumption funds rose by 134 billion rubles. This broadened the economic base for exercising the constitutional rights of the Soviet people to free education, medical aid, rest, and old age security.

Prime attention was paid to housing construction. In this area capital investments were made exceeding the planned figure by 1.5 billion rubles. In the course of the five-year plan the population will receive approximately one-half billion square meters of housing area. About 80 percent of the urban population already enjoy individual housing.

These achievements are based on the general economic growth and the steady increase of the country's production power in all directions. Compared with the previous five-year plan industrial output will be higher by 717 billion rubles; agricultural output will be higher by 50 billion rubles. Within that period the national income will have increased by 397 billion rubles.

A total of 635 billion rubles was invested in the national economy. Over 1,200 big industrial enterprises were commissioned. Many of these projects are of

great importance to the national economy and meet the highest requirements. The working people of Western Siberia scored noteworthy achievements: in the course of the five-year plan they more than doubled petroleum extraction and increased natural gas output by a factor of almost 4.5.

A major step forward was taken in the development of agricultural production. For the first time, in this five-year plan, the average annual grain harvest exceeded 200 million tons. Let us particularly note the contribution of Kazakhstan which, for the fourth time in the five-year plan, sold the state over one billion poods of grain and overfulfilled its five-year plan (applause). Major successes were achieved by the working people of Krasnodarskiy Krai and Orenburgskaya and Kustanayskaya oblasts who delivered over one billion poods of grain each over the five-year plan. The cotton-growing republics fulfilled their five-year cotton harvesting plan.

Each five-year plan creates new heroes. This one is no exception. We shall soon be summing up its final results. The best among the best will be unquestionably rewarded with the high awards of the homeland. As of now, however, the CC CPSU plenum can quite legitimately address words of gratitude and warm thanks to all leading collectives and all town and country working people who have done so much for the blossoming of our country (lengthy applause).

Naturally, not everything went smoothly in the development of the national economy. We have had and will have to surmount many difficulties. Many of them were the result of the fact that out of the past 5 years only 1976 and 1978 could be considered relatively good for agriculture. The other three could not be considered among the better ones. Some complications were created by the exhaustion of many of the old mineral deposits, some of them substantial, and the shifting of the main extracting industry centers to the east and the north.

Work shortcomings were also among the objective reasons which slowed down the pace of growth. Let us frankly admit that the management and planning mechanisms and the economic management and performing discipline methods have not as yet reached contemporary standards. This hindered a turn toward effectiveness and the conversion of the national economy to intensive development. This is one of the important reasons for the underfulfillment of the plans for a number of items and for shortcomings and tight spots in the national economy.

I would also like to emphasize that our country is entering the 1980s with a powerful economic and scientific and technical potential and highly skilled cadres at its disposal. We are confidently facing the future (lengthy applause).

As the reports by Comrades N. K. Baybakov and V. F. Garbuzov indicate, the 1981 plan and budget insure the further growth of the economy of the entire country and of each union republic. Large funds will be allocated for the development of the fuel-energy complex, agriculture, machine building and transportation. Measures have been earmarked for the concentration of resources in capital construction. The consumer goods industrial sectors will increase their growth rates. New social measures are planned as well.

Naturally, these documents reflect the problems and tight spots existing in the national economy. The CC CPSU Politburo pointed out, in particular, the great stress in the implementation of a number of assignments and the unbalanced nature of the plan for some types of material and technical resources and freight haulage. For this reason the planned assignments must be backed by effective organizational work, high discipline and firm control.

The overall assessment of the plan and the budget indicates that they are consistent with our overall economic policy. They are extending the party's course of insuring the further upsurge in the living standard of the people, the development of the material production and upgrading its effectiveness, insuring the defense capability of our state and strengthening cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries. In a word, the development of the national economy will rest on good foundations (applause).

For all these reasons the Politburo approved in principle the 1981 draft plan and budget, which were submitted to the CC CPSU plenum for consideration.

Allow me now to discuss some more general problems directly related to next year's economic activities and the development of the economy in the 11th Five-Year Plan. Their consideration is made even more timely by the fact that the drafting of the Basic Directions of the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and Through 1990 has entered its most important stage.

I would like to initiate the discussion on such matters not with the problems of metal, transportation or even fuel and energy, despite their tremendous significance, but with problems whose resolution most directly affects the living conditions of the Soviet people. This, precisely, constitutes the party approach, based on concern for the good of the people. From the strictly economic viewpoint as well it is better to proceed from the end objective to what determines its implementation.

The improvement of food supplies is first among the problems which determine the living standard of the Soviet people.

In implementing the line of the March 1965 CC CPSU Plenum we laid the foundations of the type of modern agriculture which we want to, can and must have in order fully to satisfy the needs of the people. A tremendous amount of work has been accomplished. The country is producing considerably larger amounts of crop and animal husbandry products. The level of per capita consumption is rising. However, we are still encountering difficulties in supplying cities and industrial centers with foodstuffs such as meat and milk.

It is important, therefore, to continue to appropriate for agriculture substantial capital investments and material resources. At the same time, however, we must demand far more strictly that the appropriated funds, chemical fertilizers and equipment be used by the kolkhozes and sovkhoses sensibly and economically, and with maximum returns.

Year after year thousands of kolkhozes and sovkhoses in the country are raising good crops and achieving high livestock productivity. However, there also exist



many farms and even entire oblasts in which capital investments are increasing while for a number of years the volume of output has remained unchanged. The central committees of communist parties, councils of ministers of union republics, and CC CPSU departments must make a profound study of the reasons for this situation and take measures to eliminate stragglings.

We must adamantly apply progressive experience and improve the organization of labor and output in kolkhozes and sovkhozes. It is particularly important to raise cadre responsibility and to develop initiative in the work. We must forbid the petty supervision over and bureaucratic control of sovkhoz and kolkhoz managers and specialists.

The effective utilization of the possibilities of agriculture is most directly related to the solution of the social problems of the countryside. A great deal has been accomplished in this area but far more remains to be done. Many rayons are short of comfortable housing, consumer and cultural institutions and good roads. This creates difficulties in the organization of stable labor collectives which, in turn, leads to substantial losses. The problems of rural reorganization must be resolved energetically and fundamentally and the necessary resources for this purpose must be found on a nationwide scale and in the individual republics, krays and oblasts, and in each kolkhoz and sovkhoz.

Comrades! The CC CPSU Politburo recently passed a decision on the drafting of a food supply program. The purpose of such a program would be to integrate problems of the development of agriculture with the industrial sectors servicing it, the procurement, storage, transportation and processing of agricultural commodities, and the development of the food industry and trade in foodstuffs. As was pointed out, such an agroindustrial food complex should be planned, financed and managed as a single entity which would insure high end results. The food program should be drafted in such a way as to become an organic component of the 11th Five Year Plan.

Major changes are also required in the production of consumer goods in order to enhance the prosperity of the people. Such changes would affect the quantity, quality and variety of such goods. This is also important for the development of the economy, increasing labor incentives and strengthening the monetary circulation. In a word, it would be no exaggeration to say that the fast upsurge of group B sectors is a task of primary economic and political significance.

A great deal has already been achieved in this area. This five-year plan alone the output of group B sectors will be higher by 40 billion rubles. However, the quality of many goods remains substandard. There are frequent hold-ups involving one or another commodity in mass demand. This is due, above all, to shortcomings in the work of light industry.

Everything seems to indicate that the situation prevailing in group "B" cannot be corrected with piecemeal solutions. The production of consumer goods must be developed on the basis of a well-planned long-range program such as to rally the efforts of all sectors on which it depends. The local party, soviets and economic organs must show greater concern for increasing the production of goods and services for the population. The system of planning and financing these sectors must be improved and made strictly dependent on trade and the consumers.

I would also like to address myself to the managers of many heavy and defense industry sectors. Thanks to their efforts the production of many consumer goods, including televisions, refrigerators and washing machines, has increased substantially. However, we must not allow any reduction in the pace of this growth in the next five-year plan. We are confident that the heads of these sectors will continue to consider the production of consumer goods an important governmental and party matter (applause).

Housing construction, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev went on to say, is a major socio-economic problem. We deem it necessary to maintain its current scale throughout the 11th Five-Year Plan and, simultaneously, to improve the quality of housing construction.

Housing construction must be related more closely to the solution of production problems. The pace of development of the new areas in Siberia and the Far East, the development of the Nonchernozem, and the improvement of the shift work coefficient of existing enterprises are largely determined by the availability of comfortable housing. A short while ago the CC CPSU Politburo issued a strict warning to ministers who had allowed housing construction to fall substantially behind the building of industrial projects.

Housing construction must be the focal point of attention for the soviets of people's deputies. It must be strictly controlled by oblast and city party committees. I believe that the plenum will agree that this work must be considered a direct instruction given by the party's Central Committee (lengthy applause).

Social problems such as improving labor conditions, health care, education and culture also demand unabated attention.

Specific measures in all these areas must be contemplated in the new five-year plan. This, comrades, is the direct result of the economic strategy we formulated in the last party congresses. It is a strategy which calls for a steeper turn of the economy toward the solution of the variety of problems related to upgrading the people's prosperity.

The entire work style of party, soviet, and economic organs and, naturally, the trade unions, must be imbued with an attentive and concerned attitude toward the people. Such an attitude must become an inseparable feature of the work of any manager, big or small. There must be no place for bureaucracy, callousness or conceit in our Soviet way of life. In my view, particular attention should be paid to all these problems in the course of the accountability and election party meetings and conferences (applause).

Comrades! Naturally, it is clear to all of us that the prosperity of the people cannot be upgraded without upgrading the effectiveness of the economy and the intensification of all public production. The Basic Directions must insure substantial progress along this path in the next five-year plan.

Economic effectiveness is inseparably linked with the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. I shall mention here one problem only. The combination

of science with production and the influence of progressive ideas on the production process are achieved through machines and technology. This assigns an incomparable role to machine building in the developing of the national economy and in the upsurge of labor productivity.

Our machine builders have reached a level consistent with the highest world standards in the production of a number of items. However, we cannot ignore the fact that in some machine-building sectors the situation remains far from satisfactory. Complaints of scarcity and low quality have been voiced regarding many items produced by the transport, road and construction machine building industries, and machines and equipment for the petroleum and gas and, particularly, the light and food industries.

Agricultural machine building, a sector which has now assumed particular importance, is continuing to straggle. The technical standards and quality of many of the machines it produces deserve a severe reprimand. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev went on to cite a number of examples and to criticize the work of the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that in the new five-year plan one must, it is simply necessary to, design and begin the manufacturing of the types of plowing tractor and grain combine whose characteristics would meet the highest contemporary standards. This would enable us to take a big step forward in upgrading agricultural effectiveness.

The CC CPSU Politburo, which ascribes tremendous importance to agricultural machine building, has taken measures to strengthen the management of the sector. The Central Committee set up a Department of Agricultural Machine Building.

Comrades, particular attention must be paid to insuring the upsurge of machine building in the new five-year plan. Essentially, you will be faced ever more urgently with the problem of renovating the productive capital and the technical retooling of the various economic areas.

Our strongest scientific collectives must be directed toward this target. By this I mean, along with the Academy of Sciences, the scientists and designers working in the defense sectors. I believe that their contribution to the development of the country's national economy could be more extensive and comprehensive. The Council of Ministers and the specialists should be instructed to define the specific scientific and design collectives in the defense industry which could help civilian machine building one way or another. They could help them to develop highly effective and high quality machine prototypes and to formulate specific programs and assignments.

Next, it is hardly necessary to mention the extent to which the effectiveness of the national economy depends on uninterrupted fuel and energy supplies.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev then discussed some current problems facing the fuel industry and transport sectors. As we resolve the problems related to the coming winter, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev went on to say, at the same time, precisely now, as we draft the five-year plan, we must seriously think of the future. We must



continue to develop the nuclear power industry. Unabated attention must be paid to promising types of energy such as thermonuclear power.

The fast increase in the extraction of natural gas is assuming a particularly important role. There are huge deposits of natural gas above all in Western Siberia. Such reserves facilitate the solution of the fuel and energy problem. They enable us to accelerate the development of the chemical and many other sectors. Increased gas deliveries could contribute to the better satisfaction of the needs of the members of the socialist comity.

On the basis of such considerations it has been suggested that a large-scale program be formulated for the accelerated development of the petroleum and gas industry in Western Siberia. The suggestion was supported by the Politburo. The task of the Gosplan is to make such a program the most important project of the 11th and even the 12th Five-Year Plan.

Our plans must also call for extensive fuel and energy conservation. By this I mean the type of conservation which will decisively oppose negligence and waste, as well as conservation related to a purposeful technical and capital investment policy.

Allow me to mention chemistry as one of the major national economic problems. Major changes have taken place in this area. Nevertheless, chemistry has fallen behind the needs of the economy. Its role must be intensified in the development of agriculture and in the group B sectors, the elimination of metal shortages and the acceleration of technical progress. The plans must stipulate significant increases in the production of plastics, synthetic fibers, dyes, and household chemical goods.

The surmounting of intrasectorial disproportions in the chemical industry, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said, demands particular attention. He pointed out the need to increase the production of raw materials with a view to insuring the fuller utilization of capacities for the production of fertilizers and for increasing their delivery to agriculture. The increased production of plant protection chemicals is of great importance as well.

The Basic Directions, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev went on to say, must include a set of measures which will enable us to surmount any lags in the chemical industry. He emphasized that it must be specifically a question of formulating a set of decisive measures. Today there can be no effective economy without a modern large-scale chemical industry.

Certain other directions of economic activities deserve most serious attention as well. They include, unquestionably, capital construction, metallurgy, transportation and foreign economic relations. I shall not discuss them today, for a number of such problems have already been frequently discussed at CC CPSU plenums. The point is to find reliable means for the solution of these problems through the new five-year plan, starting with the plan for 1981.

I shall discuss only two problems within the major and topical subject of management.

The first relates to planning. We must make extensive use of the target program method. Each such program must consist of a substantiated and accurately computed plan for measures aimed at achieving end results, at the full solution of one or another problem. The program must stipulate the stages and sequence of the problems to be resolved. Naturally, a program control system must be developed which will clearly define those personally responsible for each work sector and will give them the necessary rights. A program deprived of all this is not a program but a set of pious wishes.

The second problem is that of the proper correlation between centralism and the democratic principle. The USSR Constitution emphasizes with perfect justification that the country's economy is a single national economic complex. It operates on the basis of a complex system of intersectorial and territorial-production relations. Naturally, such a complex must be effectively managed as a single entity and departmental and parochial tendencies can be countered only from a single center. On the other hand, the normal functioning of the economy requires the all-round development of local initiative, of the initiative of labor collectives and economic managers. The bulk of operative problems must be resolved precisely where they can be resolved quickly, without unnecessary delays or coordination. The USSR Council of Ministers is drafting proposals for improving the organizational structure of management. This work must be completed before the congress in order to delete obsolete structures from the new five-year plan.

Corresponding decrees have already been passed on a number of other management problems. Important among them is the decree on perfecting the economic mechanism. Now the question is the implementation of such decrees consistently and decisively. Naturally, there are many problems which could and should be resolved without awaiting special decrees.

Comrades! Allow me to conclude by saying that a great deal of work remains to be done. The conversion of the economy to the pursuit of intensive development must be completed in the 1980s. Labor productivity and quality must be improved sharply. Upgrading the level of economic work and developing cadre efficiency, responsibility and initiative remain mandatory prerequisites for production successes.

The CC CPSU draft "Basic Directions for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and for the Period Through 1990" will be submitted for discussion by the whole people soon. This important party document will be actively discussed at oblast and kray conferences, congresses of communist parties of union republics, and all party organizations. Such discussions must be purposeful and must contribute to the enhancement of all economic activities.

Currently socialist competition for the successful completion of the 10th Five-Year Plan and worthily welcoming the 26th party congress is spreading throughout the entire country. Production collectives in industry, agriculture, construction and transportation are pledging to upgrade quality, increase conservation, strengthen labor discipline and properly start the 11th Five-Year Plan.

The accountability and election campaign in the party organizations is in full swing. This is always a responsible time in the party's life. However, it

becomes particularly important in the pre-congress period. All aspects of the activities of party organizations are discussed at meetings and conferences in a businesslike, sharp and self-critical manner. Omissions and shortcomings are exposed and everything positive is supported. The critical remarks and suggestions of the party members are of great value. The party committees which immediately take specific measures on their basis act quite correctly. This is good. It upgrades the effectiveness of the meetings and of the criticism.

The reports which the party committees submit to the party members are also, essentially, reports to the working people, to the entire nation. We consider that publicity and informing the masses on party activities is a mandatory law. Hence, the mass information media--the press, radio and television--must systematically cover the course of the accountability and election campaign and describe its content more profoundly. Let me point out, in this connection, that both mass information media and propaganda organs have improved their work. They have raised a number of grave problems on which serious party decisions are made. This can only be pleasing. However, we must also realize that a great deal more remains to be done to insure the full implementation of the CC CPSU decree on further improving ideological and political-educational work.

Comrades! The party is marching toward its congress closely united with the people and with a clear program for action in domestic and foreign policy. Allow me to express my confidence that the party members, the entire Soviet people will approve this program and will implement it adamantly and consistently (applause). This is a guarantee for the successful solution of the forthcoming problems and for new progress in the building of communism (lengthy applause).

5003  
CSO: 1802

**DRAFT STATE PLAN FOR THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE USSR AND  
THE USSR STATE BUDGET FOR 1981**

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 80 p 12

[21 October 1980 CPSU Central Committee Plenum Decree]

[Text] 1. Approve in principle the draft State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR and the USSR State Budget for 1981.

Recommend to the USSR Council of Ministers to submit said drafts for consideration by the regular session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

2. Approve in their entirety and totality the stipulations and conclusions formulated in the speech by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, at the present plenum, adopting them as the foundation of the activities of all party, soviet and economic organs and trade union and Komsomol organizations for the fulfillment and overfulfillment of the 1981 plan and the fuller utilization of intensive economic development factors in the interest of upgrading the prosperity of the Soviet people.

3. The CPSU Central Committee plenum expresses its firm belief that the workers, kolkhoz members, intelligentsia and all working people in the country will welcome the 26th Leninist party congress with new labor accomplishments and apply their effort, knowledge and experience to the successful implementation of the 1981 plan--the plan for the first year of the 11th Five-Year Plan.

5003  
CSO: 1802

## SOVIETS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALIST STATEHOOD

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 80 pp 13-29

[Article by V. Kuznetsov, CC CPSU Politburo candidate member and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium]

[Text] The decision of the June 1980 CC CPSU Plenum to convene the regular 26th party congress was a major incentive for the development of tremendous creative work in the country related to the profound and comprehensive study of the period which followed the 25th party congress and the summing up of the experience acquired in the building of communism. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, emphasized in his speech at the October 1980 CC CPSU Plenum, "The party is marching toward its congress closely united with the people and with a clear program for action in the field of domestic and foreign policy." This program is unanimously approved by the entire Soviet people and is being adamantly and systematically implemented.

The USSR's entry into the period of developed socialism required the enhancement of the constructive and organizing role of the Soviet state and the adaptation of all state machinery levels to the conditions of the new stage. This is a legitimate and a necessary process, for, as V. I. Lenin taught, "Each level we reach in the development of production forces and culture must be paralleled by the further finishing and refashioning of our Soviet system...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 44, p 774).

The 25th CPSU Congress defined the general direction of the further development of Soviet statehood. In the Central Committee accountability reports to the congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev drew our attention to the need constitutionally to codify the basic features of the developed socialist society, its political system and the principles of national economic management, and clearly to define the role of the state in the development of the economy, science and all realms of social life and the prospects for the advancement of Soviet socialist democracy. A specific program was formulated for increasing the activities of the representative power organs--the soviets--and for strengthening the legal foundations of governmental and social life.

Comprehensive and purposeful work was undertaken in the country, under the party's guidance, for the implementation of the decisions passed by the congress. It affected all aspects of activities and all levels of the Soviet state of the whole people. The almost 2.3-million-strong people's deputies, the more than 30-million-strong aktiv of the soviets and the mass public organizations--the trade



unions, the Komsomol, the cooperatives, the labor collectives, and the numerous voluntary organizations of the working people—are involved most directly in this work. It would be no exaggeration to say that in the period between the 25th and the 26th congresses the building of the state became a matter for the entire people, a vivid manifestation of the inexhaustible vital strength of Soviet rule by the people, a triumph of socialist democracy.

The historical creativity of the masses and their determining role in resolving basic problems of state life were shown with particular clarity and fullness in the course of the nationwide discussion of the draft of the USSR Constitution in 1977. More than 140 million people—over four-fifths of the country's adult population—participated in this exceptionally big political campaign. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized at the Extraordinary Ninth Convocation of the Seventh USSR Supreme Soviet Session, "Never before had our country experienced such breadth of popular activity."

The adoption of the new USSR Constitution—an outstanding document of creative Marxism-Leninism—was a central event in the development of Soviet statehood between congresses. It legislatively codified the new historical level reached in our progress toward communism—the building of a developed socialist society.

The USSR Constitution gave a powerful impetus to the further intensification and advancement of socialist democracy. The communist party is the high embodiment and main guarantor of this process inherent in socialism. Armed with the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the CPSU formulates the future general development of society and the domestic and foreign political line of the USSR. It guides the great and constructive activities of the Soviet people and gives their struggle for communism a planned and a scientifically substantiated nature. The more the scope of revolutionary changes broadens and the more complex the problems resolved by the socialist society become, the stricter become the requirements faced on the level of management of the economy and of social processes, and the education of the new man. This determines the inevitably growing significance of the party as the political leader of the working class and of all working people.

2

The 26th CPSU Congress will sum up the results of the development of Soviet statehood since the 25th party congress and will define the path leading to the party's further advancement. However, we can confidently say as of now that a major step forward was taken in the development of the economy and culture and in strengthening our Soviet state of the whole people and its defense capability. The basic constructive functions of the state have become richer and more meaningful. It is a question, above all, of guiding economic and social development and upgrading the prosperity and standards of the people and the education of the new man.

For the first time in world practice our state has assumed full responsibility for the organization of the national economy. Mankind's ideas concerning the possibilities and role of the state have been truly changed. As early as the period of socialist reorganization, "The state authority," Lenin pointed out, "stops being a parasitical apparatus standing above the production process; it

begins to turn into an organization which directly fulfills the functions of managing the country's economy...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 442).

After initiating the organization of a qualitatively new and historically superior type of state management of the material life of society, the Soviet state covered a long and complex distance in that direction. Varied and truly priceless management experience was acquired. Specific socialist ways and means of participation by the working people in its implementation were developed. Dozens of countries have learned and are learning from us the art of state planned economic management.

The tremendous scale of the national economy, the appearance of new economic directions and the acceleration of scientific and technical progress raised the urgent task of upgrading the level of state management and making our entire economic mechanism consistent with the new requirements of the times. This is a complex and difficult problem whose solution is related to the reorganization of all areas of management, improvement in planning and the energizing of economic levers influencing the production process and the abandonment of a number of customary yet obsolete methods of economic management and of some prevailing views and concepts.

This comprehensive work became a project of the entire party and people. The soviets of people's deputies, which play a leading role in the state mechanism, are participating in it most directly and energetically. The comprehensive rights constitutionally granted the soviets for the purpose of managing state, economic and sociocultural construction were the political and legal base on whose foundations they are intensifying their beneficial influence on the economy, social development and culture.

The practical activities of the soviets over the past 3 years have convincingly shown that the party line of increasing the powers of our representative organs and of upgrading their role and responsibility is the only accurate line which is entirely consistent with the requirements of the stage reached in the building of communism. This represents the factual embodiment of the Leninist idea of the place and role of representative organs under developed socialist conditions.

The Soviet state has broadened and enriched its social activities since the 25th congress. The USSR Constitution stipulates that the state will help to strengthen the social homogeneity of society: through elimination of class disparities and of major disparities between town and country and between people engaged in mental and physical labor, and the all-round development of and rapprochement among all nations and nationalities in the USSR.

Systematically resolving this programmatic task, the state shows daily concern for the improvement of labor conditions, upgrading the material prosperity of the working people, improving their social insurance and consumer services and expanding the real possibilities for the spiritual growth of every person. There will be major accomplishments in this area in the interval between congresses. Real per capita income will be 17 percent higher. Payments and benefits from social consumption funds will be 134 billion rubles higher. The working people will have been provided with 500 million square meters of housing area.

Today the social functions of the Soviet state are assuming a truly all-embracing nature, covering all areas of social and spiritual relations. The state focuses on the Soviet person. Continuing concern for the good of man, for the good of the people, is the main content of the activities of the state.

The Soviet state is resolving its problems comprehensively. The steadfast improvement of the material prosperity of the people and the development of the spiritual needs of the person and of all his capabilities and talents in the interests of society are achieved on the basis of the increased effectiveness of public production and labor productivity and the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution. This most important characteristic of the state of the whole people is a powerful weapon of the people who are implementing the great constructive plans for the building of communism under CPSU leadership.

The implementation by the Soviet state of its economic and social functions and the active and creative participation of the working people in this matter consolidate the social and ideological-political unity of the people and the unity of the classes, nations and nationalities of which it is composed, and contribute to the further unification of the qualitatively new historical human community. The Soviet Union, the USSR Constitution stipulates, embodies the state unity of the Soviet people.

Soviet statehood includes a system of various forms of national statehood. However, it functions as a single organism in the interests of all peoples and individual nations and nationalities in the USSR. "Under socialism," Lenin emphasized, "the toiling masses themselves will never agree to exclusiveness for purely economic...reasons..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 30, p 37). Indeed, it is only by uniting within a strong multinational state that the peoples of our country were able to reach within an extremely short historical period the peak of economic and sociocultural progress, achieve a general upsurge and develop at a pace unknown to any presocialist system. The anniversaries of the founding of a number of union republics, solemnly celebrated this year by the entire Soviet people, offered yet another convincing proof of the international nature of Soviet statehood and of the vitality of its national forms.

At the present stage of the building of communism, at the peak of its maturity and experience, comprehensively using its broadened possibilities, and relying on the new methods for a reorganized influence on practical work formulated by the party, the Soviet state is systematically resolving the problems related to making a sharp turn toward upgrading work effectiveness and quality, emphasizing end results of economic activities. This turn is the pivot of the party's economic strategy, as was most strongly emphasized at the October 1980 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The speech which Comrade L. I. Brezhnev delivered at the plenum provided a profound and comprehensive study of the results of the 10th Five-Year Plan and of the plans for 1981. It defined the assignments for the 11th Five-Year Plan and indicated the means for their implementation and for reaching new heights in the building of communism.

The problem of further enhancing the living standard of the Soviet people is the key aspect of the party's practical work in the field of economics. "The improvement of food supplies," L. I. Brezhnev emphasized, "has priority among the problems which determine the living standard of the Soviet people."



The CC CPSU Politburo passed a decision on the formulation of a food program, which must become an organic component of the 11th Five-Year Plan. Major changes must be made in the production of consumer goods.

The plenum noted the great socioeconomic importance of housing construction, which must remain "in the center of attention of the soviets of people's deputies and under the strict control of oblast and city party committees." The need for paying unabated attention to problems of health care, education, culture, improvements in working conditions, and so on, was emphasized as well.

The plenum approved in their entirety all stipulations and conclusions included in L. I. Brezhnev's speech and decreed that they become the basis for the activities of all party, soviet, economic, trade union and Komsomol organizations.

The fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet ratified the 1981 USSR state plan for economic and social development and state budget and made them laws. The comprehensive and profound discussion of these documents at the session and by the permanent commissions of the chambers, which took into consideration the remarks and recommendations of the deputies, made the plan and the budget even more substantiated and profound and made it possible to determine the existence of some reserves which were allocated for social deeds related to the work of children's homes, boarding schools, rural cultural institutions, and others.

## II

After the 25th CPSU Congress substantial qualitative changes occurred in all areas of state life. Changes were quite noticeable in the activities of the soviets as well. Over the past 5 years, actively undertaking the implementation of the decisions of the congress, the organs of the people's system adamantly and systematically undertook to improve their work. They reached a higher stage as a whole, improved their organization, enhanced the quality and effectiveness of their work, strengthened their ties with the masses and increased their participation in implementing the policies of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

In managing state, economic and sociocultural construction in accordance with the constitution, the soviets act as a single organism, all of whose parts closely interact and receive guidance from a single center.

The adoption of the USSR Constitution and the election of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, as chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and his comprehensive and fruitful activities in this high governmental position were the beginning of a qualitatively new stage in the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the soviets at other levels. Leonid Il'ich issues recommendations and instructions on major problems at USSR Supreme Soviet sessions and at all levels within our system of representative power organs.

Important measures have been implemented over the past 5 years to energize and improve the work of the soviets. The ripe and material possibilities of rural, settlement, rayon and city soviets were increased. The Law on Basic Rights of Kray, Oblast and Okrug Soviets was passed at the Third June session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Essentially, the promulgation of this law completed the creation

of union legislation governing the activities of all state power units. The soviets of people's deputies were given additional opportunities for the successful implementation of the party's tasks.

In accordance with the new constitution the most important characteristic of the work of the soviets is their increased attention to the economy and to the main problems of economic development. This qualitative change in their work enables the soviets today to consider and resolve a broad range of problems related to the management and administration of economic construction, more actively to participate in the formulation of production and budget plans, to control their implementation and the implementation of the suggestions and recommendations of permanent commissions and deputies. Suffice it to say that most of the 767,000 problems considered last year at soviet sessions dealt precisely with economic problems.

As it insures the comprehensive development of its territory, each power organ, from the village or settlement soviet to the supreme soviet of the republic, proceeds, above all, from the need simultaneously to resolve economic and social problems. In themselves, problems such as housing construction, increasing population services, urbanization and many others are comprehensive and could be properly resolved only within the limits of a defined territory such as city, workers settlement, village or rayon. Today the soviets of people's deputies have all the opportunities for insuring practical comprehensive development and for organically combining centralism with the broad initiative and activity of the masses, for the combined solution of national and local problems and for combining sectorial with territorial management. Practical experience indicates that wherever close cooperation and interaction has been achieved between the organs managing national economic sectors and the territorial organs, substantiated and correct solutions are always achieved, taking into consideration production interests and improvement in population services. This approach yields the best possible results in the fulfillment of state plans and in upgrading work quality and effectiveness.

The soviets are actively participating in the work done throughout the country to improve the economic mechanism. A great deal has been accomplished in this direction. However, a great deal more remains to be done, particularly on the local level, and in associations and enterprises. In its 20 August 1979 decree the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium drew the attention of the soviets to the tasks based on a decision on this matter previously passed by the CC CPSU. Currently proposals are being drafted for the further improvement of the organizational structure of management, including measures to improve sectorial and territorial management and the organizational forms for the implementation of target programs, and suggestions on upgrading the role of the soviets in economic construction and broadening the rights and initiatives of labor collectives.

The 3 years of work under the new constitution made it possible for a number of soviets to acquire a certain amount of experience in insuring the comprehensive economic and social development of their territories. We are quite familiar with such achievements in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Sverdlovsk, Tallinn and many other cities. Essentially, the USSR Constitution requires the comprehensive formulation of such plans.

The rights of the soviets in managing economic construction on their territory will be expanded as they gradually assume jurisdiction over departmental housing, communal economy projects, and as their executive committees take over the functions of a single customer for the construction of housing and cultural-consumer projects. All this will increase the influence of the soviets on the implementation of construction plans in the nonproduction area as a whole, the urbanization of town and country and the improvement of health care, trade, and consumer services.

It is precisely from this viewpoint that the supreme soviets of the Ukrainian and Uzbek SSRs, the permanent commissions of the supreme power organs of the union republics, and a number of local soviets consider problems of further upgrading the quality of housing construction and of communal and sociocultural projects.

Complex problems related to the implementation by the soviets of their coordination and control functions with enterprises and associations under superior jurisdiction arise in the formulation of the comprehensive plan. Frequently the soviets are forced to play the role of "petitioners" with such organizations in cases of improving amenities, building engineering facilities, and so on. Currently the situation is being gradually changed. Many cases remain, however, in which sectorial ministries and departments, while building production projects, fall seriously behind in the implementation of their plans for the building of housing and cultural-consumer institutions or else do not plan for such construction at all. The final victim here is the production process itself. Labor productivity does not grow, cadre turnover increases and the moral and psychological climate in the labor collective worsens. Such practices must be decisively eliminated.

One of the central problems raised by the party is that of increasing the production of consumer goods and improving their quality. We could cite many examples of the effective way in which the soviets use their extensive rights in this area. This is the case in cities such as L'vov, Tula, Minsk, Voronezh, Kemerovo and many others. However, existing possibilities are being used very little and not everywhere. This was particularly emphasized at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium held on the work of the soviets of the Azerbaijan and Estonian SSRs on the production of consumer goods from local resources.

The soviets have acquired considerable experience in the area of agricultural management. In this sector they have a wide range of obligations. The soviets must take all measures at their disposal to implement the instructions of the CC CPSU and of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev on increasing the production of grain and other crops. Particular attention must be paid to the development of animal husbandry and to increasing its productivity.

The task of systematically improving the life of the rural working people is closely related to the further upsurge of agricultural production. It is precisely the soviets which are responsible for creating in the villages the type of living and working conditions which would be consistent with the contemporary spiritual requirements of the rural population, the young people in particular.

Without this no stable rural cadres can be developed and the implementation of the party's plans for upgrading the production of agricultural commodities cannot be insured. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium drew the attention of the soviets to the need for improving production, social, and living conditions for young people in the villages in the course of its consideration of this type of work in Kostromskaya Oblast.

The local soviets play a great role in the solution of the important problem of upgrading agricultural output in the auxiliary farms and enterprises, kolkhoz members and sovkhos workers. The auxiliary farms need continuing and effective aid and attention if they are to provide the necessary yields. Naturally, this is exacting work. However, the soviets can and must deal with it. That is precisely the way this question was formulated by the party at its October 1980 CC CPSU Plenum.

The adoption of the new constitution substantially increased the control which representative organs exercise over the observance of planned assignments, the decisions made and the work of administrative organs. The USSR Supreme Soviet has acquired useful experience in reviewing reports submitted by the government, ministries and departments at sessions and meetings of the presidium and of the permanent commissions of the chambers. Such practices are being extensively developed at other soviet levels. Let us emphasize that the control activities of the soviets are consistent with the extensive efforts made by the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Committee Politburo to increase control and supervision of execution.

The topic of responsibility, discipline and a critical approach to the work was particularly emphasized in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's addresses at the November 1979 and June 1980 CC CPSU Plenums. He emphasized the need for greater strictness in supervising the implementation of assignments, which must be backed by "efficient organization, high-level discipline, and firm control." This has also been pointed out in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree on the tasks of the soviets in the further strengthening of discipline and improving the utilization of manpower resources.

Recently the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium studied the work of the soviets of the Armenian SSR in increasing control over the implementation of planned assignments and decisions and strengthening performing disciplines. The discussion indicated that of late the soviets have acquired a great deal of experience in this area. At the same time, the tasks of communist construction call for improving control activities further. The strict implementation of party directives and of laws and decisions is one of the most important requirements today. The soviets must implement it strictly and consistently.

All forms of control which have proved their value must be better utilized and their effectiveness increased. Control effectiveness must be assessed on the basis of end results. Such results must include the elimination of shortcomings and work improvements.

Improvements in the moral incentives given the working people are inseparably related to strengthening the discipline and upgrading responsibility in all work



areas. No single good, valuable or practical initiative should remain unnoticed. This is particularly important today, when the socialist competition in honor of the 26th CPSU Congress is extensively developing. Problems of the participation of the soviets in the organization of this competition are being followed by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's addresses to production leaders and innovators and socialist competition winners are of particular importance in upgrading the labor and political activeness of the Soviet people. In recent years the CC CPSU and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium have adopted important measures to improve legislation on rewards. The current system of state rewards of the USSR and the union republics makes it possible properly to note outstanding manifestations of labor valor by the Soviet people. The soviets, particularly at the kray, oblast or okrug levels, and the public organizations have been given the right to nominate working people for awards. Such rights must be skillfully used in the dissemination of the best examples of work and progressive experience.

The solution of the party's tasks related to the building of communism and the molding of the new person are inseparably linked with the intensification of ideological and political-educational work among the masses. The soviets have the necessary prerequisites to accomplish this. They have tens of thousands of institutions dealing with culture, public education, instruction and sports. In order to insure the active participation of the soviets in the implementation of the CC CPSU decree "On Further Improving Ideological and Political-Educational Work," the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium earmarked an extensive set of measures on improving the cultural-educational work of the soviets and their subordinate organs.

Attention to the people and concern for their needs and demands make it incumbent upon our power organs adamantly to perfect their work with the letters sent by the working people and to improve the organization of citizens' interviews with officials. The CPSU Central Committee is always emphasizing the need to raise the standard of this work. Of late the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has repeatedly addressed itself to work on the letters sent by citizens. In particular, it has studied the practice of the soviets in Krasnodar and of Chelyabinskaya Oblast. The local soviets must daily direct and control the work on letters. They must decisively eliminate manifestations of bureaucracy and red tape and systematically inform the working people of the measures they have taken based on their reports.

Unfortunately, many institutions are still slow in eliminating the faulty practice according to which the detailed consideration of appeals and the adoption of necessary measures are replaced by irresponsible promises which are subsequently ignored. One deadline after another is violated. A firm end must be put to such an approach. It undermines the trust of the population in the power organs and harms our state. It is the task of the soviets comprehensively to insure that the petitions and addresses submitted by citizens are considered and satisfied without red tape and strictly in accordance with the law.

Under mature socialist conditions the significance of the soviets' guidance of the work of subordinate state organs becomes substantially greater. The USSR

Supreme Soviet Presidium, headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, is implementing this function in a specific and efficient manner. It is here that the entire net of the soviet system comes to a point and comprehensive experience in state construction and in soviet work is acquired. This experience is made available to the union republics and helps the soviets more fully and effectively to exercise their increased rights and have a clearer view of everything new and progressive.

In the past few years all of the major directions of soviet work and the experience of union republics have been especially considered by the supreme power organ. The decisions made by the USSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium on basic problems of economic and social development, upgrading the prosperity of the Soviet people, control of the implementation of decisions, work on voters' instructions and letters sent by the working people, the development of legislation and the strengthening of law and order and the consideration of international and some other problems have contributed to the energizing of the entire system of state organs and have insured a unified approach by the soviets to the implementation of the party's policy and of governmental decisions.

The supreme soviets of union republics and their presidiums are providing greater guidance to subordinate soviets. Of late their practical work has been noted for a great variety of methods and purposefulness and it has a growing influence on the content and level of all soviet work. The approach developed by the USSR Supreme Soviet to the consideration of a number of vital problems of social development is being carefully studied by union republics and is meeting with extensive local response. It is being adopted and skillfully applied in accordance with local characteristics. We can see the way local initiative and practical experience are creating new and interesting forms of useful soviet influence on economic and sociocultural construction and on the solution of all-union problems.

### III

Three years of work under the new USSR Constitution have led to the further comprehensive development of socialist democracy and to the enrichment of its forms. The development has been both intensive and extensive. The leading trend in this process is the ever-broader participation of the working people in the administration of governmental and social affairs and in the strengthening of our statehood.

The tremendous constructive potential and historical advantages of Soviet democracy were manifested with new emphasis in the course of the elections for the USSR Supreme Soviet and the supreme soviets of union and autonomous republics and local soviets of people's deputies. They were held under the sign of the inviolable unity between party and people and confirmed the high political activity of the voters.

Considerable work is being done to develop the democratic foundations of soviet activities. In this connection upgrading the role of the sessions is of major importance. The constitutional terms for convening them are being observed more strictly; the range of considered items has been expanded and the activity of the deputies is greater. Today shortcomings are being exposed more boldly and on a principled basis at soviet sessions; criticism has become more serious and

constructive and more significant decisions are being made. Naturally, many commissions remain in the field of preparation and holding of sessions. They were pointed out by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium which considered the practice of holding sessions by the soviets of the Uzbek SSR. The submitted problems are not considered profoundly and comprehensively, different opinions are not compared, and programs for action are not clearly defined at all sessions. The soviets must make fuller use of the truly inexhaustible possibilities offered by this form of work. A great deal has been accomplished in upgrading the role of the permanent commissions of the soviets and the deputies. Practice has indicated that the planned work of the commissions enhances the initiative of the deputies, who can consider problems more thoroughly and participate more actively in the drafting of decisions and bills.

The prestige of production deputy groups and deputy posts is rising. They make it possible for the soviets to become better acquainted with the situation at enterprises, exert their influence from within, through the labor collective, and exercise daily effective control.

The implementation of voters' instructions plays an important role in soviet activities. In the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium which considered the work of Belorussian soviets with voters' instructions, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev described them as bits of popular initiative and a vivid manifestation of our democracy. The recently passed ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on organizing work with voters' instructions will strengthen even further the ties between soviets and the masses and will make it possible to take better into consideration and more completely to satisfy the requirements and needs of the working people.

The supreme soviets of union republics and their presidiums pay great attention to the development of democratic forms of activity, improving the work with voters' instructions, and summarizing and disseminating progressive experience by the soviets. Thus, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium discussed the way soviet deputies in Novosibirskaya and Yaroslavl'skaya oblasts implement their rights in their electoral districts. The Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium considered the organizational work of the local soviets in Chimbentskaya Oblast on implementing voters' instructions and the experience in the reports submitted by soviet executive committees and their departments and administrations to the soviets and the population of Pavlodarskaya Oblast.

The public organizations play an important role in the socialist political system. The trade unions and cooperatives, the Komsomol, the women's organizations and the voluntary societies and creative associations, working under the party's guidance, are actively participating in the building of communism. They express the variety of interests of the various population groups, combining them with the interests of the entire society.

In the past period the interaction in the solution of vital problems of the life and work of the Soviet people has been increased between the public organizations and the soviets and the other state organs. The ways and means of this cooperation have become richer. This is clearly apparent in all areas of social development. The unity in the goals and tasks of the Soviet state and the public

organizations enables them effectively to join efforts in the great constructive work for the implementation of the political course of the Leninist party.

The labor collectives—the nuclei of the socialist society—play an important role in the system of socialist democracy. It is precisely here that the tasks formulated by the party are translated into the language of practice, that the fate of the plan is determined and the ideological and moral training of the people takes place. Today, when the USSR Constitution has granted labor collectives extensive rights regarding the discussion of governmental and public affairs and participation in their implementation, their opportunities have been increased considerably. The labor collective is developing as real on-the-job training. The permanent production complex and workers' meetings at which the general problems of plants, factories and sovkhozes, plans for economic and social development, their implementation, and so on, are discussed, are forms of participation by the working people in the solution of the most important problems of the labor collectives and of public control.

The further broadening of the democratic principles governing the activities of labor collectives and the skilful combination of one-man command with the extensive participation of the working people in production management are becoming very important. The experience of many famed collectives in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk and other cities proves that success in the solution of economic and education problems is achieved through collective search and the adoption of a democratic procedure for decision-making and execution, in which everyone is given the opportunity to express his own views and actively to influence the formulation of a coordinated action program.

Throughout all stages of the building of socialism and communism the CPSU and the Soviet state have always been concerned with the exercise of the rights and freedoms of the Soviet citizen and the fulfillment of his obligations to society. The new USSR Constitution reflected the qualitative changes made in this area. In the 3 years since its enactment the working people in the country have come to appreciate the extent to which the content of their rights and freedoms was intensified and the increased meaningfulness of the material guarantees for such rights and freedoms. The new constitutionally codified democratic forms of activities and the broadest possible opportunities offered for political, scientific and technical and artistic creativity can encompass the entire variety of people's initiatives.

Let us particularly emphasize that this entire comprehensive work done by the soviets in managing the economic and sociocultural construction we have discussed also represents the laying of a reliable material foundation for the extensive and full exercise by the Soviet people of their vitally important constitutional rights such as the right to work, rest, health care, housing, education, use of cultural achievements and many others. This is a clear manifestation of the real humanism and consistent democracy of the developed socialist society.

The exercise of rights and freedoms is indivisible from the fulfillment of civic obligations. The two are organically interrelated. "...While concerned with the all-round development of the individual and with the rights of the citizens," L. I. Brezhnev has emphasized, "we also paid the necessary attention to problems



of strengthening the social discipline and the implementation by all citizens of their duties to society. Democracy is unattainable without discipline and a firm social order."

#### IV

The implementation of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the country's new constitution made a great deal of legislative work necessary. Its scale and duration were determined by the 12 December 1977 USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree "On Organizing Work for Insuring the Consistency Between USSR Legislation and the USSR Constitution."

The program drafted is being systematically implemented. The renovation of constitutional legislation has been completed successfully. Fifteen constitutions of union republics and 20 constitutions of autonomous republics were drafted and adopted on the basis of the country's fundamental law.

The Regulation on the USSR Supreme Soviet, the laws on elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet, on the USSR Council of Ministers, on the rights of kray, oblast and okrug soviets, on people's control in the USSR, on the USSR Supreme Court and the USSR Prosecutor's Office, the Ukase on Organizing the Work on Voters' Instructions, the General Regulation Governing USSR Orders, Medals and Honorific Titles, and many other bills passed by the supreme organ of state power contribute to the further advancement of the activities of the basic units of the Soviet state of the whole people.

The necessary amendments and supplements were made to the legislative acts governing the basic rights and obligations of rayon, city, rural and settlement soviets, the laws on the status of deputies and the procedure for recalling a deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Regulation on the Permanent Commissions of Supreme Soviet Chambers, and others.

A number of major laws were aimed at insuring the further improvement of the economic mechanism. Let us add to this the already-mentioned Law on the USSR Council of Ministers, Law on the USSR State Arbitration, and a number of Supreme Soviet decrees. Environmental protection legislation was developed. Laws on the protection of the air and the protection and utilization of the animal world were passed by the USSR Supreme Soviet Third Session, 10th Convocation. Amendments and supplements were made to the Foundations of Land, Water and Timber Legislation and the Foundations of Ground Legislation.

A great deal of work has been accomplished in strengthening the legal status of the individual in the USSR. The Foundations of Legislation on Labor, Law on State Pensions, and Foundations of Legislation on Health Care, Public Education and Marriage and the family were updated in accordance with the constitution and current requirements. The Law on USSR Citizenship was passed. A new text was approved for the Ukase on the Procedure for the Consideration of Citizens' Suggestions, Petitions and Complaints.

At the present time the Supreme Soviet has already passed all the laws directly stipulated in the USSR Constitution.

The USSR Council of Ministers has done a great deal of legislative work. Departmental legal acts are being substantially updated, supplemented, and made consistent with the USSR Constitution. Similar work is being done by union and autonomous republics. All the laws which were passed actively contribute to the further enrichment of human rights and to strengthening the legal system of developed socialism.

Activities on coordinating legislation with the new constitution are an organic part of the drafting of a USSR Code of Laws and of codes of laws of union republics, based on the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress. Systematic and active work is being done on drafting legal codes. The first title of the USSR Code of Laws will be published for the 26th CPSU Congress.

The energizing of legislative work sets the urgent task of further upgrading the quality of such documents. As it summed up the results of the efforts to coordinate USSR legislation with the constitution, the Supreme Soviet Presidium paid particular attention to this fact. Speaking of the quality of the laws and of other decisions made by the soviets, let us emphasize that in this case uniformity is important. The main feature of the ordinances passed by the soviets, however, must be their organic tie with reality, with the party's policy and the needs of society. It would be useful in this connection to recall Lenin's wise advice. He said that "One must legislate after triple consideration. Measure seven times before cutting!" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 54, p 191).

In the course of their adamant efforts to improve legislation, the communist party and the Soviet government ascribe prime importance to the practical implementation of legal stipulations. "A proper, planned system of laws and their strict implementation," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has emphasized, "means legality and law and order, without which a socialist way of life or socialist democracy would be inconceivable."

This clear formula essentially defines the program for the activities of all our state organs in this area. In themselves, the drafting of a good law and its adoption are not enough. The law must work in the required direction. Reality has proved that strengthening legality is a permanent factor in the strengthening of our system and improving the situation in economic construction.

Let us particularly emphasize that it is a question of reaching a higher level of conscious discipline and legality. The strength of our state of the whole people lies, above all, in the political maturity and high conscientiousness of the working people and the systematic development of democracy in which, as Lenin said, the masses know everything, can judge everything, and do everything conscientiously. The soviets must be able to rely, above all, precisely on this Soviet feature developed as a result of all our activities.

The important steps taken after the 25th CPSU Congress to strengthen law and order do not eliminate the task of waging a further nationwide struggle for legality. This was most strongly reemphasized in the CPSU Central Committee

decree "On Improving the Work on the Preservation of Law and Order and Intensifying the Struggle Against Violations of the Law," and in the decisions of the October 1980 CC CPSU Plenum and the Fourth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which ratified the Foundations of the Legislation of the USSR and of Union Republics on Administrative Violations of the Law.

The organs of the prosecutor's office, the militia and the courts face important tasks. They must wage an uncompromising struggle against delinquency. Success in this area depends, above all, on the operativeness and purposefulness of the work of the law enforcement organs and the extent to which they closely interact with the public. This is convincingly proved by available experience. Wherever the party organs engage in extensive organizational work and the soviets, labor collectives, people's units and the militia join efforts, the number of crimes or disturbances of the public order steadily declines.

Unfortunately, there still exist individual cities or settlements where the crime rate is not declining. This situation cannot be tolerated. It calls for seriously improving preventive work, energizing the activities of the law enforcement organs, and mobilizing the broad public in the struggle against crime.

In this connection it would be proper to draw attention to the following feature: our country has over two million deputies and over 30 million activists in the soviets. This is a tremendous force which could decisively influence the creation of an environment of universal intolerance of crime. If every deputy or activist sets an example at work and elsewhere, observing the norms in the law and morality and waging a battle against those who violate them, unquestionably the strengthening of law and order will be improved and the norms of the moral code of the builder of communism will be asserted in our life more rapidly and broadly.

V

The implementation of the Leninist policy of peace and the struggle for strengthening the security of the peoples and for extensive international cooperation--the essential tasks of the Soviet state in the international arena--were codified in the 1977 Constitution. The basic directions of USSR foreign policy and the principles on which relations between the Soviet Union and other countries are based were given a legal status.

Systematically and consistently implementing the peace program adopted at the 24th and developed at the 25th party congress, the Soviet state achieved a great deal of success in the 1970s. The course of detente and of establishing the principles of peaceful coexistence among countries with different sociopolitical systems gained ever greater support throughout the world. The desire of our country for peace and disarmament was newly and vividly manifested in the reduction of the role of military expenditures in the 1981 USSR state budget, which was ratified in October at the Fourth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The foreign political activities of the Soviet state became richer and more varied. Together with the other socialist countries, the Soviet Union adamantly

worked for the further progress of detente and for insuring a real turn from the arms race to disarmament. It promoted the development of mutually profitable international cooperation.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, has made a tremendous contribution to the formulation and implementation of the Soviet foreign political course. The Soviet people and all honest people on earth are expressing to Leonid Il'ich--the outstanding state and political leader of our time--their profound gratitude for his tireless struggle in the defense of peace. On this level his meetings and talks with the heads of other countries, political and public leaders, and parliamentarians from foreign countries are of major significance. Each one of these meetings gives impetus both to the development of bilateral relations between the USSR and one or another country and the further progress of international detente as a whole.

The materials from such meetings and talks and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's speeches on foreign political problems are guidelines for all practical work conducted by Soviet parliamentarians in the international arena and for the development of international relations between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the legislative organs of foreign countries. Such relations expand, deepen, and improve with every passing year. In the past 5 years alone the Soviet Union has been visited by 46 parliamentary delegations from 43 countries. Within the same period Soviet delegations have visited 46 countries at the invitation of foreign parliaments. Active foreign relations were maintained by the Foreign Affairs Commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers and the USSR Parliamentary Group.

In accordance with existing practices, the delegations of foreign parliamentarians visit union and autonomous republics and many industrial and cultural centers. In the course of their meetings and talks with members of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the supreme soviets of the republics and the executive committees of local soviets, they are informed in detail of the achievements of the Soviet people in state, economic and sociocultural construction, the resolution of the national problem in our country and the development of socialist democracy. All this gives us an opportunity to prove the historical advantages of real socialism through specific examples and facts and to dispel the mistrust and prejudices of foreign parliamentarians who are still entrapped by the dogmas of the cold war and the slanders and stereotypes designed by anticommunist propagandists.

What are the main directions of such activities? Understandably, in this regard the further expansion and advancement of cooperation among parliaments of socialist countries, the coordination of their positions on topical foreign political problems and the reciprocal exchange of, so to say, "first-hand" information on the activities of their higher and local authorities, legislative developments, and the course of state building are of primary significance. It can be said that regular meetings of representatives of the supreme power organs of the socialist countries have become a firm tradition which plays a major part in the development of relations among countries.

Let us particularly emphasize the joint actions undertaken by parliamentarians in the fraternal socialist countries with a view to strengthening the peace and



security on the basis of the decisions of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact Members. These were the topics of the already traditional meetings among members of their parliaments held in July 1977 in Leningrad, in October 1979 in Prague, and in June 1980 in Minsk. In the course of the Minsk meeting, dedicated to the 25th anniversary of the Warsaw Pact, the parliamentarians addressed an appeal to the parliaments and parliamentarians of countries in Europe and throughout the world to make a real contribution to the normalizing of international circumstances and to extend even further the struggle for peace, national independence and social progress. The resulting answers prove that the appeal met with a broad positive response among foreign parliamentary circles.

Relations with the supreme power organs of nonaligned countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, which have become noticeably energized in recent years, are another line of activities followed by the USSR Supreme Soviet in the international arena. This is understandable, for these countries, which are playing an ever more active role in international affairs, are increasingly anxious to learn more about the life of the Soviet people and the way the USSR power system operates, and to take from the rich experience of the Soviet Union whatever would be useful in their own development. This year alone the Soviet Union was visited by delegations from Sri Lanka, Nigeria, Mauritius, and Djibouti. In turn, USSR Supreme Soviet delegations visited Syria, Algeria, South Yemen and many other countries. For the first time, Soviet parliamentarians paid a visit to Brazil, the largest Latin American country.

Finally, the continuation of parliamentary exchanges with the Western countries is of major importance, particularly today, at the beginning of the 1980s, when the international situation has become far more complex thanks to the imperialist and reactionary forces, the United States above all. Naturally, this could not fail to affect parliamentary relations to a certain extent. However, the initiators of suspension of political and other contacts with the Soviet Union neither achieved nor could achieve the desired results. "Today everyone can see," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said in his 29 August Alma' Ata speech, "that such attempts to bury detente and lead the world into a new cold war did not in any way meet with the approval of the broad people's masses and the majority of governments and brought no advantages to their initiators."

The international relations between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the parliaments of capitalist countries remain quite active. The September 1979 consideration by the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the problem of parliamentary relations with the members of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was of major importance in this connection. The meetings and talks with parliamentarians from such countries today, taking into consideration the holding of the Madrid meeting, are a major component of the struggle for the preservation and strengthening of detente in Europe.

The direct discussion of specific political problems at the meetings of the USSR Supreme Soviet, its Presidium, and the foreign affairs commission of the chambers was of great importance in their foreign political activities. Thus in 1978, the USSR Supreme Soviet considered the Law on the Procedure for the Conclusion, Execution and Denunciation of International Treaties by the USSR. Based on the report submitted by A. A. Gromyko, CC CPSU Politburo member and USSR minister of

foreign affairs, the Supreme Soviet passed a decree on the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. It expressed complete and full approval of the foreign political course and practical activities of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers in the pursuit of the peaceful foreign political course and the implementation of the peace program for the further struggle for peace and international cooperation and the freedom and independence of the peoples formulated at the 25th party congress.

Implementing its constitutional rights, in the past 5 years the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has ratified 66 international treaties, agreements, conventions and protocols. They include major basic international agreements such as the treaties of friendship and cooperation with Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. On 8 October a friendship and cooperation treaty was concluded with the Syrian Arab Republic. This treaty is of major political significance in terms of the further strengthening and intensification of Soviet-Syrian cooperation. The treaty is aimed at establishing a really just peace in the Middle East and contributing to the normalizing of the international situation.

The USSR Parliamentary Group, which includes all Supreme Soviet deputies, is making a substantial contribution to resolving the problems in the struggle for peace and international cooperation. The deputies work through the parliamentary group by actively participating in the conferences and meetings of the organs of the Interparliamentary Union, going abroad, and meeting with foreign parliamentarians visiting our country.

All this confirms the concrete and daily participation of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its organs and deputies in the major effort for the implementation of the peace program of the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses.

The decisions of the June 1980 Plenum emphasize that today as well, when the adventuristic actions of the United States and its accomplices have increased the threat of war, a firm course of comprehensive strengthening of the fraternal alliance among socialist countries and support of the just struggle waged by the peoples for freedom and independence and for peaceful coexistence is necessary. "Today countries and peoples have no more important task," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has noted, "than to prevent the imperialist policy 'from a position of strength' from slowing detente, and the pendulum of the arms race from gathering new and dangerous speed."

Today, on the threshold of the regular 26th CPSU Congress, we could state with full justification that the decisions of the 25th congress on the development of Soviet statehood are being successfully implemented.

Over the past period the soviets of people's deputies and the state organs under their administration have carried out extensive and useful work to implement the party's policy and the plans for economic and social development. The role of the soviets and their influence on all realms of state and social life and their prestige among the people have risen noticeably. These beneficial qualitative changes are the embodiment of the consistent CC CPSU line of comprehensively strengthening our representative organs, upgrading their real power, and insuring

the further development of the nature of the soviets, brilliantly shown by Lenin, which they mean rule by the people and for the people.

The soviets and the people's deputies are fully aware of their high responsibility in remaining the active promoters of the party's policy and the interests of the people when, in the words of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "We shall take one more step in our progress to communism." Leonid Il'ich expressed his confidence that the soviets and the more than two million deputies will also do their jobs properly in the period of preparations for the congress and, subsequently, in the course of the implementation of its decisions.

The soviets, the army of the people's choices which actively joined the socialist competition, are doing everything possible honorably to justify the high trust of the Leninist party and welcome the supreme forum of Soviet party members with new accomplishments.

5003

CSO: 1802

**JOINT STRUGGLE OF THE WORKERS AND NATIONAL-LIBERATION MOVEMENTS AGAINST  
IMPERIALISM AND FOR SOCIAL PROGRESS**

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 80 pp 30-44

[Report by B. Ponomarev, CC CPSU Politburo candidate member and CC CPSU secretary, presented at the 20 October 1980 Berlin International Scientific Conference]

[Text] Contacts and interactions among representatives of communist and workers parties and detachments of the national liberation movements are particularly important today. We listened most attentively to the speech by Comrade E. Honecker, SED Central Committee general secretary, and share with him his assessment of the significance of the conference and the importance of the problems we are about to discuss.

Naturally, our delegation does not intend to discuss all the aspects of the tremendous topic of this conference. We are relying on a broad exchange of views. Naturally, the statements which will be made here by the direct participants in the national liberation movement will be of particular importance.

This conference is being held in a complex international situation. The threat of war has intensified again because of imperialism. World reactionary forces are trying to mount a counteroffensive and regain their lost positions. This affects the lives of hundreds and hundreds of millions of people on all continents. Understandably, this problem will be always present in the proceedings of this conference.

V. I. Lenin considered the national liberation movement an inseparable part of the global revolutionary process. The communists were the first to consider the tremendous revolutionary potential of the peoples oppressed by imperialism, and consistently to defend their right to independence and independent development. The communists have always been, and remain, systematic fighters for the liberation of the peoples from imperialism and the loyal allies of the forces building a new, a free society.

The Great October Socialist Revolution struck a decisive blow at imperialism and its centers--the other countries and its colonial and semicolonial periphery. This marked the beginning of the crisis of the colonial system.

Subsequently, the World War II defeat of the bloc of fascist and militaristic states radically changed the ratio of forces in favor of socialism. It facilitated the struggle waged by the colonial peoples for the rejection of imperialist



rule. World socialism insured favorable international conditions for the successful outcome of the struggle for the breakdown of colonial empires. Capitalism entered a new stage of its general crisis, which is becoming ever increasingly more acute.

The Soviet Union assumed the initiative in the 1960 United Nations declaration on granting independence to colonial countries and peoples. Twenty years later, the historical significance of this initiative becomes particularly clear. It is the concentrated expression of the policy of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries concerning the national liberation movement.

The working class and the communist parties of the developed capitalist countries made a major contribution to the liberation struggle of the peoples. We are very familiar with the role played, for example, by the communist parties of France, Portugal, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands and other Western European countries in support of the struggle waged by the peoples of colonial and semicolonial countries.

The communists in the developing countries are waging a dedicated struggle for the completion of the anti-imperialist, antifeudal and democratic revolutions, for a socialist future and for improving the living standard of the people's masses. They firmly support the anti-imperialist steps of the national governments aimed at consolidating the gains but oppose antidemocratic measures, the harming of the interests of the working people and steps which conflict with the principles of national autonomy. The communist objectives are consistent with the supreme interests of the nation, of the people's masses. It is entirely obvious that the reactionary attempts, made under the banner of anticommunism, to destroy national fronts wherever they exist and to isolate the communists, not to speak of their persecution and repression, weaken the forces of the national movement opposing the reactionaries and the external imperialist forces.

Today the world of countries which have achieved national independence presents an impressive and many-faceted picture. The processes taking place in such countries have a tremendous impact on the lives and destinies of dozens of nations accounting for over 50 percent of the population on earth. It is a question of the establishment of statehood, national revival, and economic and cultural upsurge or, in other words, of a total renovation of the entire way of life, using everything valuable and specific acquired in the past and which the colonizers tried to suppress and destroy. For centuries they suppressed and tortured the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, thus extensively holding back their development and, in many cases, throwing it far back into the past.

We know, for example, that long before the advent of the colonizers, Africa had its own original culture. Most such achievements, however, were lost as a result of the colonial enslavement, exploitation and deportation of millions of people as slaves to other parts of the world. Today the peoples of Africa are rediscovering and putting to use their historical heritage.

As a whole, this is a huge area which includes countries with a great variety of political, social and economic conditions, different levels of development, national characteristics and cultural traditions. More than any other, this part

of the world is noted for its exceptionally great political uncertainty and instability. However, there is one thing which unites the overwhelming majority of such countries. It is anti-imperialism, and the resolve to put an end to colonialism, neocolonialism, racism, and all manifestations of national oppression, and to create a free and democratic society.

The countries with a socialist orientation play an outstanding and ever more active role in this world and in international relations at large. India, Nigeria and other such countries are a most important factor countering today's imperialist strategy.

Currently the active participation of new countries is of major importance in the successful solution of world problems and in reliably insuring peace and security on earth. That is why the reciprocal understanding and joint actions of such countries with all other anti-imperialist forces of our time assume exceptional importance regarding the entire future of human society.

#### I. Results of the Liberation Struggle in the 1970s

Major changes occurred in world politics in the 1970s. They were marked by the following features:

New shifts in the ratio of forces in the international arena in favor of socialism and national liberation;

Major successes achieved by the policy of detente, as a result of which the so-called "maneuvering freedom" of most aggressive imperialist forces was substantially restricted;

The expanded scale of the anti-imperialist struggle in which virtually all areas of the zone of national liberation have become involved and the enriched content of this struggle.

Because of favorable international conditions, the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean were able to score major successes. Above all, a new, crushing blow was struck at the system of traditional colonialism. The last colonial empire--the Portuguese--crumbled. An end was put to racist rule in Zimbabwe. The liberation struggle of the peoples of the Republic of South Africa and Namibia is gathering strength. Today mankind stands on the threshold of the total and definitive elimination of colonial rule, that monstrous offspring of capitalism.

During that period the victory of Vietnam and of the patriotic forces of Laos and Kampuchea were events of tremendous importance. With the support of world socialism they were able to defeat the largest contemporary imperialist country which tried to suppress the liberation struggle of the peoples of this part of the world through extensive armed intervention. This is a historical victory!

The people's revolutions in Ethiopia and Afghanistan and the victory of the people of Nicaragua were powerful blows struck at imperialism. This proved, yet once again, the futility of imperialist reliance on preserving its domination by

relying on dictatorial regimes. The revolution in Iran was a major defeat for imperialism.

Having achieved their state and political independence, many liberated countries undertook to resolve most complex problems of economic restoration. Some successes were achieved along this difficult path. However, the unequal status of the developing countries in the world capitalist economy remains and imperialist exploitation has not ended yet. The gap between these countries and the imperialist states in terms of a number of important economic indicators has broadened rather than narrowed.

Many young countries, facing the stubborn aspiration of imperialism to preserve its economic privileges, are resorting, in turn, to decisive measures such as the nationalization of the assets of foreign companies. This daring step has given real content to state sovereignty. It has helped to establish control over natural resources. The mass nationalization of the property of foreign monopolies opened a wide breach in the system of imperialist exploitation of former colonies and semicolonies.

In the 1970s, the need for the elimination of the entire neocolonial structure of exploitation was put on the agenda. In the course of a number of international forums, a platform was drafted for the struggle for the establishment of a new world economic order free from inequality and exploitation. Regional and international associations and organizations of developing countries became a weapon for counteracting the exploiting policy of the monopolies. Greater unity and joint defense of economic interests and the support of the socialist countries give real strength to the movement against economic neocolonialism.

The strengthening of the positions of the liberated countries, in their confrontation with imperialism is tremendously assisted by the progressive changes taking place within these countries themselves, i.e., by the strengthening of their national statehood, the creation of foundations for a national economy, and the development of national culture.

In his characterization of the political course of the liberated countries Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said that "One could definitely say about most of them that in their confrontation with imperialism, they are defending with increasing energy their political and economic rights. They are trying to strengthen their independence and raise the level of the social, economic and cultural development of their peoples."

## II. The Neocolonialist Course and Topical Problems in Cooperation Among the Anti-imperialist Forces

The comprehensive neocolonialist strategy of imperialism, of U.S. imperialism above all, pursues several basic objectives:

To keep the developing countries within the system of the capitalist world economy as dependent customers and tributaries;

To see to it that they remain in the fairway of imperialist policy, assuming positions which oppose the countries of real socialism and countries following the path of socialist development;

To block the free development of such countries and to hinder their social progress by imposing upon them a capitalist way and even by supporting archaic, semi-feudal, feudal and tribal structures.

In the course of the past 70 years imperialism has suffered one defeat after another. However, it has steadfastly tried to modernize its neocolonial course. In recent times, at the beginning of the 1980s, it tried to mount a counter-offensive and take its revenge.

Let us consider the area of economics. Here the striking force of modern neocolonialism is the so-called transnational corporations. Not balking at any means, they are trying to assume control of the economies of the liberated countries, to use their industrial development for the sake of their own interests. The international monopolies are massively transferring here the most labor-intensive types of work, exploiting inexpensive manpower, and developing sectors with the highest environmental pollution levels.

The following new bourgeois system for an international division of labor is developing: the imperialist countries are concentrating on the development of scientific and technical potential and on the latest sectors and production methods, while Asia, Africa and Latin America have been assigned the role of centers for labor-intensive and so-called dirty production. In other words, all the "plums" of the scientific and technical revolution go to the imperialist centers while the cost and the reverse side of such benefits go to the "periphery."

The industrial branches of the international monopolies in the developing countries are being developed as narrow specialists. This makes them technologically heavily dependent on the monopolistic centers. It is thus that a new form of dependency is developed--a kind of technological neocolonialism. Under the conditions of a growing energy and raw material crisis in the capitalist world, the imperialist line of plundering foreign natural resources becomes ever more cynical and shameless.

In the political area imperialist circles, the United States above all, ignoring the lessons of Vietnam, are once again raising the concept of American "leadership." They are again openly claiming the role of world policemen. Furthermore, they frequently cynically proclaim a return to the infamous policy of the "big stick."

Once again imperialism is fanning the fires of conflict and provoking "hot" local wars. The Camp David policy brought about a further aggravation of circumstances in the Middle East, while many parts of the Middle East, the southern part of Lebanon in particular, have become permanent areas of military clashes.

The history of recent decades has never witnessed such rage and slander as has been used by the Western and Beijing propaganda in connection with the Afghan events. In fact, however, this propaganda concealed actions and plans such as:

Waging an undeclared war on Afghanistan;



Formulation of incredibly cynical claims by American imperialism which has proclaimed as a sphere of "vital interest" areas located many thousands of kilometers away from the United States;

Concentrating in this area an entire armada of U. S. armed forces used for intervention and blackmail, pressure and naked threats;

Creating a policeman's "rapid deployment corps" concealed behind fabrications of the "Soviet military threat;"

Pursuit by the Pentagon of new military bases in the Arab Peninsula, East Africa and the Mediterranean;

Exertion of overt pressure on post-shah Iran and engaging in subversive activities and even armed intervention against the new regime.

At the same time, together with Beijing, Washington is weaving intrigues aimed at the recreation of an active military hotbed in Southeast Asia.

In Latin America, American imperialism is strengthening its ties with the repressive regimes and increasing its plotting against the patriotic, democratic and anti-imperialist movements. Everyone realizes that without the support of Yankee imperialism the shameful terrorist regimes of Pinochet in Chile, Stroessner in Paraguay, and Duvalier in Haiti could not exist; mass persecution of and increased repression against left-wing and democratic forces in Uruguay would have been impossible; a military coup in Bolivia, aimed at the legitimate constitutional authorities elected by the people, could not have taken place. Currently the United States is increasing its interference in the internal affairs of El Salvador in an effort to block the path to freedom for its courageous people, who have taken up the struggle against tyranny.

Thus, in the 1980s U. S. imperialism is acting as the main neocolonial power and as the enemy of the liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Let us particularly mention imperialism's use of conflicts between new countries in the national liberation zone. It is a fact that political, economic and occasionally territorial disputes break out among some countries in this area. Most frequently they are a legacy of colonial times and of the policy pursued by imperialism, guided by the principle of "divide and rule."

The difficult problems are consequences of the arbitrary behavior of the colonizers. They could and must be resolved through political and diplomatic methods, through the patient search for just and mutually acceptable solutions. A one-sided approach taken in defending the interests of a given state, ignoring the interests of other nations and the common tasks of the struggle against imperialism, leads to the appearance of situations which are actively used by imperialism, which is doing everything possible to hinder the unification of liberated countries. Conflicts between new countries in the zone of the liberation and national struggles, not to mention military clashes, are the best gift imperialism could receive.



The most alarming problem now is the conflict between Iran and Iraq. The Soviet position on this conflict is known: "...We," said General L. I. Brezhnev, "are in favor of Iran and Iraq settling between them their arguments, sitting at the conference table. It would be good if what they could resolve today were resolved in a spirit of agreement and what cannot be resolved today were postponed for tomorrow, when, possibly, a solution may become easier. Generally speaking, we believe that war in our time neither could nor should be a means for resolving disputes between countries. To an even greater extent this applies to war in a nerve center such as the Near and Middle East."

At the same time, the Soviet Union firmly opposes the attempts of imperialism to use the Iran-Iraq conflict as a pretext for interfering in the affairs of countries in the Persian Gulf. However, the threat of such interference is real. The militaristic fervor provided by the imperialists with blabberings about the "Soviet threat" represents a menace to many countries, not the least among them countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The truth is becoming ever more apparent -- attacks on international detente affect the vital interests of the liberated peoples and that they involve encroachments on national resources and the fanning of interethnic conflicts. In other words, the policy of "antidetente" and neocolonialist revenge are profoundly interlinked.

In the area of ideology as well imperialism is energizing its antipeople's subversive activities. The efforts of its centers are quite comprehensive and varied. Militant anticommunism and anti-Sovietism are the quintessence of the ideological counteroffensive. This is the keynote of the ideological intrigues of imperialism, ranging from unctuous philistine statements on the defense of "human rights" to the factual protection of the organizers of genocide, executioners and murderers.

All manifestations of neocolonialism, which became so apparent at the beginning of the 1980s, are objectively interrelated. In order to block the forces of national and social progress and continue with its colonialist plunder and exploitation, imperialism would like to isolate these forces and alienate them from the socialist comity of nations, a powerful anti-imperialist stronghold.

It is hard not to see that, mobilizing its forces for a counteroffensive against the liberation movement, imperialism is particularly relying on Beijing. The apostasy of the Beijing leaders and their hegemonistic line are some of the trump cards of imperialist policy today. It is precisely Beijing's partnership with imperialism that encouraged the forces of aggression and the opponents of detente. That is why, when we speak of the main directions of the joint struggle waged by world socialism and the workers and national liberation movement, we cannot ignore the question of counteracting the policy of hegemonism and chauvinism pursued by today's Beijing leadership.

The pseudorevolutionary and pseudoanticolonialist camouflage used by Beijing to conceal its conversion to the camp of the enemies of socialism has been factually exposed. Beijing's shameful proimperialist line, coordinating its efforts with imperialism, is visible in any area of the struggle for national liberation. In the Middle East Beijing supports Sadat's capitulationist course and is even trying to involve other Arab countries in deals similar to that of Camp David. Beijing

is actively participating in the undeclared war waged by the United States, Pakistan and some circles in other countries on the Afghan people. In Southeast Asia Chinese hegemonism is engaged in shameful sallies against the Vietnamese people and in subversive activities against the other countries of Indochina. Beijing is responsible for the sufferings of the Kampuchean people. In South Asia a hotbed of tension remains on the border with India. Anti-Indian intrigues are underway in Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal serving the expansionistic objectives of Chinese great power hegemonism. In Africa Beijing's cooperation with imperialism against the patriotic forces of Angola and other states and subversive operations within the African national liberation movement can be seen clearly. In Latin America Beijing is strengthening its ties with the fascist junta in Chile and with other reactionary forces. Chinese hegemonists are actively participating in the hostile campaign mounted by American imperialism against socialist Cuba. Having allied themselves with imperialism, the Beijing leaders are calling on the developing countries to join their "united front" in the struggle against the forces of socialism, peace and progress.

Particular mention should be made of the PRC's territorial claims against its neighbors. According to the statements of the Chinese leadership and various types of "historical" publications and maps, the overall territory which Beijing considers as "lost" almost exceeds the area of China itself.

The Beijing leadership, which uses China's ties with Chinese communities in foreign countries, with their bourgeois leadership above all, is trying to extract in its favor a considerable share of the national income of these countries. Available estimates show that Beijing's annual profit from trade with the developing countries ranges between \$1 billion and \$1.7 billion. These funds are subsequently used to pay the West for China's purchases aimed at updating the military-economic potential of the PRC.

China is particularly hostile to countries engaged in implementing deep socio-economic changes such as, for example, Angola, Afghanistan, Ethiopia and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. Therefore, today's Beijing policy is exceptionally threatening to the peoples fighting for national liberation, national independence and social progress.

The energizing of aggressive neocolonialist intrigues and the mobilizing of all global reactionary forces against the liberation movement make the unification of the forces of national liberation, the international working class and the world socialist comity even more urgent.

Everyday life proves the error of the concept that as primary objectives of national liberation are achieved the interaction among these three basic currents of world progress loses its previous importance. Such a picture may be presented only by those who are not interested in national and social progress, those who, riding the crest of the national liberation struggle, are now inclined to reach an agreement with imperialism and believe that the time has come, so to say, for "sounding taps and folding the flags."

The Sadat movement is a typical example of such a position which embodies the betrayal of the interests of the liberation struggle. Everywhere imperialism is

trying to raise large and small Sadats and to put them in power. Here and there they succeed. This is directly related to the aggravation of the class struggle in the liberated countries and the trends toward a bourgeois degeneration which have become apparent in a number of countries. The basic interests and expectations of the peoples adamantly call for the surmounting of such harmful trends and for a decisive struggle against them. There is no question that in the wide stream of the liberation struggle forces able to block such trends will be found.

We, the Soviet communists, are convinced that however complex and circuitous the development of the anti-imperialist movement might have been, with its occasional failures, the future is its own, provided that it firmly follows the general stream of the revolutionary, peace-loving and liberation forces of our time.

International associations such as, for example, the Organization of African Unity, play an important role in the joint actions of nations fighting imperialism and neocolonialism. The nonalignment movement has become a particularly influential global political factor today. This was reconfirmed at the September 1979 Havana Conference of Heads of States and Governments of Nonaligned Countries. The participants in the conference and the speeches and documents confirmed their resolve to maintain their anti-imperialist positions and struggle for the common cause of the peace, independence and security of the peoples and for social progress. The USSR and the other members of the socialist comity ascribe major importance to the joint efforts of the nonaligned countries and sincerely try to develop cooperation with them. A broad objective base of reciprocal interest and common and similar positions held on the main problems of global development exists for this purpose. The interests of the peoples of the nonaligned countries objectively coincide with the interests of all forces in contemporary society who oppose aggressive imperialist activities, favor international detente and are against the unrestrained growth of armaments. On the other hand, the interests of the nonaligned countries are tremendously harmed by the exploitation of their natural resources and the acquisition of the results of the toil of their populations by imperialism, the monopolies and the entire neocolonialist system.

Of late we have witnessed the increased efforts of international reaction to emasculate the anti-imperialist trend in the nonaligned movement, to divide its ranks and to pit it against the socialist comity and other progressive peace-loving forces. The concept of "equidistance" has become the instrument for such attempts. Efforts are being made to depict this "equidistance" as a condition for the autonomous role of the nonaligned movement. We must not forget, however, the role which the cooperation between the new national states and the socialist countries played in the organization of the nonaligned movement as an influential and independent international force. "Equidistance" between a policy of peace and a policy of war, and between a policy of freedom for the peoples and a policy of neocolonialism, radically conflicts with the historical objectives of the non-aligned countries and hinders the enhancement of their independent role in world politics.

What are the main directions followed in the cooperation between developing countries and the members of the socialist comity, the international workers movement and other progressive forces?

They are above all the joint efforts undertaken in favor of strengthening the peace and security of the peoples, blocking imperialist aggression, and opposing neocolonialist attempts to "replay history," i.e., to secure for themselves, once again, the possibility of unhindered exploitation of the liberated countries. The struggle for the consolidation of the peace and for detente is truly inseparable from the struggle against colonialism and racism and for strengthening the political independence of the young national states and achieving their economic liberation.

The time is past when the imperialists and the Beijing hegemonists were able to impose upon the liberated countries the thesis that the cause of disarmament did not concern them and that the arms race was not a vitally important problem in their case. Today these countries realize the tremendous resources which the arms race extracts from them. The imperialists in the United States, Great Britain and other countries extract billions from the former colonies, funds which they subsequently use for the arms race, for arms aimed at the peace-loving nations.

This applies both to resources spent by the developing countries themselves for military purposes as well as funds which they might receive as foreign aid. Available data show that in the past 20 years the share of these countries in global armament expenditures has risen from 4 to 15 percent. Whereas in 1970 their direct military expenditures totaled about \$40 billion, by 1979 they had reached \$90 billion. The countries which joined the imperialist military-political blocs became the first targets of militarization and "pioneers" in the stockpiling of weapons. This is confirmed most of all by the Egyptian example. Countries assigned the role of imperialist policemen are being literally flooded with imported weapons.

Naturally, the rise of international tension related to this course forces the peace-loving countries as well to be concerned with their defense requirements and to produce and acquire the armaments they need. The final result is the expenditure of vast funds which are so urgently needed for the elimination of economic backwardness, hunger and poverty.

The Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity have long and adamantly called for putting a stop to the arms race, reducing military budgets, and allocating some of the funds thus released for increased aid to Asian, African and Latin American countries. At the last United Nations General Assembly session the Soviet Union proclaimed its readiness to agree on the size of the funds which can be set aside by each country which lowers its military budget for the purpose of increasing such economic aid. Our course of detente and disarmament is fully consistent with development tasks. That is precisely why the positions of the socialist and the liberated countries are so similar on matters of disarmament, nuclear disarmament included. This similarity or closeness of positions made a contribution to the constructive results of the special UN General Assembly session on disarmament and has been reflected in numerous documents jointly adopted at different meetings.

Experience proves, however, that good resolutions alone will not stop the plots of the aggressive imperialist forces and of the military-industrial complex



backing them. All forces must be energized. The broad popular masses must act. Active cooperation must be organized among all countries interested in strengthening the peace and disarmament.

The practice of relations between liberated and socialist countries includes the specific application of the principles of equality, mutual benefit and anti-imperialist solidarity. Today, when these countries raise the question of a radical reorganization of international economic relations and of eliminating from their areas any manifestations of discrimination, tyranny and exploitation, they can rely on the practical experience achieved in maintaining international relations of a new type.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries actively support the anti-imperialist nature of the Charter of Economic Rights and Obligations of States and the Declaration on the Organization of A New International Economic Order, drafted as a result of equal cooperation and adopted by the United Nations.

The tasks of eliminating discrimination and any artificial barriers in international trade and of the abolishment of all manifestations of inequality, tyranny and exploitation in international economic relations were formulated at our 25th party congress as part of the program for the further struggle for peace and international cooperation and for the freedom and independence of the peoples. At the recently held special session of the United Nations General Assembly on economic problems, the socialist countries actively supported, yet once again, the just demands of the new countries.

The direct economic help provided by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries for the economic development of the liberated states is of major importance. The role which the socialist comity plays in the development of the independent industrial potential of these countries is confirmed, for example, by the fact that today over 40 percent of the pig iron and approximately 30 percent of the steel produced in Asian and African countries is smelted at enterprises built with the help of the Soviet Union. The development of a national energy, metallurgical and machine building industries--in fact that of all such sectors within the state economic sector--has been and is being greatly assisted by the economic aid of the socialist comity.

The assistance and experience of world socialism have played a major role in the elaboration of the principles of national sovereignty over natural resources, ways and means for the utilization of natural resources, the development of science, the organization of public education, the training of national cadres, and the development of health care. Cultural relations, which contribute to the reciprocal enrichment of spiritual values, are of great significance.

The very existence and strengthening of the world socialist system have a major impact on economic relations between liberated and imperialist countries. The latter are frequently forced to take into consideration the economic aid of the socialist comity and make concessions to the liberated countries.

The progressive forces of the developing world are becoming ever more fully aware of the fact that the reorganization of international economic relations on a



democratic basis depends, above all, on the extent to which they themselves are systematically fighting neocolonialism and exercising effective control over the imperialist monopolies, and the extent to which they use the positive experience of the socialist countries in the creation of their independent national economies.

As we know, motivated by the desire to isolate the developing countries from world socialism, imperialism and its Beijing accomplices are actively exploiting the false concept of the "poor" nations of the "south," allegedly opposing the "rich" nations of the "north," among which they include the USSR and the other socialist countries. This concept, which distorts the historically existing situation, also holds the socialist countries responsible for the calamitous situation of the peoples of the "south."

Our country is not denying the legitimacy of raising the question of obtaining additional foreign funds to finance the economic development programs of the former colonies. However, the contribution of such foreign funds should be considered in connection with compensation for the losses previously inflicted on the new countries by the former mother countries as well as a certain compensation for the losses they are suffering today as a result of the activities of the multinational monopolies.

Cooperation between the liberated countries and the socialist countries and the organization of their joint actions with the working class in the capitalist countries in the struggle against the common exploiter—the multinational corporations—could and should contribute to the satisfaction of just demands and to putting an end to the exploitation of the peoples of the developing countries.

### III. A Socialist Orientation Is A Guarantee for A Successful Struggle for A National Renaissance and Social Progress

In our days the struggle against imperialism and for political and economic independence is also a struggle against reactionary internal forces on which imperialism relies.

With regard to the national liberation zone, the countries with a socialist orientation or countries following the path of socialism are in the lead in this struggle. They include countries with varying levels of development and of maturity in social relations. Differences exist among them also in terms of the specific objectives which their leading vanguards set themselves at any given stage. As a whole, however, it is a question of countries in Asia, Africa and Central America which, following the victory of the anti-imperialist, antifeudal and democratic revolutions, have engaged or are engaging in a transition to socialism.

In the past decade the range of such countries has broadened. This is noteworthy and is yet another proof of the fact that our age is an age of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism on a global scale.

As we know, Lenin was the first to substantiate the possibility for an individual country to bypass or shorten the capitalist stage of development. He predicted that the struggle waged by the majority of mankind against colonial oppression,

dependency and backwardness will directly grow into a struggle against capitalism, in the course of which the peoples left behind in their development will be able to rely on the countries of victorious socialism. Reality has fully confirmed this brilliant prediction.

The course of events confirms the conclusions codified in the CPSU program. "Capitalism is the path of people's sufferings," it states. "It will not insure fast economic progress or the elimination of poverty.... Imperialism remains the main enemy and main obstacle to the solution of national problems facing the young sovereign states and all dependent countries." Reality has confirmed and proves with every passing day the fact that the path of the new countries is not that of imperialism and that objectively their present and future interests are close to or coincide with the interests of the countries of victorious socialism. The socialist countries actively support the progressive revolutionary-democratic forces and movements which favor the socialist choice and are trying to implement it. This is a specific manifestation of the class internationalist nature of socialist foreign policy. In turn, the countries which have taken the path of socialism legitimately consider the socialist comity their closest and natural friend and fellow worker, sharing their cause.

Today we cannot conceive of the political and social picture of the world without a large group of countries in Asia, Africa and Central America having undertaken to reorganize their societies on the basis of socialist principles. It is precisely because a socialist orientation or a course toward socialism is proving its viability that it is so fiercely attacked by imperialism.

The existence of real socialism makes it possible for countries with a socialist orientation to oppose more effectively the policy of imperialist interference and aggression, to use the historical experience already acquired in building a new society and gain broad access to contemporary scientific knowledge and to the latest equipment and technology, and to achieve substantial progress in cadre training.

Relations largely based on common objectives and interests have developed and are developing between countries with a socialist orientation and the members of the socialist comity. These are relations of solidarity and mutual aid and mutually profitable cooperation.

It is clear, however, that the existence of favorable external prerequisites does not automatically insure the success of the struggle for socialist ideals. This struggle demands the adamant and tireless efforts of the broad people's masses and of their political vanguard. The socialist system is created in the course of a decisive struggle waged by the progressive forces of society and as a result of the adamant constructive toil of the entire people. Only this makes possible the establishment of a new type of social relations and the new man, a member of a society following the path of socialism.

Naturally, the most important factor is making the position of the countries with a socialist orientation ever stronger and firmer. This is no easy task, for imperialism, allied with the internal reactionary forces, is constantly trying to undermine the progressive regimes. Such attempts are quite dangerous. Suffice

it to take as an example Egypt and Somalia. Subversions, conspiracies and even open intervention, as is the case with Afghanistan, speculation on economic difficulties and backwardness, and the promotion of national and tribal discord are all used by imperialism.

The entire past historical experience proves that in order to preserve and strengthen their progressive positions these countries must:

Have a revolutionary party guiding their society and acting on the basis of scientific socialism;

Strengthen, from top to bottom, the organs of democratic power established after the abolishment of the colonial rule;

Train and raise party and state cadres loyal to the toiling masses and the cause of socialism;

Strengthen national armed forces capable of defending the gains of the people;

Steadily expand the ties between the party and the state and the masses, and draw the working people into the administration of public affairs;

Pursue a correct economic and social policy which insures the strengthened independence of the country, raises the level of output and improves the people's living conditions;

Develop relations with the socialist countries--the most loyal and reliable friends of independent, freedom-loving countries.

Even though, as we mentioned, the countries which have proclaimed a course of socialist orientation or of development along the socialist path differ in stages of development, in all of them priority must be given to the need for ideological-political leadership on the part of a revolutionary vanguard party. The links between such a party and the people play a tremendous role. Life teaches us that only a party which lives within the people, knowing the people's moods and expectations, a party which can approach the masses and earn their trust can in practice insure the implementation of plans with a socialist orientation.

In order to implement socialist ideals the resistance of socially hostile elements and the inertia of the old order must be surmounted. National ethnic and religious problems must be resolved within the framework of democratic statehood. The involvement of young people in the affairs of the state, party-political work with the army, and involving the army in social reorganization work are exceptionally important in the course of the creation of a new governmental apparatus.

The solution of all these complex problems will require the training of a large number of skilled specialists within a very short time. This is quite difficult but attainable, particularly when we take into consideration the possibility of using the experience and aid of the USSR and the other fraternal socialist

countries. Our doors are open for the training of cadres. We are ready to send our specialists to train cadres locally.

Economic policy is the most important area of activity for vanguard parties. Its complexity lies in the need simultaneously to engage in the creation of a new material and technical base and to improve the life of the working people. Under such circumstances the leadership of the countries with a socialist orientation finds that the solution lies in making gradual progress, avoiding the artificial acceleration of social changes. Naturally, priority is given to the problem of the most rational utilization of internal sources of accumulation and the development of natural resources. The development of cooperatives in agriculture and crafts is of great importance. However, they must be developed while taking into consideration the ripening of proper conditions and improvements in the work of enterprises within the state sector. The experience of a number of countries with a socialist orientation proves the useful role which private enterprise could play with proper governmental control.

The utilization of internal resources is related to the development of a new attitude toward labor based on conscientious discipline and to understanding the difficulties accompanying development of the new economy.

A decisive step, indeed even a turning point, insuring success in a course with a socialist orientation, is development of a situation in which the working people really feel the results of the revolution, not only in the moral-political sense—a feeling of human dignity and respect for the working man—but on the level of a substantial improvement in living conditions as well.

The experience in laying the foundations of the new society acquired by the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity is of major value to countries which have taken the path of socialist changes. We know that fraternal Mongolia bypassed capitalism to reach socialism. The new economic policy (NEP), which the great Lenin formulated, provided priceless experience in how the revolutionary system, having assumed command levels in a multiple-tiered economy insures the combination of the interests of the town and country working people with those of the state and of the building of socialism. In this case a variety of forms of economic management are possible—state, state-capitalist, cooperative and private-capitalist—for rebuilding the economy, promoting industrialization and the technical retooling of the farms, and the establishment of cooperatives in the countryside as conditions for such steps mature and in accordance with the level of conscientiousness reached by the peasantry.

When we discuss the significance of the experience of the socialist countries we must emphasize that it neither is nor could it be a question of any kind of duplication of our models. There are different paths of transition to socialism. The practical experience of the countries with a socialist orientation is introducing and will introduce in this area a great many new developments. It is understandable that each of them tries to find the ways and means of reorganization which would be consistent with its specific conditions and national characteristics.



The increased role of the head ministries as well will help to improve the coordination of the work among related sectors. Even though industrial ministries are based on the sectorial principle, usually their systems fail to include many enterprises within the sector and they have borne no responsibility for the output of such "separated" enterprises.

Now the situation has been radically changed. The head ministries will be answerable for supplying the country with all necessary products even, if they are produced at enterprises not under their jurisdiction. This is an important organizational innovation. Its real implementation, however, will require a corresponding legal mechanism which will enable the head ministries to influence the work of associations and enterprises not within their jurisdiction.

Naturally, managing the subunits within its own system remains the main task of any ministry. In this respect as well the decree on economic mechanisms contains important stipulations. They substantially strengthen existing and proven experience. In general, this document is characterized by a combination of new concepts and already developed and proven ones. In particular, this applies to a conversion to the two- and three-step industrial management system. This management structure will now be applied in construction and, subsequently, in transportation.

Let us also note, however, some essentially new directions in controlling the activities of economic ministries. It is particularly important to note their work based on cost-effectiveness. This was preceded by the experimental testing of the system at the Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment and Control Systems and other industrial ministries. Positive economic results were achieved.

Furthermore, an extensive discussion was held with the participation of economists and jurists, in the course of which various views were expressed on the possibility and expediency of organizing ministry work on a cost-effectiveness basis. An attempt was made to reduce cost effectiveness merely to commodity-monetary relations and to pit them against economic-management relations which, allegedly, could not be based on cost effectiveness. Such statements ignored the unity of economic relations, both horizontal and vertical, and the fact that the ministry is not only an organ of state management but a center of an economic system. If such a system operates on a cost effectiveness basis, its center as well must be guided by the same principle. In a way, the decree is a summation of the results of this discussion. It directly stipulates that cost effectiveness methods must be developed in the activities of industrial and construction ministries. This provides an economic base for the management of national economic sectors.

Naturally, cost effectiveness could be applied only by economic ministries and not by ministries doing administrative-political or sociocultural work. However, the activities of both are now governed by a single general regulation. In our view, this is no longer consistent with the task of improving the economic mechanism. Clearly, a special regulation should be issued on economic ministries which will stipulate the procedure governing their work on a cost effectiveness basis.



Finally, let us emphasize the following: the all-round strengthening of the countries with a socialist orientation or countries which have taken the path of the building of socialism is of tremendous international significance. The peoples of many countries freed from colonialism are closely watching the development of these countries and are studying their experience. Therefore, their successful progress will greatly determine the choice which will be made by previously enslaved peoples in selecting the path for their further social development, determining their historical destinies and, as a whole, strengthening the anti-imperialist positions in the world.

In summation, let us say the following:

First. The joint actions and mutual understanding among the forces of world socialism, the workers movement in the capitalist countries and the national liberation forces are required in order to secure peace and social progress. Their joint efforts are scheduled to play an outstanding role in insuring the security of the peoples and the reorganization of the world on the basis of equality, freedom, democracy and justice. Unity among the three main currents in the contemporary revolutionary process will remain the locomotive engine of global progress.

Second. In the present international circumstances, the following aspects of our joint struggle assume priority:

Energetic actions for countering the growing threat of a global thermonuclear war and attempts to disturb detente and the joint struggle for a termination of the arms race;

Rebuff of the policy of "neocolonialist revenge," and of the imperialist line of tyranny and blackmail and encroachments on the autonomy of independent countries, their resources and their territorial integrity;

Adoption of counteractions to the chauvinistic course pursued by Beijing which is allying itself with imperialism;

Struggle for a democratic reorganization of international economic relations; and

Naturally, constant struggle against attempted ideological imperialist expansion and against anticommunism and anti-Sovietism, used to conceal an aggressive and neocolonialist course.

Third. As in the past--and even to a greater extent--the interaction among the ruling parties of the socialist countries, the communist parties of other countries, the vanguard parties in countries with a socialist orientation and all progressive forces in the new countries will play a tremendous role in the solution of the major problems of global development.

We are confident that however strongly the forces of reaction, militarism and colonial robbery may be raging, the cause of freedom and social progress of the peoples is irresistible. Its final triumph is guaranteed by the unity of world socialism, the international working class and the national liberation forces.

5003  
CSO: 1802

## ECONOMIC MECHANISM AND ECONOMIC LAW

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 80 pp 45-56

[Article by V. Laptev, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member]

[Text] Currently our country is implementing measures for the reorganization of the economic mechanism. These measures have been defined in a number of party and state documents. Their purpose is to upgrade public production effectiveness. The decree of the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers on improving the economic mechanism, passed in July 1979, is of fundamental importance in this respect.

### The Legal Regulation of the Economy Is An Element of the Economic Mechanism

As we know, the management and implementation of economic activities in our country are based on laws consistent with economic legislation. The norms of economic law regulate relations which develop among the units of the economic mechanism horizontally and vertically. Therefore, legal control is an inseparable element of the economic mechanism of the socialist society.

There is only one economic mechanism which covers all sectors and areas of the socialist economy. The USSR Constitution emphasizes that our country's economy is a single national economic complex covering all units of social production, distribution and exchange. As a single system, the socialist economy consists of sectorial, intersectorial and territorial subsystems which encompass units on a relatively lower level.

The systems approach to the organization of the socialist economy reflects the rising level of production socialization, concentration and specialization, and the expansion and increased complexity of economic relations reached at the mature socialist stage. These circumstances require the rational combination of centralized management with the economic autonomy and initiative of enterprises, associations, and other economic units. This is largely attained with the help of the legal regulation of economic relations through the legislatively established procedures governing management and exercise of economic activities.

Naturally, the legal support of the economic mechanism cannot be reduced merely to said functions. It is equally important to insure a rational legal organization of labor relations, utilization of nature and environmental protection, activities of local soviets in managing the economy and struggle against economic crimes and administrative misdemeanors in the economic area. Naturally, this is

insured not only by economic means but with the help of other areas of the law: labor, environmental protection, administrative, or criminal.

However, economic law is the core of the legal regulation of the economic mechanism and its main nucleus. It is precisely its norm that regulates economic relations among the different units within the socialist economy. It is with its help that the mechanism of the socialist economy is strengthened and becomes firm, stable and viable.

The consideration of these problems is of both theoretical and practical value. Above all, improvements in the respective legislation are necessary. The party and government decree on the economic mechanism provides essentially new solutions and defines the basic directions for the development of socialist economic management. The practical implementation of these solutions requires the formulation of an efficient legal mechanism. Only thus could they be successfully implemented. The formulation of a number of essentially departmental laws is stipulated in the decree itself. Essentially, this means the drafting of methodical instructions and regulations. A number of them have been already formulated and approved.

Legal support of the advancement of the economic mechanism will also require the formulation of laws and governmental decrees, i.e., juridical acts on a higher level, which will make it possible to resolve most important economic problems. Now the task of juridical science is to elaborate the theoretical foundations for the improvement of economic legislation and to draft practical recommendations aimed at improving the legal regulation of the national economy.

#### Improvements in Economic Management and the Law

In recent years great attention has been paid to improving economic management. This particularly applies to the management of industrial sectors where, on the basis of general plans, important measures were implemented to increase production specialization, cooperation and concentration, reduce the number of management stages, create associations, combine science with production, and develop cost effectiveness and economic management methods. Essentially, all this has yielded positive results and contributed to improvements in sectorial management.

However, the coordination of activities among related industrial and national economic sectors remains an unresolved problem. We have 15 machine-building ministries. Their work, however, is extremely poorly coordinated. The decisions of the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum particularly stressed the need to improve the management of sectors which are organically related and represent single economic complexes.

Above all, the role of the functional organs such as the Gosplan, Gosstab, State Committee for Science and Technology, Gosstandart and some others, all of which provide overall control and intersectorial national economic management, will be strengthened. In their own areas they will make decisions binding upon all ministries and departments. They are now assuming new tasks which should upgrade their work effectiveness in correlating activities of related industrial sectors and within the entire national economy.

The decree on the economic mechanism confirms the accuracy of the creation of associations. This is quite important considering the fact that some scientific and practical workers have tried to question the need for and usefulness of them. The press has frequently published cases of formal organization of production associations and the failure of such projects in some ministries, caused by sluggishness, mental inertia, attachment to the old methods and unwillingness to reorganize.

Let us point out, however, that the extensive development of the associations is obstructed by the lack of a single legal base for their organization. We have a governmental regulation on the production association (combine) which applies to industry only. In the case of other sectors (construction, transportation) where such work is to be done, the procedure governing the organization and activities of associations is based on departmental regulations. Furthermore, frequently different solutions are found for essential, vital problems which require a single legal regulation. Thus, the production units of industrial associations can keep only checking accounts but not payment accounts, whereas in industry they have payment accounts as well, as stipulated in the Regulation on the Industrial Construction-Assembly Association approved by the USSR Gosstroy. But is such a disparity in the solution of problems reflecting the very essence of production associations admissible? Naturally, it is not! In this case a single legal regulation must prevail and if production units cannot settle accounts from their checking accounts (which, in fact, they do not), payment accounts should be opened for all territorially distant production units in construction and industry alike.

Even greater disparities exist in the legal regulations governing the activities of production associations in agriculture. Whereas in all economic sectors production associations are considered basic organizations including production units which do not enjoy enterprise status, agricultural production associations include autonomous enterprises. This distorts the very nature of the production association, which is converted from a basic unit into a middle economic unit.

In our view, in order to eliminate this disparity, a general regulation on production associations for all economic sectors should be formulated. It should include the necessary sectorial characteristics. This practice was tested and proved fully consistent with enterprise activities.

The decree on the economic mechanism emphasizes that the brigade method becomes the basic production organization method. It is very important to pay greater attention to brigade cost effectiveness and to improving the legal organization of brigade activities. However, the solution of such problems is hindered by the lagging of the law and by the fact that some scientists reject the legal nature of relations among enterprise subunits, claiming that such relations are not of a commodity-monetary nature. Matters have gone so far that relations among production units within associations are considered contrary to the law even though the legislation directly stipulates the existence of their fields of competence and rights and obligations in resolving problems of economic activities. Such views make practical work ineffective. They are theoretically groundless and are based on the overestimating of the role of commodity-monetary relations under



socialism, whereas planning rather than marketability is the determining feature in socialist economic relations.

### The Legal Aspects of Planning

Measures for the improvement of planning hold a central position in the decree on the economic mechanism. Here the basic principle is that planning must be directed toward end national economic results. For this purpose the role of long-term plans is being increased, a new system of planning documents is introduced, comprehensive target programs are drafted, and new planning indicators are set.

Planning is essentially an economic activity. However, it is carried out within legal forms in accordance with the legislation which defines the planning principles and procedures and the range of competence of the planning organs. That is why planning and legislative improvements are inseparably linked.

From the juridical viewpoint, the list of directival indicators issued enterprises and associations provides demarcation of the rights of superior organs and lower economic units: directival indicators are defined by superior organs while accountability indicators are formulated by the enterprises and production associations themselves.

According to the decree on the economic mechanism, planned indicators have now been defined and the range of competence governing their approval has been formulated. However, this is not to say in the least that all problems will be automatically resolved. The point is that previously as well the legislation stipulated the rights of enterprises and associations in the planning area. However, they were frequently violated by superior planning or economic organs. Such violations were justifiably denounced in the decisions of the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum. Therefore, the stipulation of rights is insufficient. One must provide the juridical guarantees for their exercise. Effective measures must be formulated to insure the observance of the law in economic planning and management relations. Only then will the new economic mechanism operate successfully and effectively. This equally applies to planned norms, whose role has been considerably enhanced due to the fact that they will be defined within the five-year plan, along with the basic indicators. This creates a firm base for scientific planning. Here again, however, the juridical aspect of the matter is quite important. In the past as well such norms were occasionally set. Frequently, however, the superior planning and economic organs proceeded from the fact that they mandatorily applied to enterprises and associations only and not to themselves. This created grounds for planning on the basis of levels reached. Therefore, we must juridically codify the mandatory nature of norms not only for enterprises and associations but for superior planning and economic organs as well.

The formulation of registration documents for each enterprise and production association upgrades the scientific standard of planning. This document should provide data on production capacities. It supplies an objective base for the planning of their economic activities. We must proceed from the fact that the registration of enterprises and production associations is of both economical and juridical significance. In other words, the planned assignment issued the enterprise must be consistent with its certificate.



The improvement of planning legislation is the only means for improving planning. A tremendous number of laws operate in this area. Some of them are quite obsolete and conflict with others. Following is a single example: Item 57 of the Regulation On the Production Association stipulates that the ministries must resolve the problem of planning association activities with or without consideration of internal turnover; Item 2 and 3 of the 10 March 1976 instruction of the Gosplan, Central Statistical Administration and USSR Ministry of Finance stipulate that internal turnover does not have to be considered. The result is the simultaneous effect of two laws which contain conflicting stipulations. Furthermore, the Regulation On the Production Association approved by the government and the departmental normative documents must be consistent with the instruction. The lack of such consistency is a violation of socialist law. Legislative lack of coordination such as this reduces the effectiveness of the laws, undermines their authority in the eyes of economic managers and hinders the functioning of the economic mechanism.

What is the solution? The solution is to turn planning legislation into a single system and to create a single normative act which will stipulate the principles governing planning, the range of competence of planning organs, and their inter-relationship on the sectorial and territorial levels; such an act would strengthen the juridical importance of plan indicators and norms and stipulate measures of responsibility and guarantees for observing planning laws.

The USSR Constitution stipulates that economic management is achieved in accordance with the sectorial and territorial principles. The legislation must clearly establish the correlation between these principles. In terms of planning the decree on the economic mechanism includes certain rules on the matter. Among them are the coordination of sectorial development plans between ministries and councils of ministers of union republics, the submission to local organs of plans of enterprises and associations under superior jurisdiction, the formulation of correlated territorial plans and balances for production distribution, and the creation of territorial-production complexes.

Territorial-production complexes and industrial centers have been created in the past as well. This includes the establishment of the Zapadno-Sibirskiy, Bratsko-Ust'-ilimskiy, Orenburgskiy, Nizhnekamskiy and several other complexes. However, frequently the activities of territorial-production complexes were insufficiently effective largely because of the existence of unresolved problems regarding their legal organization, confusion in the ratios between rights and obligations of sectorial and territorial organs in charge of their administration, and the undefined functions of the local soviets in the management of the complexes. In order to resolve such problems it would be expedient to draft a regulation on territorial-production complexes.

#### The Economic Contract As A Planning Instrument

The idea of upgrading the role of the economic contract in the planning and organization of economic relations runs throughout the decree on the economic mechanism. The role of the economic contract as a planning instrument is explained by the fact that any, even the most rigid, planning system leaves unanswered problems which are not defined in the planned assignment and must be resolved by the enterprises themselves. Whenever this affects consumers' interests, such problems

must be resolved not one-sidedly but in coordination with the client organization, through the conclusion of an economic contract. Therefore, the contract represents a joint planning decision which shapes the production program of participating economic organs.

The decree on the economic mechanism stipulates that production associations and enterprises must define in their annual plans the type and variety of goods to be produced on the basis of consumer orders and in accordance with concluded contracts.

The implementation of this very important stipulation will contribute to the development of long-term direct economic relations. Their implementation presumes the conclusion of long-term (5-year as a rule) contracts. This is consistent with the conversion of the five-year plan into a basic form of planning. Such contracts make it possible to concretize the assignments of the five-year plan in accordance with the requirements of enterprises and associations and, on this basis, to formulate an annual plan for nomenclature and variety.

The realm of economic-contractual relations is being expanded as well. Whereas previously contracts were concluded, as a rule, between organizations on the primary level--enterprises and production associations--now they are being developed also in the middle level of the economic system. Following the publication of the General Regulation On All-Union and Republic Industrial Associations, the managements of such associations began to sign such contracts with union main supply and marketing administrations, which are the middle level organizations within the USSR Gosnab system. Currently this procedure is being introduced in wholesale trade as well.

The effective utilization of economic contracts in the socialist economy will enable each enterprise and production association to draft a list of goods to be manufactured and delivered. This list will be approved by the ministry with the participation of the USSR Gosnab. The list has a double legal significance. On the one hand, it safeguards the interests of manufacturing enterprises and associations, for they can be instructed to sign a contract only for goods they produce according to their specialization. On the other hand, this safeguards the interests of consumers. They have the right to demand the conclusion of contracts for any commodity included in the list, even if its manufacturing and procurement are unprofitable to the producer. Consequently, a firm base is created for the organization of economic relations and for the solution of precontract disputes by state arbitration organs whose work, in this respect, will become easier.

At the same time, however, not all problems related to upgrading the role of the economic contract have been fully settled. The point is that physical indicators are currently becoming more important--nomenclatures and varieties included in the five-year and the annual plans. However, the economic contract as well should define such indicators above all. Under such circumstances, how could the role of the contract be upgraded? In terms of the annual plan, the decree on the economic mechanism provides a clear answer to this question: nomenclature and variety must be defined in accordance with concluded contracts. Therefore, in this case the contract is the basis for the formulation of the plan.

The correlation between the economic contract and the five-year plan is structured differently. Here the plan, whose assignments are concretized in the contracts, is the basis. The decree stipulates that in the development of their five-year plans, associations and enterprises must engage together with the marketing organizations in preliminary work with consumers and suppliers in order to determine the nomenclature and variety of output required for the conclusion of economic contracts. Therefore, planning and contractual work become organically combined. This is consistent with the increased role of the economic contract as a planning instrument. However, the implementation of this rule requires an efficient legal mechanism. The implementation of preliminary precontract contacts between suppliers and consumers in the course of the formulation of the five-year plan must be specifically defined.

Improvements in planning in this direction are hindered by the fact that so far economic contracts have applied to civil legislation. The result is that gifts and legacies among private citizens and contracts among industrial giants are governed by the same norms. The only common element here is that all such relations involves property elements. However, in the economic contract they are inseparably linked with planning organizational elements which are not extended to civil legislation.

A practical solution to this problem was found in the promulgation of numerous laws governing deliveries, capital construction, freight haulage and other types of economic activities in which economic contracts are regulated as an intrinsic part of the plan. Such legal acts are issued by the government and various departments. However, they have no single legislative base and the artificial appending of economic contracts to civil legislation hinders their utilization as planning tools.

The gap between the legal regulation of the plan and the contract may be traced to the juridical tradition of early capitalist times when a clear demarcation existed between public and private law. At that time this was proper, since private individuals engaged in economic activities while the state merely controlled them in the interests of the ruling class. In the imperialist period this difference began to diminish. The capitalist state began to invade the economy and convert private into "public" law. It is even less acceptable in a socialist system in which productive capital is socialized and the state not only controls the economy but participates in economic activities through its enterprises, associations and other economic organs. For this reason, at the very dawn of the Soviet system, V. I. Lenin wrote that "We do not recognize anything 'private.' We consider everything in the economic field as being public-legal rather than private" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 44, p 398).

This Leninist instruction becomes particularly important under mature socialist conditions, when the scale of public production has expanded immeasurably, economic relations have become more complex, large economic systems have developed, and the socialist economy has become a single national economic complex. Under such circumstances, how could we develop the legal regulation of the plan and the economic contract? The task of upgrading production effectiveness calls for insuring inseparable unity between plan and contract at all legislative control levels.



Cost-effectiveness liability is an important factor in socialist economic management. Being essentially economic, it is implemented in its legal forms in accordance with the legislation, i.e., it has a juridical significance as well. Economic liability can be improved only by improving its legislation.

The effectiveness of liability in economic relations may be upgraded by introducing a procedure in which bonus funds are formed and bonuses are awarded not only on the basis of the fulfillment of the plan but of contractual obligations in terms of nomenclature and variety. This procedure is of basic importance under mature socialist conditions, when the fulfillment of the plan must meet factual social requirements as expressed in contractual obligations.

It is true that a formalistic approach was adopted on such matters by some sectors. A procedure was applied in which enterprise and association workers were awarded bonuses based on the fulfillment of contractual obligations by no more than 90 percent. Essentially, this is a profanation of the new system for the assessment of economic activities. It discredits the system and legalizes violations of legality in economic relations. Obviously, such types of "accounting" for the implementation of contractual obligations does not strengthen but, conversely, weakens contractual discipline.

However, the application of the new procedure for assessing economic activities by sectors which took a serious attitude toward this problem yielded positive results. Let us take as an example the automobile industry. The level of fulfillment of contractual obligations in terms of nomenclature and variety reached by this sector was low. Even in a well-organized association such as AvtoVaz, in 1977 it accounted for 96-97 percent; in other associations it was even lower: it was no more than 88 percent at Belavtomaz. The situation sharply changed when liability for the implementation of economic contracts was increased and the new system for assessing economic activities was introduced. As a result, today AvtoVaz is fulfilling its contractual obligations almost 100 percent, while Belavtomaz has reached 99 percent.

Therefore, the proper combination of cost effectiveness and contractual liability yields good results. At the same time, considerable shortcomings remain in the application of contractual liability. They include, above all, the reciprocal amnesty granted by economic organs, and their failure to use their rights in demanding penalties from organizations which have violated their economic obligations. The decree on the economic mechanism emphasizes the mandatory nature of demanding penalties from socialist organizations. However, in the past as well, legislation dealing with deliveries stipulated that penalties must be mandatorily claimed. Nevertheless, no such claims were filed. We believe that in this case a legal mechanism should be formulated to insure the implementation of this rule. On the one hand, the formulation of claims could be encouraged by adding a certain percentage of the penalties to the bonus funds of economic organs; on the other, liability should be stipulated for failure to file penalty claims.

We must also consider the extent of justification of the current procedure according to which supply-marketing, wholesale and transport organizations must pay to the state budget 95 percent of the differential between received and paid fines. This totally undermines the desire of such organizations to file claims.



Naturally, we must not allow any "enrichment" from penalties. Nevertheless, to provide some incentive for such organizations, the amount of the funds remaining at their disposal should be increased.

Furthermore, it is hardly natural to restrict the new system for assessing economic activities to industry, procurements and wholesale trade only. The fulfillment of economic contracts is no less important in capital construction, transportation and other economic sectors. Obviously, the procedure for setting up bonus funds and for awarding bonuses to workers on the basis of the fulfillment of the plan and of economic contracts must uniformly apply to all economic sectors. This will enable us to strengthen the orientation of economic activities toward the achievement of end national economic results.

The absence of a single regulation of responsibilities in economic relations and the different levels of responsibility of organizations belonging to different economic sectors are a major shortcoming of our economic legislation. Thus, groundless facilities have been granted to transport organizations whose responsibility has been reduced. This is one of the reasons for the poor work the transportation system. That is why, with full justification, the decree on the economic mechanism indicates the need to upgrade the responsibility of transport organizations. We must also increase the liability of energy procurement organizations, currently defined by the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification itself, for which reason, naturally, it has been reduced. The following question arises: Why is it that the ministry itself is allowed to determine the extent of its liability to energy consumers? The answer is simple-- because the legislation does not have general norms governing the liability of economic organs. This creates loopholes which weaken responsibility in some economic sectors.

#### Improving Economic Legislation

The condition of economic legislation substantially affects production effectiveness. As early as 1974, in discussing the legal regulation of economic activities, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that "Unfortunately, for a long time proper attention was not paid to such matters, as a result of which a number of unresolved problems have piled up. Each national economic sector is governed by thousands of different stipulations and instructions. Try and understand them! The more so since many such instructions have become obsolete and include unjustified restrictions and petty regulations. This hinders initiative and conflicts with the new requirements currently facing the economy."

In 1975 the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers passed the special decree "On Measures For the Further Improvement of Economic Legislation." Five years have passed since without any order being introduced into economic legislation. It remains cumbersome and conflicting, has no single base, and lags behind the requirements of economic development.

Naturally, it would be wrong to claim that in recent years nothing at all has been done to improve the legal regulation of economic relations. A number of obsolete laws have been annulled. Ministries, associations and enterprises have begun to use legal instruments more actively for improving economic activity

indicators. A number of ministries "clarified" departmental rulings and issued systematized "departmental legislation" collections. Unfortunately, however, in a number of cases these collections proved to be so cumbersome as to make their use difficult. Thus, the collection issued by the USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy comes in 13 volumes. The collection entitled "Legislation on Capital Construction" comes in 10 volumes, most of which cover departmental regulations. However, it is precisely they that frequently contain unjustified restrictions of economic rights of enterprises and associations, something which hinders improvements in the economic mechanism.

The following question arises: Why has the volume of departmental rules become so inflated? The point is that there are problems which, objectively, require legal regulation but have remained unresolved so far on the level of governmental laws and decrees. This is the reason for which the various departments must issue large numbers of regulations and instructions to fill the existing juridical vacuum. The main task, therefore, is not the streamlining of departmental regulations but the legislative formulation of general norms of economic law which would uniformly resolve the main problems in the legal control of management and economic activities in all economic sectors.

The further development of economic legislation must be consistent with the main stipulations of the decree on the economic mechanism. In this connection, the uniform approach to the entire national economy, to the economic mechanism as a whole, characteristic of the decree, is of great importance. The measures to improve the economic mechanism apply to industry and construction and, subsequently, will be extended to transportation, while some of them cover the entire national economy. This approach is entirely consistent with the integral nature of the socialist economy as a national economic complex which includes all units engaged in public production, distribution and trade in the country. However, along with a general approach to the entire national economy, specific features are stipulated governing the application of some measures in individual sectors. Consequently, the general and the particular are combined in the regulation of economic relations.

This stipulation must also be considered as determining the subsequent development of economic legislation. Like the economic mechanism, this legislative sector must represent a unified system. However, no system could exist without a single pivot, without a central unit. So far there is no such pivot in economic legislation. This is the reason for its major shortcomings, lack of coordination, contradictions, and the repetitiveness of identical rules in various laws which make the laws cumbersome and difficult to master.

A single basic law governing economic relations must be drafted for the sake of eliminating shortcomings in economic legislation and making the legal regulation of the economy entirely consistent with the tasks of improving the economic mechanism. The USSR Economic Code could become such a law. It would include the general norms of economic law applicable to the entire national economy. Laws could be formulated on this basis for the individual economic sectors and types of economic activities.

The improvement of economic legislation is a necessary prerequisite for improving the economic mechanism. However, the drafting of good legislation is insufficient. The legislative stipulations must be implemented and legality in economic relations must be strictly observed. Only then could proper order be brought into the economy. In this respect state arbitration, which deals with economic disputes among socialist organizations, plays an essential role. The improvement of the economic mechanism will considerably enhance the significance of arbitration in the socialist economy. This was reflected in the 30 November 1979 Law on USSR State Arbitration.

Production effectiveness greatly depends on legal work in the national economy too, involving more than 60,000 attorneys, who exert great influence on improving management and implementing economic activities through the use of legal instruments. The attorneys not only insure the legal aspects of the activities of economic organs but contribute to the proper organization of contractual work, the strengthening of cost effectiveness, the protection of socialist property, and the defense of the economic rights and interests of enterprises and associations. Properly organized legal work makes it possible to improve the indicators of economic organs. Thus, the efficient work done by the juridical service of Kiev's Zavod Arsenal Production Association contributes to its annual saving of funds ranging from 10 to 13 percent of the planned profit of the association.

However, it would be wrong to believe that only attorneys must engage in legal work in economic organs. In the broad meaning of the term it must involve economic managers as well, for management decisions control economic relations. This is accomplished in legal forms, in accordance with the rights granted by the laws. Therefore, when we discuss the need to improve legal work in the national economy we have in mind the work not only of the legal services but of economic managers as well. In this connection it is important to upgrade their legal knowledge and to insure the study of economic law not only in law schools but in economic and engineering-technical VUZs as well.

Improvements in the legal regulation of economic relations and the active use of legal instruments in the organization of the economy will contribute to upgrading social production effectiveness, improving socialist economic management in our country.

5003  
CSO: 1802

## PERFECTING THE ORGANIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 80 pp 57-69

[Article by G. Karavayev, USSR minister of construction]

[Text] The Soviet people welcomed with great enthusiasm the decisions of the October 1980 CC CPSU Plenum on the draft State Plan For the Economic and Social Development of the USSR and USSR State Budget for 1981. The stipulations and conclusions contained in the speech which Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, delivered at the plenum direct the party and Soviet people to the solution of the basic problems related to upgrading the living standard of the Soviet people on the basis of the further growth of the country's economy and increased production effectiveness. Considerable attention was paid at the plenum to the situation in capital construction.

1

Great attention was paid to construction in the decrees of the party's Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers on improving planning and increasing the influence of the economic mechanism on upgrading production effectiveness and work quality. Our country is building extensively. In the first 4 years of the 10th Five-Year Plan alone, capital investments in the national economy exceeded 500 billion rubles. It is entirely clear that with such large-scale construction, the upgrading of its effectiveness is of primary importance.

In recent years the growth rate in the amount of construction and installation work and labor productivity has considerably slowed down and, in a number of contracting organizations, has even declined in the sector at large. The amount of unfinished output has increased. This reflects the scattering of resources among numerous simultaneous building projects, the lack of balance between planned assignments and material and technical and manpower resources, and shortcomings in material support, financing and crediting.

We must admit that construction workers as well are to be blamed for the existing situation. There are many cases in which, operating in relatively similar conditions, some subunits work successfully while others fall behind. There is no secret here. Success goes to those who begin the construction project with planned engineering preparations, who try to make use of industrial solutions more extensively and effectively, who mechanize manual labor to the maximum, who apply progressive organization of production and concentrate resources on target projects, and who properly organize the supply to the construction projects of..



all required materials and goods in accordance with work schedules. Wherever this is lacking results become entirely different.

It is this, above all, which explains the fact that at the construction projects of the Estonian Ministry of Construction, construction work worth one million rubles is done by 106 people compared with 135 at the Uzbek Ministry of Construction, 144 at the Turkmen Ministry of Construction, 179 at Tadzhikistan, 114 at the Glavzapstroy, 131 at the Glavvolgovyatskstroy, and even 186 at the construction sites of the Novgorod Territorial Administration.

Like the entire Soviet people, most construction workers labor with dedication at the implementation of their tasks. Their work is quite complex because of constantly changing sites and conditions. They are subjected to bitter cold, heat, rain and lack of roads. At the same time, the overall work results of the basic contracting organizations of the ministry have declined. About 70 percent of the sectorial organizations are failing to fulfill their planned assignments. It would be hardly possible to classify all their managers as "inadequate."

However, it would be equally wrong to explain these failings in terms of organizational shortcomings alone, the more so since the external reasons for the developed situation are quite well-known.

In our view, we must resolve the long-existing problems defined as early as the 28 May 1969 CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree, which instructed the USSR Gosplan to begin as of 1971 to "determine...the overall volume of capital investments...balanced against the material, manpower and financial resources and capacities of construction organizations. Unfortunately, no such balancing has been achieved to this day, nor is it included in the 1980 plan.

The volume plan must be drafted by territory in accordance with growth rates equal to the possibility of increasing labor productivity and manpower. This approach is dictated by the fact that, because of the demographic characteristics at the present, higher assignments cannot be supported by manpower resources. However, the USSR Gosplan continues to ignore the real possibilities of territorial construction organizations and is continuing, in planning volume of contractual work to ignore the big gap between assignments and the growth of labor productivity.

All this results in the scattering of material-technical and manpower resources among numerous construction projects, resulting in an increase in unfinished production. Despite many of the strictest possible decisions and instructions, the volume of simultaneously built projects has not been reduced. Carryover costs of initiated projects are so high that, considering today's capacities of contracting organizations, it would take over 4 years for the ministry to complete them. Let us add that in the 1978-1980 definitive plan for contractual work, from one-third to one-half of the ministry's organizations were heavily overloaded. In addition to everything else, the higher plans cause serious moral harm, objectively creating a lack of confidence in their implementation.

The splintering of resources among numerous construction projects encourages the constant desire of customers to "distribute" capital investments equally among

all projects and to include as many of them as possible in the plan for capital construction. It shows their persistent unwillingness to concentrate available resources on a limited number of most important priority projects. All this is the result of the poor implementation of the 28 May 1969 CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree we mentioned. It stipulates that the quarterly breakdown of the annual volume of contracted construction and installation projects by construction site and project should be carried out by the contracting organizations, with the agreement of the customers, on the basis of completion deadlines. However, as a rule, the clients refuse to accept the suggestions of the contractors, while the financing banks accept the breakdown of construction operations as presented by the clients. A refusal to conclude a contract for this reason may make the contractor liable to a fine (50 rubles per day of delay).

In order to eliminate such shortcomings in the USSR Gosplan planning, in our view, we must base the overall volume of contractual work in a given area on the real possibilities of the contracting construction organizations.

Unfortunately, occasionally the problems in the building and location of new enterprises are resolved by the client ministries without proper consideration and coordination with contracting construction ministries. Frequently the construction site turns out to be in an area where there are no construction organizations, transport facilities, or manpower resources to operate the future enterprise. No one disputes the fact that in many cases this is the proper solution, if the enterprise is located close to the location of the raw materials. However, matters become entirely different when the site not only has no raw materials but lacks the other necessary prerequisites as well for the normal functioning of the future enterprise. Why, then, choose such a building site? In the course of their work these client ministries and construction ministries have acquired considerable experience in the building of new projects, in the course of which the heads of departments (clients and contractors) formulated a joint comprehensive solution which took into consideration everything related to the building of a new enterprise: choice of site, development of a production base, comprehensive building of housing areas, and so on. This is frequently ignored today. The role of the ministry itself has been reduced. In our view, it is time to return to the solution of such problems in accordance with acquired experience.

A procedure according to which the construction organizations would be given the right themselves (rather than the clients) to break down by quarters the annual volume of contractual work for the various installations, in accordance with the stipulated deadlines for the completion of capacities, would also contribute to the acceleration of the completion of projects and the elimination of the scattering of resources.

A stricter approach must be adopted also in providing the projects with technical documents. In our view, the volume of construction and installation work for which contracts had not been signed by 1 January of the planned year due to the lack of necessary documents (as listed in the Rules for Contracts for Contracting Capital Construction) should be excluded from the plan. Following the conversion to planning based on completed output, the plan should include only projects supplied with technical documentation, equipment, and financing. The target sites

must be defined and charts for the completion of all types of equipment and delivery of specialized materials must be provided.

Realistic deadlines for the commissioning of capacities and projects are of major importance in the work of contracting organizations. It is true that this work must not be postponed to the fourth quarter of the year as is the practice currently. This situation creates uneven loads, nervousness and haste, and inevitably leads to unproductive losses.

The timely supply of the construction projects with equipment is of decisive importance in accelerating the completion of installations. In our view, the client should supply the construction sites with all the necessary equipment (other than imported) by working through a single organization. The installed capacities must have their sanitation-engineering equipment and heating equipment ready before the year of commissioning, while pipes for engineering facilities and amenities outside the enterprise must be consistent with construction technology rules.

How to improve such matters more quickly? The current stipulation on the material liability of the client and the supplier for promptly supplying the construction sites and target projects with technological and nonstandard equipment and special materials provides essentially no incentive. In this connection frequent suggestions are made calling for increasing the size of penalties. We believe that such a measure would yield no positive results, for the money paid in fines will come not from the enterprise's pocket but from the state.

Practical experience has indicated that in a number of cases Soyuzglavkomplekt finds it rather complex and sometimes even impossible to deliver to the construction site within the stipulated deadline the items produced by different ministries and departments, as it has no real levers with which to influence them.

We believe that in order to improve supplies to construction sites of equipment, it would be expedient to assign supplies, the consolidation of elements, the assembling and testing of all basic technological mechanisms for industrial purposes to their manufacturers--the head plants and associations of machine-building ministries. It would also be expedient to put them in charge of test runs and trials. This will permit the machine builders to become better acquainted with the shortcomings of their output and to establish direct economic relations with supply enterprises and other ministries and departments. It could lead to the development of new and more effective forms of managing supplies of equipment delivered to construction sites.

2

Material support is of decisive significance in insuring the commissioning of capacities and projects and in the implementation of the plan for contractual work. The absence of a balance between the annual plans for construction work and the material and technical resources allocated by the USSR Gosplan is one of the main reasons for the nonfulfillment of the plan and for the reduced pace of construction work.

In the first 4 years of the 10th Five-Year Plan, the plan for construction and installation work of the USSR Ministry of Construction was issued on the basis of increasing the volume of factually achieved amounts in the previous year, ranging from 6.4 to 13 percent. At the same time, however, the material and technical resources which were allocated remained on the same level and, for a number of most important items, were kept even below the 1975 level. The reduction of outlay norms (compared with the factual specific outlays per million rubles in 1975) equaled 9.8 percent for rolled metals, 7.7 percent for cement, 19 percent for timber, and 13 percent for glass. Such figures considerably exceed the levels of economies planned for such items as stipulated in the 10th Five-Year Plan (6 percent for rolled metals, 6.5 percent for cement, and 14 percent for timber). Despite such substantial lowering of outlay norms, however, they were further lowered in 1979 and 1980.

Furthermore, as we know, the use of puzzolana cement and slag-portland cement requires additional raw material outlays ranging from 0.6 to 1.0 percent. The USSR Gosplan does not compensate for such outlays. For these reasons alone the ministry organizations use ~~more than 400,000~~ extra tons of cement per year.

What complicates the situation even further is that a number of plants and enterprises, in violation of contracts, deliver metal goods, pipes, timber and cement unsatisfactorily and unrhythmically. In 1979 the Krivoy Rog, Chelyabinsk, Makeyevka and Cherepovets metallurgical plants fell short by tens of thousands of tons of armature steel and small-size rolled metals. Pursuing gross output, supply plants frequently try to chip out essentially large metal pieces. The result is metal overexpenditures reaching as high as 12 percent. The unrecoverable idling of workers' brigades causes delays in the delivery of construction materials.

**How to improve material and technical supplies to construction projects and avoid such shortcomings?**

As early as 1969 the suggestion was made to reorganize the system of material and technical supplies for capital construction by undertaking to supply construction projects with materials from USSR Gosplan, based on orders placed by construction organizations in accordance with their requirements, as stipulated in their plans and accounts. Even though it was initiated, this reorganization remained unfinished. The 12 July 1979 CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree instructed the USSR Gosplan to complete this reorganization by 1981. Unfortunately, once again the implementation of this decree is being delayed. It is high time to realize that without available materials based on the plans and blueprints, delivered within the deadlines stipulated in the production schedules, it is impossible to work in accordance with a system of technological sequence, insure the proper organization of construction and complete projects within the stipulated deadlines. We cannot tolerate a situation in which, for example, pipe is assigned only for target projects while carryover projects are entirely ignored. This violates technological rules and leads to corrective work, wage overexpenditures and cost overruns.



The reorganization of the supply system will acquire a firm foundation only when the stocks assigned to the USSR Gosnab dictate the level of stockpiling of reserve materials. They are necessary in order to fill the gaps which develop as a result of changed work plans and possible disparities between outlay norms and requirements based on blueprints and accounts related to the structural characteristics of the project. At the same time, the new material supply system will place the manager of the construction organization under effective and rigid control of the use of materials in accordance with the project (materials will have to be requested through cards showing overruns). However, this considerably simplifies the construction management system and will bring tremendous benefits to the state.

Clearly, improving the material and technical support of construction projects would be inconceivable without a strict system of economy and thrifty utilization of material resources. The CC CPSU decree "On the Work of Metallurgy, Machine Building and Construction Ministries on Upgrading the Quality of Metal Output and the Effective Utilization of Metals on the Basis of the Use of Wasteless Technology in the Light of the Requirements of the November 1979 CC CPSU Plenum" makes it incumbent on designers and builders to mobilize their reserves, make more effective use of material resources, continuously to improve blueprints, lower metal and material intensiveness and the weight of structures, insure the economical utilization, careful preservation, and transportation of materials to construction sites and prevent their losses. The USSR Ministry of Construction, which ascribes great importance to this party decision, thoroughly considered its possibilities and reserves and has adopted numerous measures to conserve material resources. A conversion to the extensive use of assembled panel buildings with the use of reinforced concrete structures of the II-04 series, replacing the II-20 series, is taking place comprehensively in the construction of social, commercial, and cultural-consumer projects. This alone will reduce the use of steel in erecting the framework of a building by as much as 45 percent; the amount of concrete will be reduced by 9 percent while the labor intensiveness of construction work may be reduced by as much as 40 percent.

The engineering services of the ministry have done extensive work to select the most progressive types of designs for animal husbandry complexes, livestock farms and other agricultural installations for the Nonchernozem zone of the RSFSR, as a result of which the number of designs used has been reduced from 119 to 22. Similar work is being done in selecting designs for other projects. The manufacturing and extensive use of lighter weight industrial structures is contemplated (with a drastic decrease in weight and reduced metal and cement requirements). This includes timber structures, pressed and extruded asbestos-cement sheathing and tiles, industrially manufactured floors, and so on.

Metal outlays will be considerably reduced by converting to assembled multiple-story residential buildings in areas of higher seismic activities in Georgia, Moldavia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Kirghizia. The houses will be made of monolithic reinforced concrete with the use of standard mobile casings. Estimates show that with this system armature steel savings will range from 21 to 37 percent.

Management is one of the important problems in improving the economic mechanism in construction. We know that the activities of the general construction

ministries engaged in industrial, housing, and cultural-consumer construction throughout the country are organized on a territorial basis, which is the only accurate method. However, this method as well must be improved further.

The point is that a large number of construction organizations operating on a parallel basis but under the jurisdiction of different departments operate in the same areas. The consequences of this phenomenon are, as a rule, negative. Such organizations have their own production facilities, developed at considerable cost in funds. This frequently results in cross-haulage of construction freight, and the poor utilization of the production capacities of industrial enterprises. Thus, 16 construction organizations belonging to different ministries and departments are working in Vyaz'ma in Smolenskaya Oblast. Two construction and installation administrations belonging to the Ministry of Rural Construction and the USSR Ministry of Construction operate in the city of Nelidovo in Kalininskaya Oblast. The former hauls prestressed reinforced concrete and other materials to Kalinin. The second hauls the same materials away from Kalinin. A similar situation has developed in Pskov, Kostroma and Gor'kovskaya Oblast.

A considerable percentage (13-17 percent) of construction work is carried out by the industrial enterprises themselves, with their own facilities. With every passing year this method is becoming ever more widespread. Meanwhile, the cadre turnover among contracting construction organizations is rising, as enterprises doing their own work pay higher wages by using some of the funds from their industrial activities. Under such circumstances, the permission granted industrial enterprises to set up their own construction organizations for construction and installation work seems hardly justified. The same reason is always cited to justify their existence: the inadequate capacity of the main contractive organization in the area. However, the adopted method does not contribute in the least to increasing the overall construction potential. This leads to a fictitious increase in capacity.

It would be perfectly sensible to combine the construction organizations under different ministries and departments (with their facilities) engaged in similar operations within a single administrative rayon or under a single ministry or department, to be followed by their subsequent consolidation.

This would create conditions for the more extensive use of the achievements of scientific and technical progress, the handling of material resources, and the reinforcement of the most important construction principle of equal wages for equal labor.

Of late, because of the increased complexity of production conditions, it has become difficult to coordinate the activities of a number of subcontracting organizations. Occasionally more than two dozen installation subunits may be working on a large construction project at its completion stage. Administratively they are not subordinated to the general contractor and their responsibility for the timely completion of the projects is purely symbolic. The new decree stipulates that, starting with the 11th Five-Year Plan, indicators governing the commissioning of capacities and projects will be issued to installation organizations as well. We must now consider the question of coordinating their

activities. In our view, the time is ripe for establishing at each construction project a service of the main subcontractor of the USSR Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work, to combine all specialized subunits within a single department and control their work. Such a head organization must settle accounts for completed projects, target complexes, and sections ready to begin production.

The time is fully ripe to organize the conclusion of contracts for installation and other special projects between the general contractor and the chief subcontractor, drafted within a single department at a given project. They must be held equally responsible for the timely and qualitative completion of the projects.

3. Successful construction is largely determined by the engineering preparation of conditions, the choice of site and location, and so on.

The choice of a site and location for new industrial projects must be mandatorily coordinated with the managements of subcontracting construction ministries, for it is they who have the fullest possible information concerning the nature of local construction conditions. The absence of such prerequisites frequently yields pitiful results. The construction site proves to be dozens of kilometers away from any housing, has no source of electric power, roads, or water supply facilities. Under such circumstances the building of enterprises involves tremendous outlays, even though in the majority of cases real opportunities exist for avoiding such extremely difficult construction conditions. More than enough examples of unplanned site choices can be funded. Thus, the Uglizhskiy Flax Plant was 'laid out' in a swamp, a great distance from any housing, without roads and water supply. An extremely poor site was chosen for a livestock complex for the Lugovskoy Sovkhoz in Altayskiy Kray. The building of a machine assembly hall of the diesel motor plant in Tutayevo (Yaroslavskaya Oblast) was undertaken in an extremely swampy area.

Unfortunately, in most cases the construction organization is told of the site where the future industrial enterprise will be located only at the time of the coordination of the plan, when the designs have already been completed. In order to avoid this, in our view, the USSR Stroybank should control more closely the procedure used in coordinating planning documents and reject the financing of projects whose sites have not been cleared with the contracting ministries.

In general, we must say that supplying construction projects with complete high-quality cost estimates has become a major problem. Practically each working year begins without some 15 to 20 percent of the necessary technical documents needed according to the program for construction and installation work. Experience has indicated that in a number of RSFSR oblasts and in some union republics which have design institutes, as a rule, there are no endless arguments with clients regarding deadlines for the drafting of technical documents.

The current situation cannot be considered adequate. The large number of design organizations providing construction designs on the same territory triggers a multiplicity of designs for identical structural elements or types of buildings.

and leads to different approaches to planned solutions. It eliminates the possibility of assembly or functional standardization of designs. All this leads to increased construction complexities and raises the cost of design operations.

Thus, in the Uzbek SSR alone, blueprints and designs for the construction part of industrial projects of union and union-republic importance built by the republic's Ministry of Construction are developed by several dozen design institutes in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tbilisi, Rostov, Odessa, Krasnoyarsk, Kuybyshev, Alma-Ata and many other cities. Do we need such a large number of organizations to plan the construction part of a project in a single area? Naturally, we do not. Substantial funds are spent on the trips of the designers alone to exercise ownership control over the construction project and considerable time is wasted by the construction workers awaiting their arrival.

In order to insure further improvements in the technical standard of designs the contracting construction ministries must take over the design institutes engaged in general construction designing of industrial enterprises and performing territorial functions within the areas of construction organizations under such ministries. They must be assigned the making of construction designs based on the requirements of the general designer--the client ministry or department--as is the rule followed by the specialized USSR construction ministries and by our friends in the socialist countries.

The elaboration of general plans for industrial centers must be done by the territorial design organizations of contracting construction ministries, based on assignments issued by the USSR Gosstroy, in coordination with technological design institutes.

All this will increase the responsibility of contracting construction ministries and departments for designs and accounts and will considerably reduce the cost and time of designing and construction work.

4

The construction workers are particularly concerned with the declining growth rates of labor productivity.

The implementation of the production program and the further growth of labor productivity in construction greatly depend on technical progress and on the use in production work of the achievements of science and technology and the industrialization and mechanization of labor operations.

The ministry drew serious conclusions from the just criticism it received from the party's central committee in the decree "On the Work of the USSR Ministry of Construction With Managing and Engineering and Technical Cadres" for shortcomings in the application of progressive construction methods, new materials and structures, and in the use of possibilities for increasing labor productivity and reducing the cost of construction and installation work. In this five-year plan considerable work was done in this area. The production base of the ministry was developed further. This included the production of new lightweight materials



and structures. Consolidated methods for assembling structures made of large blocks, and the assembly construction method based on network schedules, involving the use of computers and other progressive methods, were extensively applied in the building of major industrial complexes (the Cheboksary Plant for industrial tractors, and the Altay Coke Chemical Plant). The conversion of house-building combines to the production of large-panel housing in new progressive series with a larger number of stories and improved layout has been essentially completed. The construction of agricultural projects is being organized on an industrial basis. For this purpose the ministry has already created and is creating additional agricultural combines. All this has increased the role of assembled construction by the ministry's organizations to 73 percent, including 82 percent in industrial construction, 85 percent in agricultural construction, 68 percent in cultural consumer construction, and 74 percent in large-panel house building. The manufacturing of basic construction machinery has increased and working time losses have been reduced. This year 46 percent of all construction-installation work will be based on the brigade method. With a view to insuring the further expansion of brigade cost effectiveness, a "Comprehensive Program for the Application of the Brigade Method in the Organizations and Enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Construction for 1980 and the 11th Five-Year Plan" has been formulated and is under implementation. In 1981 the volume of work carried out according to the brigade-contracting method will reach 51 percent of the ministry's annual program. Great attention is paid to the application of the related brigade contract method based on the Tallinn House-Building Combine. This year 37 house-building combines will be following this method (plant-haulage-construction site) and by the end of 1982 it will be adopted by all house-building combines.

However, despite such measures, assignments on the growth of labor productivity are not being carried out.

Unquestionably, the construction workers have even greater opportunities for increasing labor productivity. They must address themselves most seriously to improving production and labor technology and organization and engineering preparations. Unjustified idling of personnel and construction equipment must be eliminated. Production-technological discipline must be observed and the level of prefabrication of structures and products, and work quality must be upgraded.

Nevertheless, the main reasons for the diminished growth rates of labor productivity are found in shortcomings on the intersectorial level.

Between the sixth and the ninth five-year plans the increased use of structures made of prestressed reinforced concrete and the increased percentage of assembly parts were the main prerequisites for the growth of labor productivity in the sector.

Today this possibility is virtually exhausted. The use of prestressed reinforced concrete per million rubles of construction and installation work is almost unchanging. The role of prefabricated parts has reached a high level for which reason the influence of the assembling factor on the growth of labor productivity is also nearing its end. Let us frankly say that increased output in excess of two-three percent annually is impossible with the existing level of availability of construction machinery and of new materials which reduce labor intensiveness.

The more extensive use of new progressive structures and the use of synthetic fabrics, plastics and other materials in the finishing work on buildings and equipment, which would make it possible to reduce labor intensiveness by eliminating the "wet" processes in construction, could become the source for further growth in labor productivity. This would enable us to reduce manual labor to a minimum. However, industry is still producing an extremely inadequate amount of progressive materials and structures, meeting no more than 30 to 40 percent of the demand.

A real possibility exists in the 11th Five-Year Plan of reaching an 85 percent level of fully prefabricated housing, cultural and industrial construction. This would require the fastest possible increase in capacities producing lightweight frame-panel partitions, walls and floors, parts for fully prefabricated intra-shop premises, zinc-plated shaped linings, aluminum structures, vitreous and glazed ceramic tiles for lining, parquet and protective flooring, "akmigran" type and gypsum tiles for suspended ceilings and other materials, all of them produced in amounts sufficient to meet capital construction requirements.

Great shortages exist in fireproof calibrated insulation tiles for roofs, high-grade cement, rubberoid lined with bitumastic, high-strength plaster casing, pressed asbestos-cement and cement-wood sheathing and other most important materials.

The further growth of labor productivity in construction greatly depends on the level of the machine-labor ratio, the use of machinery, and the availability of minor mechanization facilities and tools. Many improvement possibilities exist in this area. The use of machinery in two or three shifts not at all practiced everywhere. Frequently intrashift machine idling comes to 8-12 percent of the total working time. We waste a great deal of time on the repair of mechanisms, particularly those whose active life has come to an end. This applies to 18-29 percent of all excavators, 26-43 percent of bulldozers, and 12-13 percent of power cranes. All this lowers the output and entails additional material and manpower outlays for technical servicing.

In a number of cases it is impossible to improve the effectiveness with which mechanisms are used because they are frequently supplied without spare parts. The increase in unit power and machine productivity is slow. Frequently new equipment takes years to develop. The qualitative structure of construction equipment must be considerably improved as well.

A number of reasons exist in capital construction which affect the growth rates of output and reduce technical and economic indicators.

Substantial shortcomings exist in the areas of cost estimates, crediting and financing. With the 1969 introduction of the new cost estimates, over the past 10 years wholesale prices of many materials and of fuel have risen sharply. Interest rates charged for bank loans have increased and so have outlays for the exploitation of construction machinery (due to the increased balance-sheet value of the machines), and so on. However, these changes have not been reflected in cost estimates in construction, which have been kept at the 1969 price level. The increase in wholesale prices of materials and gasoline alone have raised

the expenditures of the ministry's construction organizations by nearly 90 million rubles per year. Outlays for the operation of construction machinery have increased by 33 million rubles. Interest payments on bank loans for planned volumes of unfinished output, for which the clients do not compensate construction workers, total today nearly 40 million rubles per year and will increase even further in the future.

Because of these reasons, the work profitability of construction organizations has been reduced by more than one-half (some of them are operating at a loss). Profits have dropped below planned accumulation norms (from 9 to 1 percent in 1979). Therefore, many construction organizations cannot set up material incentive funds.

In recent years the financial condition of construction organizations has worsened. Virtually all construction sites are experiencing acute shortages of working capital.

As the result of delays in the submission of cost estimate documents, lists of construction projects and financing by the customers in the first half of the year, the construction organizations fall short of 430 to 500 million rubles of working capital. This delays payments for materials, services and wages, and so on.

Great difficulties are encountered in obtaining bank credits, which are one of the main sources for covering outlays for unfinished work. This is due to the constant credit penalties levied by the institutions of the USSR Stroybank, regardless of the reasons for the temporary financial difficulties of construction organizations. The rates of interest charged on loans have been unjustifiably increased.

Shortcomings in price setting, crediting and financing seriously undermine the foundations of the cost effectiveness of construction organizations and are one of the essential reasons for the reduced effectiveness of their work.

All this makes it necessary to effect prompt resolution of problems in compensating the construction organizations for the additional outlays which have developed since 1969 by introducing a correction coefficient for the cost estimates or raising the norms for planned accumulations.

Another very urgent problem is that of supplying the construction sites with high-grade gravel and other nonmineral materials. Thus, every year the construction projects of the ministry within the Russian Federation, fall short by four-five million cubic meters of crushed rock and gravel. Because of shortages (particularly in the Verkhnevolzhskiy and Volgo-Vyatskiy areas), nonmineral goods must be hauled over distances of thousands of kilometers by rail and water from Central Asian quarries. This triples or quadruples the cost of materials. As a whole, in 1969 no more than 66.5 percent of the requirements of the construction organizations of the USSR Ministry of Construction for nonmineral materials were met for 15 oblasts and autonomous republics in the RSFSR. All this could not fail to affect the implementation of the plan for construction work.

This situation is essentially the result of the fact that enterprises producing nonmineral materials are scattered among different ministries and departments and that the allocation of such raw materials has been entrusted to the local soviets. If the Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy is deprived of the right to extract ore the case would be considered a misunderstanding. Meanwhile, the fact that construction workers do not have their own quarries and are not given the necessary amounts of chipped rock and gravel of suitable quality is considered normal.

In this connection, it would be expedient to assign to the USSR Ministry of Construction Materials Industry the task of supplying construction and the construction industry with high-grade chipped rock (in the case of concretes, brands 200 or higher). The ministry should assume complete responsibility for delivering such raw materials to the construction workers in the necessary amounts and the required quality. This would require concentrating production facilities within said ministry and allowing it to assume jurisdiction over the corresponding enterprises. All this would create prerequisites for the establishment of strong contractual relations between quarries and construction organizations.

5

Construction faces the urgent problem of supplying the construction sites with manpower. The successful solution of this problem greatly depends on the managers of construction projects and enterprises. Wherever good housing and living conditions have been created for the workers, such as a developed network of children's preschool institutions, recreation centers, preventive treatment centers and auxiliary farms or, in a word, where true concern is shown for the work, training, life and recreation of the collective, cadre turnover drops to a minimum. Such is the case with Trust No 36 of Glavzapstroy, the Uzbekshakhtostroy Trust of the Uzbek SSR Ministry of Construction, and many other subunits.

Sometimes, however, the managers of construction organizations alone cannot resolve the grave cadre problem. In our view, turnover is greatly influenced by the fact that the wages of workers engaged in construction and installation rank between 8th and 10th among those for workers in leading industrial sectors.

The January 1979 CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures for the Further Improvement of the Training of Skilled Cadres and for Retaining Them in Construction" will unquestionably have a positive influence on resolving the problem of organizing permanent workers' collectives in construction. For the time being, problems related to staffing construction projects with cadres have not been fully resolved. Cadre requirements are not met by a long shot.

The plan for recruiting workers for the USSR Ministry of Construction among demobilized draftees is being fulfilled 5-10 percent; 34 to 60 percent of the plan is fulfilled by volunteers. Approximately 20 percent fewer graduates than stipulated by the USSR Gosplan annually go to work in the enterprises and organizations of the ministry following their vocational-technical school graduation. The local vocational and technical education organs frequently arbitrarily reduce and systematically fail to fulfill their plans for student enrollment. These reasons alone prevent us from completing construction projects worth 300-400 million rubles.



Bearing in mind that the training of skilled worker cadres through the vocational education system is the only proper method of resolving manpower problems and in order to upgrade the responsibility of construction project managers for the recruitment of personnel and their training and hiring, we deem it expedient to give to contracting construction ministries jurisdiction over construction vocational-technical schools functioning on the basis of the production facilities of the organizations of such ministries, leaving the USSR State Vocational Training Administration in charge of methodical management, as is done with the technical schools and the state vocational training schools of a number of industrial ministries. The construction ministries should be given the right to formulate their own plans for enrollment in basic vocational-technical schools in terms of number of students and varieties of skills and assign graduates to construction organizations. It would be useful to send graduates of construction vocation-technical schools, drafted by the USSR armed forces, to do their military service in military-construction detachments or other engineering construction forces.

Generally speaking, ministries which act as clients and contractors must assume greater responsibility for construction results. Currently we have an excessive number of central organizations in charge of construction. This leads to anonymity. We believe that the USSR Gosplan and Gosstnab and other departments should be freed from dealing with petty matters, which should be entrusted to ministers in charge of construction.

We believe that the solution of economic problems related to upgrading capital construction effectiveness lies in the implementation of all basic stipulations contained in the 12 July 1979 CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree which includes practically all the main directions leading to improvements in the economic mechanism. The ministry has formulated and is carrying out a complex program for the implementation of the decree.

As of 1 January 1977, considering the great importance which it ascribes to achieving end work results--the installation of capacities and completion of projects--the USSR Ministry of Construction converted the Lithuanian SSR Ministry of Construction (and, as of 1 January 1978, Glavzapstroy and the Uzbek SSR Ministry of Construction) to assessment of work on the completion of projects on the basis of delivered construction output and the settling of accounts with clients for finished projects, target complexes, and sections.

The results of the work of these organizations prove that the new economic management system helps to upgrade the effectiveness of capital investments by accelerating the completion of projects and concentrating manpower, material and financial resources on target projects.

After taking into consideration the positive experience of the work of these organizations, the USSR Ministry of Construction this year converted yet another territorial subunit to the system of assessing the work on the basis of the completion of projects and payments for delivered projects. Thus the number of organizations operating under the new conditions has been raised to 11. Their annual volume of construction and installation work totals 2.5 billion rubles or

48.2 percent of the ministry's program. As of January 1981, the entire ministry will convert to assing its work on the basis of end results.

The Soviet people welcomed the decision of the October 1980 CC CPSU Plenum as a battle program for action. The plenum triggered a new influx of creative energy and political and labor upsurge. The Soviet construction workers are trying to welcome the 26th party congress in a worthy manner, to complete the last year of the 10th Five-Year Plan successfully, and thus to establish a reliable base for the successful implementation of the 11th Five-Year Plan.

5003

CSO: 1802

## BARRICADES OF ELBERFELD

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 80 pp 70-77

[Article by V. Mikhaylov]

[Text] The event in Friedrich Engels' life related by PRAVDA correspondent V. I. Mikhaylov takes us back to the 1848-1849 revolution in Germany. In the years which preceded the revolution K. Marx and F. Engels had already formulated the basic concepts of scientific communism and undertaken the organization and ideological inspiration of the first proletarian revolutionary party--the Alliance of Communists. They had already written the great Marxist program document, the "Communist Manifesto." They welcomed the revolutionary explosion in Europe as mature proletarian fighters with the weapons of their doctrine.

By remarkable coincidence the Manifesto was published at the end of February 1948. That period was marked by the uprising of the Paris workers who, joined by the other population strata, overthrew the Louis-Philippe's monarchy and proclaimed France a republic.

The flames of the revolutionary fire rapidly spread throughout Europe: they covered Italy, Belgium, and the German states. A liberal bourgeois government came to power in Prussia. The time had come to "make a revolution" rather than merely write about it.

The revolutionary events drove Marx and Engels from one country to another: Belgium, France and, finally, Germany. It was here, in Cologne, that they decided to start a new printed battle organ, the NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG, which became the center for the unification of all revolutionary-democratic forces opposing the reaction, and a center for the elaboration of a consistent proletarian line in the revolutionary movement. The plan was successfully implemented. The newspaper became not only a rostrum but a kind of revolutionary headquarters. According to Engels, the articles it published had the effect of grenades and shells.

Engels was particularly active in the newspaper. A number of issues carried his fiery articles which gave a penetrating analysis of events. He was threatened with detention. He was forced to go to Belgium but here again he was unable to escape from the persecution of the powers that be. He was held and deported to France. Engels moved to Switzerland from where he continued to send his articles

to the NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG. At the beginning of 1849 he returned to Cologne to resume his combat post with the newspaper.

By then the reaction had mounted a comprehensive counteroffensive. A trial was instigated against the newspaper's editors. However, Marx and Engels brilliantly won their case. Despite the repressive measures of the authorities, the newspaper continued its publication. It called for energetic opposition to the reaction, shamed the bloody slaughter caused by the counterrevolution in Paris and Vienna, and supported the national-liberation struggle in Hungary and Italy and the uprisings of the masses in various parts of Germany.

In the spring of 1849 the final outbreaks of the revolutionary fire reached southwestern Germany, affecting, in particular, Engels' native land. Engels decided personally to participate in the revolution and drafted his plan for rebel actions. He went to Elberfeld where one of the final scenes of the revolutionary drama was being staged.

The final issue of NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG came out on 19 May.

...They stood face to face. One of them was young, with a lithe body. His hair, parted on the right, could not conceal his high forehead. His light bright eyes were closely focused on his interlocutor. The older man was shorter, sturdier. His face was pale and rigid, assuming a painful expression only when a final inflexibility was heard in the excited voice of the younger man. At that point it was as though his massive body somehow settled and became even shorter. He turned around and walked away slowly. A barricade separated them. It was made of iron bars and cases and was no more than waist high. However, neither of them could cross it.

What was the argument between Friedrich Engels, Jr and Friedrich Engels, Sr? The son, a 28-year-old young man, wearing a red scarf across his shoulder, as the insignia of commander of the artillery and the fortifications of those who had risen against the Kaiser's omnipotence, and the father, until recently a "highly respected merchant," who scorned and feared the "mob." No notes have been preserved from that time. However, the story of the encounter between the son and the father in the hot days of May 1849 at the barricade dividing the Haspeler Bridge, has been passed on from generation to generation. I was told the story by the head of the Friedrich Engels Center in Wuppertal, Richard Kumpf, an old West German communist. He pinpointed the place where the barricade had been erected dividing the bridge between Barmen and Elberfeld which have merged now and share the name of Wuppertal.

The city spread many kilometers along the Wupper River. Once its waters were particularly valued for their flax-bleaching qualities. It was precisely this that had led the peasant Johann Kaspar Engels, Friedrich Jr's great grandfather, to abandon the cultivation of the poor and swampy banks of the Wupper and start a craft new to the entire valley--flax processing, spinning and weaving. At the beginning of the 19th century 80 to 100 of the 149 spinning machines in Barmen belonged to the Engels family. It had 300 employees. "Thank God, we do not have to worry about money," wrote F. Engels, Sr to his sister Louise, in 1818, announcing his forthcoming engagement to Elizabeth Francisca Mauricia van Haar, daughter



of the high school principal. He assumed that the line of the family and the accumulation of wealth were secured. He could not foresee that 28 November 1820, the day his son Friedrich was born, was to become a turning point not only in the history of the Engels family.

Leaving the Haspeler Bridge we followed the street taken by Friedrich Sr going back to his lands. The home where Friedrich Jr was born no longer stands. It was bombed out in 1943. Only two buildings remain which were inhabited by the father's brothers--Kaspar and August. According to local residents, these two houses, lined with dark gray slate, from the roof to their foundations, were quite similar to the one which burned down in World War II. Today one of them contains an exhibit dedicated to Friedrich Engels, Jr. It contains a number of interesting items. However, almost nothing is found of the barricade battles along the Wupper Valley. Yet, they provided the impetus, they triggered the interest of one of the creators of scientific communism in military matters. According to Marx 1849 was the year after which "Engels specialized in the study of military problems."

What occurred in Elberfeld 131 years ago? The city's archives contain newspapers of the period. We leaf through the yellowing sheets and begin to feel the faster pulsebeat of the days of May 1849. The Frankfurt National Assembly had recently drafted an all-German imperial constitution. However, the Berlin and Vienna monarchies refused to accept it. Each one of them in turn and each one with its iron fist intended to unify the divided German states. Troubles broke out in Silesia and Saxony. Dresden rebelled. In the Palatinate and Baden the troops took the side of the republicans. Waves of disobedience to the Prussian monarch and to his representative in Dusseldorf rolled over the Rheinland where the sparks thrown here by the recent French revolution were still alive and the earth was still shaking following the disturbances of the previous spring. The Landwehr--a militia recruited among the artisans and common people--was the first to proclaim its independence in Elberfeld.

ON 3 May the members of the Landwehr General Assembly "stated in their appeal that obedience to the crown (the Prussian rule--the author) should be considered as hostile to the people and to declare themselves free from obedience to the absolutist crown."

On 7 May the commander of the Seventh Corps (one-third of the entire Prussian Army was deployed at that time in the Rheinland) officially proclaimed that, "...The guilty will be punished with the full strictness of the law. The investigation order has already been issued."

On 7 May the Landwehr issued a second appeal: "...The time of passive resistance is past. We call upon everyone to meet in the morning of 8 May, as early as possible, bringing his weapon. There is strength in unity and we shall win if we are united!" If we are united....

On 7 May Karl Friedrich Melbek, one of the leaders of the Burgerwehr--the second militarized militia staffed by the sons of entrepreneurs, managers and salesmen wrote in a secret report "To the high government president in Dusseldorf.

We are faced with the greatest of dangers. For this reason the undersigned request the immediate sending of troops." This report has been preserved in Dusseldorf's state archives.

Many such proofs exist in the archives of Cologne, Dusseldorf, Solingen, and Wuppertal. What is remarkable, however, is that virtually all of them come from "the other side" of the barricades--either testimonies of the opponents of the revolution or of skeptical observers. All existing revolutionary documents are classified as "proof of crime" presented in the trials of the rebels following the defeat of the revolutionary forces. However, these documents as well prove the enthusiasm of the rebels and the confusion of the "omnipotent" machinery of oppression. Some of them follow.

"Huge masses of people assembled on the market square. Between noon and 4:00 p.m. they had the time to erect barricades and stockpile as ammunition iron bars left here to be used to repair the bridge. The cavalry charge was met on the square by a hail of rocks. The cavalry captain, hit in the chest, fell off his horse and the entire squadron retreated in disorder. The fury and shouting, the awesome sound of the revolution rose as time went on. The church bells sounded the tocsin and wildly excited peasants carrying weapons, metal bars and axes rushed from various sides to the battleground. Finally, infantry regiments approached the positions of the Landwehr. However, instead of sweeping them off immediately, the captain ordered them to stop and demanded the rebels' surrender: "Unless you lay down your arms at the third beat of the drum I will give the order to shoot all of you." The Landwehr stood up and did not lay down their arms, even after the third drumbeat. The order was issued: "Fire!" The rest was unimaginable. Instead of aiming their weapons, some of the soldiers put their rifles at parade rest. This settled everything. The captain had to order a hasty retreat unless he wished to see his forces begin to fraternize with the Landwehr" (testimony by Alexander Pagenstecher, member of the Elberfeld Municipal Council).

"...The speed with which the barricades were erected was simply amazing. This was done without anyone advising or ordering the people.... I noticed a man with a wooden leg. It may have been hard for him but he was piling up rocks on the barricade" (A. Peininger, describing the erection of the first barricade in Elberfeld).

Toward the evening of 9 May the entire city was covered with barricades. Once again the troops tried to reach the center. They took the barricade set up by the rebels across Herzog Street and rushed to the second one. They were supported by artillery but its shots were wild. The battalion commander ordered to open fire. Most of the soldiers, however, fired in the air. Only three defenders of the barricade were wounded. The rebels answered the fire. Hit on the spot, Captain von Uttenhofen fell. The soldiers' ranks began to falter. The next day the Prussian troops left Elberfeld and returned to Dusseldorf.

On 10 May the city security committee met in extraordinary session. It included members of the municipal council "in order to prevent the reds from being in the majority" (from the 25 April 1850 minutes of the Elberfeld trial). The moment the Prussian forces were no longer a threat the burghers began to fear the armed people.

On 11 May, at a critical moment, Friedrich Engels entered the mutinied city. "The military commission of the security committee entrusted Mr Friedrich Engels with the inspection of all city barricades and with improving the fortifications." The next day he was granted "all powers to deploy the guns and to recruit the necessary craftsmen" (NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG, 17 May 1849).

The house-museum in Wuppertal exhibits a plan of the fortifications erected at that time. The entire city was surrounded by barricades, numbering from 40 to 90 during various days. Why were the main weapons of the rebels--barricades and artillery--entrusted to the young Engels the moment he showed up in the city? The mere fact that he had done one year of active military service in the Prussian artillery could hardly have been considered a decisive reason. It is true that after that he had also intensively studied the martial art and published articles under a pseudonym analyzing the course of the uprising in Hungary against Austrian rule. His comments had been so accurate and perspicacious that authorship was ascribed to a Hungarian commander. At that time, however, only Karl Marx and perhaps a few other trusted people knew the identity of the real author.

Naturally, both Elberfeld and Barmen had long been familiar with Friedrich Engels' revolutionary convictions. In February 1845 he had spoken here on two occasions at the Zweibrucker Hoff Hotel on the faults of the capitalist society and the inevitability of a conversion to socialism. A letter by Ober Burghmeister von Harnap to the painter H. A. Kötting--the organizer of the speeches--has been preserved in Wuppertal's archives. The Ober Burghmeister reported that "By superior order" such talks would be forbidden in the future "as their purpose is to disseminate communism and promote communist relations" and that "attendance, depending on circumstances, will call for severe penalties." Incidentally, during the Elberfeld uprising the author of the letter, Ober Burghmeister von Harnap, as Engels subsequently wrote, was forced to hide under an overturned manure cart.

Nevertheless, young Engels' revolutionary convictions and one year of service in the Prussian artillery were hardly substantive arguments enough in the eyes of the Elberfeld security committee to put him in charge of all city fortifications. What was the reason for his appointment to such a high position? What "decisive argument" did he contribute?

The archive documents and the testimony of participants in the events offer no precise answer. Biographic literature mentions the fact that Engels headed a detachment of 400 people from Solingen. This, however, is not documented. Thus Friedrich Engels' biography still includes unanswered questions, such as this one. I soon realized that I was not the only one to be bothered by this question. For example, it was raised in one of the scientific works on the area's history, a copy of which is kept in Solingen's city archives. Here again, however, no clear solution can be found.

Following my search in Wuppertal I decided to retrace Engels' path to Elberfeld, passing through Solingen.

The road follows the winding of the river and on rare occasions, as though bored with its turns, moves to the other bank of the Wupper across a hanging bridge. The people of Wuppertal pride themselves with the fact that their city has the first "elevated streetcar," still the only one of its kind in the world. It moves

on overhead tracks supported by metal frames resting on both banks of the river. The entire system suspended over the Wupper looks like a huge centipede.

The odometer showed a distance of 20 kilometers. The sign said, "Turn Left Solingen-Grefrat." The industrial area ends with a thick forest. A small settlement lies ahead. The roofs are made of slate, as was Engels' home in Wuppertal. I leave the main road and find myself back into the past. Narrow little streets lined with paving blocks. Small houses lined in gray slate from top to bottom, like medieval shirts of mail. It is as though time has bypassed this town. I knock at the door of a small stationery store. At the sight of a new customer, the owner opens the door readily.

"Where is the old armory?" I ask the woman.

She shrugs her shoulder: "The old one? My mother may know." She leads me inside the store. An old woman sitting in a corner comes to life:

"Yes, of course!... It was the monastery and it is now the almshouse."

"Do you happen to know about the battle for the armory in the 19th century?"

"I heard that there was a fight but not who fought whom."

"Go to the building next to the armory, the city archives," said the store owner, seeing me out.

Walking, I remembered everything I had read about the armory. In German lands under Prussian rule they were not only weapons arsenals but the command centers of the district where regular troops were billeted. It was here that the new draftees came to receive their uniforms and arms. Whoever controlled the armory controlled the district.

The Grefrat armory stands on the highest spot, usually reserved for churches. Not far from it is a two-story building with tall Gothic windows. Currently it houses Solingen's archives. It turned out to have quite a lot of documents related to the events of May 1849. I piled my table with books, document folders, and minutes of the court trial which was held soon after the defeat of the uprising. What did I find? At the time when Engels was passing through Solingen and Grefrat the heat of revolutionary events had reached its peak.

On 10 May "...A crowd of people gathered in front of Solingen's town hall. Bearing arms, swords, or sticks the people rushed into the hall where the municipal council was in session and asked to go to Eiberfeld to join its population" (from the indictment of the 9 April 1850 trial).

In the afternoon, "responding to the locain, the people gathered again by the town hall and demanded to go immediately to Grefrat and arm themselves. They formed a big column. They walked to Grefrat with drums, music and flags to take from the arsenal arms for all the people" (Ibid.).



As the column approached, Major von Winning, the garrison commander, ordered his troops hastily to withdraw to Dusseldorf. He ordered the rifle bolts removed. However, repairing the weapons was no trouble to the workers of Solingen, who were master metallurgists and armorers. Following the seizure of the arsenal by the rebels, "Here...every day and almost every hour entire squads came from different directions for weapons, ammunition and fittings" (ibid.).

Was it possible for Engels simply to go through Solingen and Grefrat? It is almost impossible to assume this. He himself writes that he took from here to Elberfeld "two cartridge cases." Engels frequently mentions the workers of Solingen and their firmness, writing as someone well familiar with their work. Had the Elberfeld workers, he wrote, been as advanced and well organized as those of Solingen the chances of the uprising would have been entirely different.

However, the most important proof that Engels could not ignore the events in Solingen is the strategic plan with which he reached Elberfeld.

Engels' plan was based on the factual circumstances. Since an uprising was underway on the right side of the Rhine, in the industrial centers, while the left bank remained under the control of the powerful fortresses with their strong garrisons, unnecessary clashes were to be avoided on the left bank, above all in the garrison cities. The actions were to be organized only in the small cities, the factory settlements and the rural areas and concentrate all available forces in the mutinied areas on the right bank, expand the uprising and attempt here, with the help of the people's militia (the Landwehr) to create the nucleus of the revolutionary army.

Such were the plan and the decision to undertake this mission, as he wrote himself, with which Engels reached Elberfeld. Passing by Solingen, one of the bulwarks of the revolutionary workers, and by Grefrat, with its stocks of weapons, which were so greatly needed in raising an army, would have been inconceivable. All this leads us to assume that Engels directly participated in the Solingen events and marched to Elberfeld from here, heading a large detachment of workers.

In his native city he immediately undertook to organize the local armed forces. The first day he set up a company of sappers and organized the rebuilding of the spontaneously created barricades. The city began to turn into a real fortress. However, Engels had absolutely no intention to settle down. He knew that a passive attitude would lead to inevitable defeat. However, active actions required large forces.

On 11 May no less than 2,500 to 3,000 armed people had gathered in the city. However, they belonged to two different groups. The workers alone were reliable. They were essentially opposed by the Burgherwehr—a civilian militia raised by the bourgeoisie to protect its property and interests. From a position of neutrality, held at the beginning, the Burgherwehr began to engage in hostile actions against the rebels: at night it destroyed the barricade erected during the day. Aware of the indecisiveness of the Security Committee, the workers felt betrayed and began to leave Elberfeld.

To the revolution any delay was like death. For this reason Engels asked the Security Committee to adopt "fast and decisive measures which would bring back life into the movement, draw new combat forces and paralyze its internal enemies" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 7, p 132).

The action program called, above all, for the disarming of the Burgherwehr and the distribution of the arms among the workers. Everything depended on this initial step. "...Armed with the order of the Security Committee and with no more than 400 Solingen workers," Engels wrote, "the Elberfeld civilian militia could have been disarmed in an instant. Its courage was not even worth mentioning" (Ibid.).

However, the Security Committee had already become paralyzed by its fear of the revolution. The demand was denied as "untimely." Engels decided to act independently. Together with the commanders of other detachments he requisitioned the weapons of the local Burgherwehr stored in the town hall near Kronenberg. It is believed that Engels returned to Grefrat and there, "at the head of 30 to 40 workers, holding a pistol, forced the arsenal's guards to provide weapons and uniforms" (from the indictment at the court trial of the participants in the Elberfeld uprising. Remscheid city archives).

In a few days Engels earned the deep respect of the rebels through his actions and daring. However, the bourgeois saw in him a person who could take the revolution they themselves had initiated to its logical conclusion which they greatly feared. Rumors spread throughout the city that at night Engels moved from the barricades the black-red-gold flags, hoisting red flags instead, and that he intended to proclaim a "red republic." It was rumored that his presence would subject the city to "plunder" and the "horrors of violence." The bourgeoisie was already beginning to develop its art of running down its class enemy and label some people "real cannibals," as Engels was to write to his mother many years later (21 October 1871).

The people, he pointed out, are "literally being crammed with lies" through the Cologne and Elberfeld newspapers. One might only imagine Engels' reaction to today's Western press!

Slanders performed their sinister work in Elberfeld as well. Under the pressure of over-frightened bourgeois the Security Committee passed the following decision: "While fully acknowledging the activities deployed so far in this city by citizen Friedrich Engels from Barmen, of late a resident of Cologne, we ask him, however, to leave the limits of the city municipality this very day, for his presence could give grounds for misunderstandings concerning the nature of the movement."

The indignation of the armed workers was great. "Once again the moneybag won," wrote one of the rebels to his father (from the letter of J. A. Hett. Hersfeld Central State Archives). A number of people insisted that Engels remain, promising to "defend him at the cost of their own lives." Considering the situation, however, discord in the rebel camp could only ease the task of the Prussian forces nearing the city.

The bourgeoisie became impudent following Engels' departure and its militia began to prepare itself for a counterrevolutionary coup. In order to avoid a stab in

the back, the voluntary detachments left the city and began to make their way to the southwestern part of Germany, to Baden and Pfalz, where the uprising was continuing. A month later Engels, this time as adjutant to A. Willich, commander of the voluntary detachment and member of the Alliance of Communists, met there the armed workers of Elberfeld and Solingen. Together with them he participated in four major battles and when retreat became necessary in the face of superior Prussian forces, again with them he covered the withdrawal of the rebel army across the Swiss border.

The uprising of the workers in the Wupper valley was described by the NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG as the "prologue of another, a thousand times larger movement which will affect the deepest interests of the workers" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 6, p 545). In Friedrich Engels' case this became the prologue of a topic which was to occupy the rest of his life. He has left behind several hundred works and letters on military problems. Today they are the foundations of the military fury of the working class. One of his latest works was an article on a theme so topical today: "Could Europe Disarm?"

5003  
CSO: 1801

## ONE GENIUS NEXT TO ANOTHER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 80 pp 78-92

[Article by G. Volkov]

[Text] As is usually the case, the death of the autocrat in Russia and the ascension to the throne of his heir triggered great hopes in some circles. The despot Alexander III was replaced by the gentler, obliging and seemingly liberal Nicholas II. It was believed that the era of Pobedonostsev, who had stretched his "owlish wings" over Russia had come to an end. The "cruel" and "iron" 19th century was drawing to an end.

The approaching new century was the occasion for numerous forecasts and prophecies. Most of them were upbeat. It looked as though machines, steam and electricity would soon resolve all social problems. Economists were computing the improved material condition of the working class and the growth of the national wealth. Reformism was gathering strength in Germany and so was legal Marxism in Russia. It seemed to the supporters of both currents that the period of revolutionary tempests, class conflicts and wars was a thing of the past. Europe was entering a period of prosperous and calm development promising a general future prosperity.

How could one predict at that point the bloody worldwide slaughter in the making and the unparalleled revolutionary upheavals of the "birth pangs" of a new civilization on earth? Who could predict the life and death clash between Germany and Russia, which would be deadly both for the Romanov and the Hohenzollern dynasties?

There was such a min.

On 10 November 1894 Friedrich Engels, receiving in London the news that Alexander III was dead, wrote to F. Sorge: "I cannot imagine that the current system could survive a change of monarchs.... However, should trouble break out in Russia the young Wilhelm will be forced to realize that something new is happening. At that point a liberal wind will blow over all of Europe..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 39, p 259).

---

\* Subsequent references to the collected works of Marx and Engels will indicate volume and page only.



Two days later, in his letter to Laura Lafargue, he expressed himself even more definitely on the subject of Nicholas II: "He is a virtual idiot, weak in spirit and body, and promises to provide precisely the kind of unstable reign by a person who will simply be a toy in the hands of other people with conflicting intrigues. This is precisely what is needed for the final destruction of the Russian despotic system" (Ibid. p 261).

What an amazingly accurate and perspicacious characteristic of the last Russian czar and of his pitiful destiny! Nicholas' first months of reign merely convinced Engels of the accuracy of his initial view. His belief that the Russian revolution was approaching was becoming firmer and firmer. "If the devil of the revolution has grabbed anyone by the throat," he wrote to G. V. Plekhanov, "this person is Nicholas II" (Ibid., p 334). Finally, several months before his death, he ironically noted in a letter that "In Russia little Nicholas has done our work, making the revolution absolutely inevitable" (Ibid., p 349).

Naturally, Engels based his forecasts essentially not on the personal characteristics of a Russian, German, or any other monarch, something which bourgeois-subjectivistic philosophers frequently overemphasize, but on his profound analysis of the economic situation in Europe and the development of contradictions between Russia, France and England, on the one hand, and Germany and Austria-Hungary, on the other. It was precisely this study that led him to the conclusion that a world conflict was inevitable and that a future war could not be "localized."

Attentively following the tempestuous dissemination of capitalist relations in Russia, toward the end of his life Engels let it clearly be understood that the hopes of the narodniks that Russia would take a separate path to socialism through the peasant municipalities, bypassing capitalism, were not to be realized. Russia was to experience all the difficulties of capitalist development. Its backwardness and preservation of feudal relics were merely to worsen this process while the upheaval triggered by the fast economic changes in a country with a large peasant population could turn out to be far more violent and acute than anywhere else, and achieved "only at the cost of fearful pains and upheavals. However, history is the most cruel of all goddesses,\* dragging her triumphant chariot over mountains of corpses not only in war but in periods of 'peaceful' economic development" (Vol 39, p 35).

Like Marx, Engels was convinced that the developing revolutionary movement in Russia would inevitably lead to the creation of a "Russian commune" after a lengthy and hard struggle (Vol 19, p 252).

Engels' unusual perspicacity had repeatedly amazed other people in the past as well. In the time of the 1848 revolution, once in a while the *NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG*, edited by Marx, published occasional articles on the revolutionary war in Hungary. They were ascribed to one of the top commanders of the Hungarian army, for they were unusually rich in information and the predictions they contained on the possible development of military operations were almost always

---

\* The words "all goddesses" were written by Engels in Russian--the editor.

accurate. Yet, these articles were authored by a 28-year-old young man who had never visited Hungary: Friedrich Engels.

In 1870, during the Franco-Prussian War, once again Engels drew the attention of the professional military. He predicted the outbreak of the war, the battle of Sedan and the defeat of the French army. It was since then that he earned the semijocular nickname of "General" given to him by Marx' family circle.

However exceptional such qualities might seem, there was nothing amazing in them considering, naturally, Engels' entirely unique and unusual personality.

Bourgeois and revisionist "Marxology" has developed the rather strong tradition of pitting, one way or another, Marx against Engels. In such cases, usually Engels is ascribed a totally secondary role: something like a student and popularizer of Marx' doctrine, presenting the ideas of the "master" frequently in an inadequate, simplistic, and rough manner. It is also persistently claimed that Engels was "a lesser creative mind" which "reflected the light."

Strange though it might seem, possibly one of the "parents" of this myth seems to have been Engels himself.

He always tried to remain in the shadow of his great friend. He frequently emphasized that he merely played "second violin" in their duet. After Marx' death, when he himself began to "conduct the orchestra," he was amazed by the "unexpected honors" which were heaped on him and credited almost all of them to Marx' memory.

Answering greetings on the occasion of his 70th birthday, coming to him from all over the world, the General wrote: "No one better than I knows that I owe most of these honors not to myself or my merits. It has been my fate to harvest the glory and honor whose seeds were planted by a greater man than I--Karl Marx. I can only solemnly promise to dedicate the rest of my life to active service of the proletariat so that, perhaps in the future, I may be worthy of such honors" (Vol 22, p 91).

After Franz Mehring gave Engels his due as one of the creators of historical materialism, in an appendix to his book "The Legend of Lessing," Engels deemed it necessary to make the following remark: "If I have any objections, they are only to the fact that you are ascribing to me greater credit than I deserve, even assuming that in the course of time I may have independently discovered everything which Marx, with his more penetrating eyes and broader outlook, discovered far earlier. A person who has had the luck to work for 40 years with someone such as Marx does not usually, in his lifetime, enjoy the recognition which he might deserve. However, when the great man dies, it can easily happen that his less important fellow worker begins to be valued more than he deserves. Apparently, this is what is now happening to me. In the final account, history will put everything in its proper place. By then, however, I shall have left this world and will know nothing of this" (Vol 39, p 82).

Engels' view that during Marx' lifetime he played "second violin" was considered by V. I. Lenin, generally speaking, entirely accurate (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.")

[Completed Collected Works], Vol 2, p 12). This, however, does not represent any whatever belittling of Engels' credit for the creation and development of Marxism. In the same article Lenin gives full credit to Engels as one "of the two great teachers of the contemporary proletariat," emphasizing in a number of cases his unquestionable priority. This circumstance was noted by Marx himself. In a letter written in 1864 the Moor wrote to Fred, "You know that, to begin with, everything happens afterwards and that, secondly, I always follow your steps" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 30, p 342).

This statement should be considered most carefully and attentively.

We know that neither Marx' nor Engels' individual and conceptual development rushed along year after year. By 1844, the time they met in Paris, both of them had totally converted from idealism to revolutionary democracy and to materialism and scientific communism quite independently from one another. Both of them had reached the basic and essentially coinciding features of the new, the communist outlook. However, they had separately reached it their own way.

Engels covered his road somewhat faster (he was 2 years younger than Marx) and under incomparably more favorable conditions.

Let us recall that Engels grew up in a pious religious family, in Wuppertal, which was famous for its orthodox and pietist traditions, and that his teachers, educators, and mentors were frequently unctuous and sanctimonious figures who crossed themselves whenever the names Goethe or Schiller were mentioned.

In his high school years Engels was obedient to the stern fatherly admonitions, a sincere believer in God and in fanatical sermons, sometimes prayerful but more frequently lightheartedly cheerful. Nevertheless, he was unable to graduate from secondary school. On his father's insistence, without completing his final grade, he was asked to become a merchant and work as an apprentice in a commercial company in Bremen. This marked the end of his formal education.

While Marx was taking his exams at the University of Berlin and writing his doctoral dissertation, Engels drew up accounts, kept books, and corresponded with customers. Nevertheless, his spirit remained excellent. The way he managed to combine the rather tedious and monotonous office work with most intensive study of philosophy, theology, languages, poetry, literature, journalism, theater and music (he himself composed chorales), drawing, and sports (fencing, swimming, riding) remains a mystery.

After 3 years of work in the Bremen commercial company he attended the real universities of independent spiritual development.

The first major victory he won was that over the religious ghosts which had surrounded him in his father's home. This began with an ironical attitude toward the obscurantists and pietists, followed by a doubt in the infallibility of theological texts and of the "sacred books" themselves, and intensified studies of theology, of Hegel, Straus and the Young Hegelians.... The religious blanket fell off his eyes and, with amazing courage and consistency, he discarded

the straight-jacket of "orthodoxy" and became a convinced pantheist. All this was literally accomplished in a period of a few months in 1839!

He closely combined the struggle against the altar with that against the throne. More and more he began to hate the philistine system which found delight in religion. This 19-year-old office clerk hurled angry words at the king and his retinue. "From the master," he writes, "I will expect something good only when his head begins to ache after the people have slapped him in the face and when the windows in his palace have been broken by the cobblestones of the revolution" (Vol 41, p 444).

These words carry no longer merely a youthful discontent but also a true revolutionary temper. Marx was to develop similar "montagnard" moods somewhat later...

In that same year of 1839, so significant in Engels' spiritual development, he wrote and published his first journalistic work, "Letters From Wuppertal." This is an amazing work in terms of intellectual maturity and sharpness of observation. It already revealed the basic features of Engels' talent for satire, as the angry denouncer of the existing system with its social relations, and the witty and biting critic of the philistine way of life and way of thinking.

In this work, for the first time Engels draws attention to the working class, to the disastrous situation of mercilessly and cynically exploited factory workers. When he describes the "horrible poverty" of the workers and their work in "low premises where people inhale more coal fumes and dust than oxygen," mass diseases, child labor starting at the age of six, from which the bosses double their profits compared with adult labor, Engels sarcastically points out that all this hardly disturbs the pious factory owners who have an "elastic conscience. The fact that one child or another would wither away would not send the soul of the pietist to hell, the more so since this soul goes to church twice every Easter!" It has been proven that "among the factory owners the pietists are the ones who treat their workers the worst: they do everything possible to lower the workers' wages allegedly for the purpose of preventing them from drinking..." (Vol 1, p 456).

In the subsequent period of his life, in 1841-1842, when Engels was in Berlin for his military service, while attending lectures at the university and consorting with the Young Hegelians, his development took another headlong leap. He tried to fill the gap in his philosophical education, a gap which, incidentally, did not prevent him from immediately assuming a firm militant position in the struggle which the Young Hegelians waged against the reactionary-loyal mystical philosophizing as displayed by Schelling who, at that time, was very old. The brilliant pamphlets which Engels wrote against Schelling had a great impact. Arnold Ruge, who assumed that the author of the pamphlet "Schelling and the Revelation," anonymously published by Engels, was written by Mikhail Bakunin, noted that "This pleasant young man has left behind all the old asses in Berlin" (A. Cornu, "Karl Marks i Fridrikh Engel's. Zhizn' i Deyatel'nost'" [Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Life and Activities], Progress, Moscow, 1976, pp 443-444). Engels critically reinterpreted Hegel's philosophy, his philosophy of history in particular, and drew from it radical conclusions. After his exposure to the



Young Hegelians, he became one their most radical members and turned to Feuerbach's materialism and atheism and, finally, to communism, which at that point was still in its immature utopian form. Nevertheless, all this was achieved in the course of a single year!

However, Engels himself had no illusions as to the substantive nature of his philosophical knowledge. For a while he even abandoned his very successful literary-journalistic activities to immerse himself entirely in scientific studies. His letter to Ruge is quite frank in this respect: "I have decided entirely to abandon literary activities for awhile and instead to study more. The reasons for this are obvious. I am young and I am self-educated in philosophy. My knowledge is sufficient to develop a certain conviction and, if necessary, to defend it. However, it is insufficient if I am to accomplish this truly successfully. It will be claimed to an ever greater extent that I am a "philosophical traveling salesman" and that, lacking a doctoral diploma, have no right to engage in philosophizing. By the time that I write something again, this time signed with my own name, I may be able to meet this requirement" (Vol 27, pp 365-366).

Engels took a headlong plunge into history. He surged ahead as though wearing seven-league boots. He caught up and, soon afterwards, confidently bypassed his recent friends, noted Young Germans, Young Hegelians, or "free spirits," and began to adopt a critical attitude toward them. For example, he realized that the latter suffered from the fault of supporting an abstract purely "theoretical terrorism." He enthusiastically turned to Feuerbach's philosophy, finding in it a way to bridge the gap between "the earth and the sky." Finally, he was eager to combine philosophy with practical work.

We have the curious testimony of M. Hess, one of the first Young Hegelians to proclaim himself a communist. Recalling Engels' first visit to the RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG, in the autumn of 1842, Hess wrote that this "old (!) revolutionary" parted with him as "a most zealous communist."

Naturally, the first meeting between Engels, who has already become a "zealous communist" and Marx, who was still supporting radical-democratic positions and looked mistrustfully at communism because of the "phrase-mongering" form in which it was then preached in Germany, proved to be "very cold."

Soon afterwards, however, "following Engels' steps," Marx undertook a most profound study of utopian socialism (communism).

By that time Engels had gone to England to deal with his father's commercial firm. It was as though he had literally moved one century ahead, compared with Germany, and saw bourgeois relations in their developed aspect (in his homeland they were merely embryonic). He became aware of the sharp class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat which had already developed as a powerful political force.

Engels sent to the RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG one article after another, in which he described most openly the revolutionary workers' movement which was gathering

strength in England. His initially immature and loose communist convictions strengthened with every passing day. He consciously adopted the positions of the working class as the only class capable of making a social revolution.

At the beginning of December 1842 Marx published in the RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG Engels' article "Internal Crises," which openly concluded that in England "a peaceful revolution is impossible and that only the violent overthrow of the existing unnatural relations, the radical overthrow of the nobility and the industrial aristocracy could improve the material situation of the proletariat" (Vol 1, p 503).

Conceivably, it is precisely Engels' articles from England that inspired Marx soon afterwards to focus his entire attention on the working class as the new revolutionary force.

Naturally, Engels' stay in England contributed to the development of his ever increasing interest in the country's economic life and in the theoretical problems of bourgeois political economy. He became ever more strongly convinced that it is precisely the factors of economic life that are determining in the area of political and ideological actions and that it is they that direct the course of the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and lead to the all-round aggravation of conflicts within the bourgeois society and, in the future, would become the material foundations of a communist society.

Engels' utopian and "philosophical" communism with which he went to England began to acquire a firm scientific ground. Engels' conversion to the positions of scientific communism and materialism in the understanding of social phenomena is recorded in two articles published in the "German-French Yearbook." In the same publication Marx firmly announced his conversion to the positions of the proletariat. Following his own way, from critically surmounting the philosophy of Hegel and Feuerbach, and following his study of the history of the French evolution and the class struggle in France, Marx formulated with the entire passion of an irreconcilable revolutionary fighter, in those same "German-French Yearbooks," the initial postulates of a new outlook. Whereas politically Marx' conclusions were more efficient, consistent and clear than Engels', the latter had the advantage in one respect. In his article "Outlines On the Critique of Political Economy," for the first time Engels revealed the economic roots of scientific communism. According to F. Mehring, at that time, in the field of economics, "Engels was the one who gave while Marx was the one who took" (F. Mehring, "Karl Marks. Istoriya Yego Zhizni" [Karl Marx. Life History], Moscow, 1957, p 121). Marx himself subsequently described Engels' article as "a brilliant outline of the critique of economic categories" (Vol 13, p 8).

One year later Engels published his famous work "The Condition of the Working Class in England," a study based on data gathered in the course of his stay in that country. It is hard to believe that this social analysis, containing such an amazingly broad historical insight, depth and accuracy, was written by a young man of 24! Half a century after its publication, Lenin wrote that "Neither before nor after 1845 such a vivid and truthful depiction of the disasters of the working class has ever come out" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works]

Vol 2, p 9). Lenin also noted Engels' merit that he was "the first to say that the proletariat is not merely a suffering class...." (Ibid.).

In his work, on the basis of tremendous factual data, Engels economically substantiated the inevitability of the breakdown of the bourgeois society as a result of its internal inherent antagonisms, the development of the working class, and the merger of the revolutionary movement with socialist theory. For the first time in world economic literature, Engels comprehensively analyzed, from a communist standpoint, the trends of the industrial revolution and its social consequences.

The author based his theoretical conclusions on his own observations and data and reports he collected on the situation of the working class in the various economic sectors. In this respect his work is a model of concrete-sociological research. In the book's preface, addressed to the working class of Great Britain, he wrote: "I have spent a sufficiently long time among you to become familiar with your situation. I studied it most profoundly. I studied various official and unofficial documents to the extent to which I was able to procure them. All this, however, failed to satisfy me. I looked for more than merely an abstract knowledge of the subject. I wanted to see you in your homes, observe your daily lives, talk with you on your situation and your needs, and witness your struggle against the social and political power of your oppressors. That is precisely what I did. I left behind society and dinner invitations, and the port and champagne of the bourgeoisie and dedicated my free time almost exclusively to consorting with real workers; this makes me pleased and proud" (Vol 2, p 235).

The entire book is imbued with a feeling of the inevitability of the revolution in the most immediate future. Naturally, this was an illusion. However, Engels proved to be amazingly accurate in his main forecast concerning the development of English society as an ever deepening conflict between the working class and the bourgeoisie. Marx noted this fact almost 20 years after the publication of the book in his letter to the author, saying that everything in it "has been confirmed by the developments after 1844, even to the slightest detail." Marx then added that, "Rereading your book, I regretfully note that we are getting older. How vigorously, passionately, and with what daring foresight has this thing been written, without the help of scientists and without scientific doubts! The very illusion that one could see historical result tomorrow or the day after projects such warmth and vitality whereas our subsequent style of writing 'in dark colors' triggers a feeling of hellish annoyance" (Vol 30, p 280).

Engels' capital work on the situation of the working class in England was written and published in 1845, one year after his second meeting with Marx, when, as Engels wrote, "Our complete agreement in all theoretical fields" became immediately clear (Vol 21, p 220). This marked the beginning of their unparalleled friendship and joint work which lasted until Marx's death. It was as though they acted as catalytic agents of each other's creative thinking. They perfectly complemented each other precisely because of the differences in their natures, temperaments, way of thinking, and literary styles.

By the time they met, Marx had acquired an incomparably greater depth and systematic philosophical-historical knowledge. Engels had become enriched with a specific knowledge of the economic and political development of the most advanced industrial country in the world. The former was unsurpassable in the theoretical power of his analysis of most complex social problems; the latter was at home in summarizing and describing tremendous empirical data and singling out the main, the essential features in the flow of daily events.

To continue the comparison between Engels and his brilliant friend, let us say that Engels was like a lightly armed soldier who could move faster, more flexibly and freely, and was the first to note the approach of the enemy and daringly to attack the enemy's fortress. Marx tended to organize the lengthy siege of such fortresses and engage in a slow yet thorough and insurmountable movement ahead, scrupulously, step by step. The former was quick and impatient in his conclusions and his work, quickly mastering new data and more easily absorbing new knowledge. He did not stop long in his study of a subject. He synthesized more freely data borrowed from very different and greatly unrelated areas of science and culture. The latter was unable to publish a single line without being able to prove his conclusion in 10 different ways; he endlessly reworked his literary offspring and was never satisfied with his work. The former had adopted as his semiserious slogan "To take an easy attitude toward everything;" the slogan of the latter was "To question everything."

Each one of them had his method of analyzing current historical events. While the one would authoritatively consider the peaceful developments of a phenomenon the other would acquire the incomparable clarity of view and the ability to find the only proper solution in a stormy period. On this subject Engels noted that, "In times of peace, it is true, occasionally events have proved that I, and not he, was right; in revolutionary times, however, his judgment was almost impeccable" (Vol 36, p 188).

They had their own unique literary style (style is the man'). The mind of the first was clearer and more transparent, like a fast spring and it seemed as though it could satisfy anyone's spiritual thirst. The mind of the other moved like an avalanche, like an untameable Niagara, forming strange metaphorical whirlpools, dialectical metamorphoses and daring categories. The irony of the one was light, even somewhat simple and direct, whereas the irony of the second was philosophically deep, and murderously corrosive.

As time passed, their friendship, which developed from their creative collaboration on "The Holy Family" and "The German Ideology," was becoming every closer. Their spiritual unity became so great that they were totally unable to do without each other. Each one of them admired and lovingly gave its due to the talent and qualities of the other.

At one point Marx described his friend as follows: "...He is a real encyclopedia. He can work any time of the day or night, whether sober or tipsy, he can write and think quickly, like a devil..." (Vol 28, p 505). Indeed, Engels was distinguished by his unusually ubiquitous knowledge and interests. He could perfectly find his way, as we know, not only in the social but the natural sciences



(including medicine). He loved the theater, music and literature. Furthermore, he was a real polyglot and had perfectly mastered not only virtually all European languages but many dialects as well. "Engels can stutter in 20 languages," joked a socialist, referring to Engels' way of stuttering slightly when excited. At the same time, however, he was entirely different from the idea of a bookworm. He was athletic and had a splendid military bearing. He was a passionate hunter and horseman.

In a word, he was a universally developed person in the full meaning of the term, universally using his talents.

Once Marx received a letter from his publisher in Hamburg who reported having been visited by Engels and was thus given the opportunity to meet the most charming person he had ever met.

"I would like to meet a man," Marx exclaimed with a naive sense of pride, interrupting the reading of the letter, "who has not found Fred to be as nice as he is educated!"

Engels appears precisely as a nice, energetic and witty person when we read his "Confession"--his answers to a questionnaire submitted by Marx' daughter.

Quality you value the most:

In people: cheerfulness;

In men: minding one's own business;

In women: ability to put things in their proper place;

Your distinguishing feature: to know half of everything;

Your idea of happiness: Chateau-Margaux 1848\*;

A fault you consider tolerable: any kind of excess;

A fault which repels you most: hypocrisy;

Your dislike: affected and standoffish women;

Your favorite occupation: to tease and be teased;

Your favorite hero: none;

Your favorite heroine: there are too many to name but one;

Your favorite flower: the bluebell;

Your favorite color: any color unless it is aniline dye;

Your favorite dish: cold--salad; hot--Irish stew;

\* A vintage wine; the choice of year drunk at the 1848 revolutionary events--editor.

Your favorite rule in life: none.

Your favorite slogan: take everything lightly (Vol 32, pp 581-582).

Both Engels and Marx had an exceptionally developed sense of humor for a good joke. This helped them to withstand the burdens of life in exile. As he read Engels' letter, Marx frequently laughed to the point of tears.

The friendship between Marx and Engels was able to withstand most severe trials. Engels deliberately set aside his own scientific work for long periods of time so that Marx would have the possibility of doing such work.

Thirty-three years passed between the publication of "The Condition of the Working Class in England" and Engels' next MAJOR scientific work, "Anti-Duhring." Naturally, this was not a period of literary silence. Engels wrote a tremendous number of articles and pamphlets on a great variety of economic, political and historical problems, problems of military affairs and military history on European countries. However, he lacked the opportunity to undertake the writing of a major scientific work.

After moving to England, Marx's family had virtually no means of existence. In order to support his friend, Engels decided to assume the burden of a commercial job and hired himself out as an employee in the office of a cotton fabric factory in Manchester, one of whose co-owners was his father. He spent 20 years in this "business slavery." Throughout this period a lively correspondence was maintained between Marx and Engels. In virtually every letter Engels, who was not swimming in luxury himself, informed Marx of sending him a modest check.

F. Mehring has justifiably pointed out that the same type of noble spirit was needed to offer and accept such a sacrifice. Furthermore, it was not a matter of material assistance alone.

When Marx was asked to write articles for THE NEW YORK DAILY TRIBUNE, Engels translated these articles into English, for his friend had not as yet entirely mastered the language. Occasionally, Engels wrote the articles himself in Marx' name.

Marx discussed with Engels all difficult problems arising in the course of his work. He considered Engels' view, as he admitted himself, "more important than anything the rest of the world may say on the subject." Marx took no single practical step or published a single work in the course of his London period without seeking his friend's advice.

We could cite a number of examples of the creative contribution the two friends made to one another, each one of them ready generously to open to the other the folds of his memory, knowledge, ideas and experience. Thus, in the period of

the French events which brought Napoleon III to power, Engels shared with Marx his quite interesting and witty considerations on the "heroes" of the events and the tragicomic situations in which they found themselves by "historical irony." In particular, he wrote that, "It is true, it seems as though the old Hegel is controlling history from his grave, like a ghost, most conscientiously forcing the repetition of all events: the first time as a great tragedy and the second as a pitiful farce. Cossidier instead of Danton, L. Blanc instead of Robespierre, Barthelomy instead of Saint-Juste, and Flocon instead of Carnot, and that mongrel (Louis Bonaparte--the editor) with a handful of officers in debt up to their necks instead of the small corporal (Napoleon I--the editor) with his galaxy of marshals. We are yet to repeat the 18th Brumaire" (Vol 27, p 341).

We can easily see how Engels' letter gave Marx the idea for the brilliant beginning of his famous book and for its very title, "Louis Bonaparte's 18th Brumaire."

Actually, they never kept, nor could they keep any kind of track concerning authorship and coauthorship. Such was the extent to which these two brilliant yet different minds had become used to working like one.

In the long period of Marx' work over "Das Kapital," he frequently turned to Engels for advice and clarifications concerning specific problems of the way the financial system operated in which Engels as a "merchant" was stronger. Marx equally "tested" first on Engels the basic mature ideas of "Das Kapital." Let us point out that Engels was not only the enthusiastic "first reader" but frequently subjected Marx to his severe criticism for insufficient clarity and "re-hashed" descriptions, advising him how to make the most complex and abstract theoretical conclusions more easily accessible to the understanding of the general reader. Engels' insistent demand that Marx complete the final rewriting of the first volume of the book and put an end to endless new drafts played a role as well.

Finally, the manuscript was submitted to the publisher. In this connection, Marx wrote to Engels that, "Without you I could have never completed this work and, I assure you, like a nightmare my conscience was tortured by the thought that you were wasting your exceptional talent on merchandising, making it rusty mainly because of me and that on top of everything else, you must experience together with me all my petty troubles" (Vol 31, p 251).

At this point Engels as well could consider how to abandon an occupation he hated. He had borne his lot stoically and had performed his office drudgery as gallily and imperturbably as though it was the best thing in the world.

However, the extent to which he was oppressed by it is indicated by a line in the memoirs of Eleanor Marx-Eweling who visited Engels at a time when his "hard labor" was coming to an end.

"I will never forget his triumphant shout, 'The last time!', when, in the morning, he put his shoes on to go to the office for the last time.

"Several hours later, waiting at the door, we saw Engels crossing the small field in front of his home. He was waving his cane around, he was singing and he was

brimming with happiness. We then sat down to celebrate, drank champagne and felt happy.

"I was too young at that time to realize all this. Today, however, I cannot remember it without tears."

That day Engels wrote his mother that he had "become a different person and felt 10 years younger."

Finally free, Engels plunged into party and scientific work with youthful energy. After his election as member of the General Council of the International Association of Workers (the First International), together with Marx he worked hard to insure the cohesion of the working class of different countries and formulate a proper strategy and tactic of the proletariat and fight anarchism, Lassallianism, and the developing reformist trends in the labor movement. The time had also come to summarize the great experience of the Paris Commune.

At the same time, he worked avidly on his creative ideas. First among them was the truly gigantic task he had set himself: the philosophical synthesis and dialectical development of the latest achievements in the natural sciences related to the history of science, technology and philosophy. Essentially, this was the same task subsequently described by Lenin as follows: "The continuation of the work of Hegel and Marx must consist of the dialectical development of the history of human thinking, science and technology" ("Poin. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 29, p 131). As we know, Lenin was not familiar with Engels' manuscript "The Dialectics of Nature," which had remained unfinished and was published for the first time in 1925.

"Anti-Duhring" was published in 1878. According to Lenin, it "analyzed the greatest problems of philosophy and the natural and social sciences" ("Poin. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 2, p 11). This was accomplished by Engels with amazing ease, like a game, in a brilliant witty-polemical style, using the humor, sarcasm and irony so typical of his style. It was here that his gift as a most profound philosopher and satirist, master of the word and the image, was manifested in full. Since then millions and millions of working people in all countries have studied and understood the Marxist outlook in all its basic aspects (philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism) by reading this work.

The writing of "Anti-Duhring" was another proof of the creative cooperation between the two geniuses. Marx studied the work in its manuscript form and wrote for it an entire chapter on political economy.

Unfortunately, to this day we find people who are trying to prove that in his "Anti-Duhring" and "The Dialectics of Nature" Engels abandoned Marx' "gnosiologism" with its reliance on the role of practice in the process of knowledge in favor of "ontologism" (and even positivism), and that we are seemingly dealing here with two different concepts of dialectics. This merely demonstrates a total lack of understanding of Marxist philosophy. Marx never acknowledged any "dialectical systems" which failed to reflect the dialectics of matter; Engels acknowledged a single dialectics: nature, society and the human mind. Dialectics, he repeatedly emphasized, is a method for the study of reality precisely because



it is an "analogue" of this reality. Lenin perfectly expressed this essence of the "living soul" of Marxism in discussing the unity among dialectics, logic and the theory of knowledge.

There has never been any "Engelsism" as distinct from "Marxism" in theory and in revolutionary strategy and tactics. Something else is true: we cannot speak of Marxism by referring to Marx' works alone and without strictly taking into consideration everything accomplished by Engels. Even the period of the development of Marxism appears different if we consider not separately but in a state of organic unity works such as Marx' "Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts" and Engels' "The Situation of the Working Class in England" as complementary.

...The historically unprecedented creative cooperation was to continue, strange though it might seem, even after Marx' death. After burying his friend, Engels once again postponed his own scientific concerns (including the unfinished manuscript "The Dialectics of Nature"). Now he had to become literally Marx' alter-ego, "take over the leadership of the world's communist movement and complete Marx' main work--"Das Kapital."

However, plodding through the mountains of papers of Marx' literary legacy, Engels came across traces of one of Marx' "side" thoughts (he had a large number of these) and, surprising even himself, became carried away. It was a question of the appearance of the initial forms of human society: Marx had made extracts on this topic from the book by Morgan, the American ethnographer. Engels recalled that Marx had praised the book highly and complained of insufficient time to express his views on the origin of the family, private property and the state. This problem was of great importance in asserting the materialistic understanding of history not only on the basis of the study of the capitalist society (which had already been accomplished by Marx), but of all preceding history as well. In two months Engels wrote his famous book "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State." He considered this work to be, "to a certain extent the fulfillment of Marx' behest."

He convincingly proved in this book that the institutions of private property and the state, proclaimed inviolable and eternal by the defenders of capitalism, in fact appeared historically and will be outlived on the basis of that same historical inevitability. We know the role which this work played in the further development of Lenin's Marxist views on the state and the revolution. He considered Engels' work one of the "basic works of contemporary socialism" and pointed out that "each one of its sentences" could be trusted ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 39, p 67).

Without a pause Engels undertook to work on "Das Kapital." The second volume was almost ready. The draft, however, was filled with Marx' handwriting, resembling hieroglyphs, with many abbreviations. "...I am the only person alive," Engels wrote to P. L. Lavrov, after studying the manuscript, "who can decipher this handwriting and understand the abbreviated words and entire sentences" (Vol 36, pp 87-88).

Engels spent several hours a day transcribing Marx' text, supplementing it where necessary but in such a way as to leave it "exclusively the work of its author" and so that no single Marxian word would be lost, each of which "had its weight in gold" (Vol 24, p 3; Vol 36, p 24).

As the disease afflicting his eyes worsened, sometimes Engels would be totally unable to work or, at best, was forced to dictate his work. Despite all this, however, he completed the preparations of the second volume for printing within an amazingly short time. The manuscript was sent to the printer as early as May, 1885.

The work involving the third volume was incomparably greater. Marx had merely outlined it. There were major gaps. Many chapters were either partial or merely sketched like a summary. One could say that the "skeleton" of the work was there, waiting to be given flesh and the breath of life.

Nevertheless, Engels was enthused by the material. He reported to August Bebel that, "I am working on the third volume. It is excellent, it is brilliant. It is indeed an unparalleled upheaval of the old political economy. Thanks to this alone our theory has acquired an unbreakable foundation and we shall be able victoriously to advance along all fronts" (Vol 36, pp 252-253).

Engels wrote one of the chapters entirely by himself. In several others he introduced a large volume of new data and coordinated existing conclusions with new economic data and trends.

The work was sporadic, hindered by poor health and a catastrophically worsening eyesight. Alas, as Engels joked, 74 is not the same as 47.

The main thing, however, was that now Engels was the acknowledged leader of the international communist movement and that the ever expanding volume of party-organizational work lay on his shoulders, particularly following the founding of the Second International. Could he ignore this work? Could he ignore it even for the sake of "Das Kapital?" Engels' answer was decisive: "...Anyone who, like me, has been actively involved in this movement for over 50 years, must consider its affairs an urgent obligation demanding immediate execution. Like in the 16th century, in our stormy period as well pure theoreticians in the area of social interests are found only on the side of the reaction. That is precisely why these gentlemen are, in reality, no theoreticians at all but simple defenders of this reaction" (Vol 25, part 1, p 4).

Engels spent almost 10 years of his life (the final 10!) on the third volume. In 1894 he proudly held it in his hands.

The 74-year-old General welcomed the new year of 1895 as always happily, among friends and fellow workers. He was full of energy and creative plans. Responding to New Year's best wishes, he wrote to his old party comrade Paul Stumpf that his only wish was "to see the new century" (Vol 39, p 303). Alas, this was the last new year Engels celebrated.

Nevertheless, his dream came true. He was able not only to "see" the new century but perspicaciously to predict a great deal of what we, in the 20th century, experienced.

Engels' predictions concerning World War I, the fall of czarism and the inevitability of the revolution in Russia, came to pass. However, this is by far not everything Engels foresaw for the 20th century.

As early as "Anti-Duhring," on the basis of Marx' "Das Kapital," Engels analyzed the new phenomena in capitalist society, which are becoming fully apparent now. In particular, he proved that the concentration of property in the hands of the bourgeois state does not change in the least the nature of the capitalist system. As though literally exposing the doctrine of today's ideologues of the peaceful merger between capitalism and socialism through the development of the "state control over property," Engels most clearly asserted that the more productive forces the bourgeois society takes over the more it will become an overall capitalist and the larger will become the number of citizens it will be exploiting. "State ownership of production forces does not resolve the conflict. However, it contains the formal instrument, the possibility for its solution" (Vol 20, p 290).

In a number of subsequent works Engels noted the appearance of monopolies as cartels and trusts and indicated the direction in which this could take the capitalist society. He was even able to foresee that capitalism will acquire the possibility to use elements of "planned production" for its own benefit and advantage. Engels also noted the "conversion of industry into shareholding enterprises" (Vol 25, part II, p 485), capital exports, the economic division of the world among the strongest countries, and their uneven development.

As he formulated his theory of imperialism, V. I. Lenin dispensed with these ideas. Concerning Engels' idea of the monopolization by trusts of entire industrial sectors and the fact that at this point "not only private production comes to an end but the absence of planning as well," Lenin wrote that "Here all that is considered is the very basis of the theoretical assessment of most modern capitalism, i.e., of imperialism," and that Engels' outstandingly valuable concept indicates "how attentively and thoughtfully he followed precisely the changes in most modern capitalism, for which reason he was able to anticipate to a certain extent the tasks of our imperialist age" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 33, p 67). However, Lenin noted that trusts are unable to develop total planning.

As he felt that the end of the 19th century "is becoming ever more charged with electricity" and predicting "times of uprisings and wars," Engels firmly opposed the reformist illusions of an exclusively peaceful parliamentary way to socialism based on the total rejection of the possibility of any violent revolutionary action.

Lenin developed in detail and thoroughly the problem of the role of the peasantry in the future revolution and the need for an alliance between it and the proletariat. "The seizure of political power by the socialist party has become a matter of the not so distant future. However, in order to seize the political power this party must begin by leaving the city for the country. It must become

strong in the countryside" (Vol 22, p 504). Engels developed the idea that the small peasant could be saved from the threat of total bankruptcy only by a proletarian revolution as the result of which the peasant would be able to protect his farm and land, "converting them into cooperative ownership and a cooperative production method" (Ibid., p 519). Like Marx, Engels considered cooperative farming an "intermediate link" in the transition to a "total communist farming" (Vol 36, p 361). Engels hoped that in the course of time the middle and larger peasants as well would understand the inevitability of the conversion to a new production method and that "economic development would teach even such stubborn minds to think" (Vol 22, p 523).

We find in the works of Marx and Engels many concepts which have proved and are proving their accuracy concerning the communist socioeconomic system. Their enumeration at this point would be unnecessary, as it represents a separate topic. The most essential characteristic of the new system, however, was that in it the producers themselves would assume control over the production process and society and would establish sensible control over reciprocal relations and between them and nature. In this connection uncontrolled socioeconomic forces would no longer rule the people, regardless of the people's mind and will, but it is the mind which, guided by its knowledge of development laws, that will determine the direction of the reorganization of social life.

In contemporary terms it is a question of a radical change in the role of the so-called subjective factor.

Engels openly mentions this in the preparatory data for "Anti-Duhring:" "The view according to which the ideas and concepts of the people have created their living conditions, rather than the opposite, is refuted by all preceding history in which, so far, results have always turned out to be different from expectations and, subsequently, in most cases, have even been the opposite of the wishes. Such a view of the more or less distant future could turn into reality to the extent to which the people will be familiar in advance with the need to change the social system (if one may say so), triggered by a change of relations, and wish for such a change before it is imposed upon them regardless of their concepts and will. This also applies to concepts of the law and, consequently, of politics..." (Vol 20, p 639).

We can easily note that such views, somewhat paradoxical on the surface, follow the train of Engels' thoughts developed in a number of letters written in the final years of his life on the converse influence of the superstructure, ideology, politics, law, and so on, on the base and economic relations. In a conscious, purposeful and scientifically managed society, naturally, this influence assumes a different nature. However, this circumstance does not lead to even the least deviation from a materialistic understanding of history.

Naturally, Marx and Engels, the great humanists, saw the communist society as a society in which man will be the center of gravity and the purpose--the free, comprehensive, infinitely developed and positive creative self-assertion of the individual.

At the start of 1894 the Italian socialist Giuseppe Canepa asked Engels a strange question: to write an epigraph for a new weekly in which the main idea of the



future communist age could be expressed in a few words. The author of the letter wanted this slogan to counter the slogan of the preceding age expressed in Dante's words, "Some people rule while others suffer."

After giving it some thought, Engels borrowed the following words from the "Communist Party Manifesto:"

"The old bourgeois society with its classes and class contradictions will be replaced by an association in which the free development of everyone is a condition for the free development of all" (Vol 39, p 166).

These words became the constitutional principle of the "Russian commune" predicted by Marx and Engels, of the first socialist state in the world.

5003

CSO: 1802

## ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 80 pp 93-94

[Article by Ho Chi Minh in the 8 November 1963 issue of the newspaper NHAN DAN. First publication in Russian]

[Text] Our people are celebrating the 46th anniversary of the Great October Revolution solemnly, warmly, and happily together with the fraternal Soviet people and the working people the world over. I take this occasion to recall the past. The past means events which occurred 20 or 30 years ago. Ever since the Communist Party of Indochina was founded the Vietnamese people have always looked up to the Soviet Union, the homeland of the great Lenin, and considered the USSR the homeland of the revolution, their second homeland.

At the time of the birth of our party, despite the fierce terrorism of the French colonizers, the revolutionary movement in the country was steadily developing. The uprising in (Ngean) and (Natin) provinces was given the name of Ngeh-Tinh Soviets. This showed the deep feelings which our people have for the fraternal Soviet people.

Since then, even though we have been forced to act in deep clandestinity, and despite incredible difficulties and dangers, every year the Vietnamese people have celebrated the anniversary of the October Revolution.

On each occasion on the eve of this great anniversary the French colonizers would mobilize their armed forces, police and secret agents and increase their security precautions everywhere. On our side, the communist groups, even though still small and regardless of the most difficult clandestine conditions, were quite active. On the eve of the anniversary, and after it, they secretly disseminated leaflets and proclamations with the slogans of, "Support the Great Soviet Union!" and "Long Live Communism!"

In those days many of our compatriots would notice a red flag with a hammer and sickle flying on top of a mountain or on the top of the tallest tree, or even on high-voltage power cables. Sometimes bamboo rafts would be floated down the rivers carrying poles with red flags blazing above the waves.

Furthermore, quite frequently the red flag with hammer and sickle would be proudly raised on the very edge of the roof of the concentration camp, jail or barracks.

This type of celebration of the revolution's anniversary triggered the helpless anger of the French colonizers. At the same time, however, it inspired our people and created admiration for the courage and cunning of the communists.

We must also remember well that whenever this noted anniversary was celebrated many comrades were arrested, thrown in jail, or guillotined. That is how the French colonizers took their revenge on the revolutionaries.

Facing the French court or the guillotine, these comrades showed inflexible courage and proudly shouted their slogans:

Down with the French colonizers!

Long live the great Soviet Union!

The Vietnamese revolution will unquestionably win!

At that time the only socialist country in the world was the great Soviet Union. Today our camp has 13 powerful socialist countries,\* and Marxism-Leninism is brightly shining on all five continents.

As we celebrate today this anniversary we express our profound gratitude to Lenin and Lenin's party and remember the comrades who heroically died for communism. And we believe even more staunchly that socialism and communism will unquestionably triumph the world over.

---

\* The number of socialist countries at the beginning of 1963 (author's note).

5003  
CSO: 1802

## NO UTOPIA BUT REAL EXPERIENCE

Moscow KOMBUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 80 pp 93-107

[Article by Marietta Shaginyan, dedicated to the 26th CPSU Congress]

[Text] Chapter I

I confess that this topic was suggested to me by the article in KOMBUNIST on real and theoretical socialism (No 11, 1979, pp 11-24). The clarification of the inter-relationship between reality and its prototype in theory is a problem of tremendous importance facing not only philosophers. It is a task facing, above all, the practices of human society and affecting the purposefulness of human actions. However, I would like to approach its solution from the site of a type of study which, to the best of my knowledge, no one has ever used: a study of V. I. Lenin's attitude toward utopia. The word "utopia," so commonly used today, is of relatively recent origin. It was coined by Thomas More who entitled "Utopia" his work on an ideal human commonwealth where everyone would have the same rights and needs, with justice, equality and freedom—briefly stated, a society which would live an ideal life embodying a lofty idea. Thomas More named this state Utopia, which means a place not to be found in this world. It is as though he had drawn the line of unattainability between what is and what should be and between what was real and ...what could exist as an idea only.

However, his "utopianism" which became the equivalent of something unattainable, something impossible in this world, was neither the first nor the last word about a "city of the happy," even though the expression "utopia" began to be applied to older tales (many of which had appeared in antiquity) and to the subsequent works written by the French, already described as utopian, at the threshold of our age. One cannot forget, one cannot eradicate from one's memory the fact that in Lenin's words Marxism appeared on the basis of German classical philosophy (Hegel, Feuerbach), English political economy (Adam Smith and David Ricardo) and the French utopian socialists (Saint-Simon, Fourier).

Therefore, the ancient "utopias" contained not only the dreams of mankind of a type of social system in which all members of society would have equal rights and live through joint labor and enjoy common goods, rather than private well-being, and would be unfamiliar with the term "my" and "yours," but would know only the word "ours;" this idea was not presented merely as an ideal, as a theory. However, all such legends found among the Eastern peoples and the Greeks and told by historians (such as, for example, Diodorus Siculus who tells us the story of



Aegimius) were convincing and began by identifying the factual place which had indeed existed at a specific point on earth (most frequently on an island). find a particular number of such stories in the so-called descriptions of the campaigns of Alexander the Great, written about 2,000 years ago. A number of poems are entitled "Alexandria". Most of them describe the way Alexander, with his troops, entered an amazing city.

The following is from a manuscript, a word for word translation done by Prof. A. K<sub>2</sub> Arends, edited by Ye. E. Bartel's, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member.

And so, a city appeared, orderly, with goodness and wealth, like paradise. Approaching the city gates he did not see them made of iron, stone or wood. The many elegant stores he saw had no locks.

The people of the city took him to a beautiful palace where they entertained him and answered his questions. Why, Iskander asked, do you have

Such gardens yet no one is found in them,... The doors are not locked... There are no shepherds with the herds, no single shepherd yet 100,000 herds?

The city people told Iskander that they by themselves were not strong but had strong faith (here Nizami gives its due to the apocryphal legend of the righteous); it turns out, subsequently, that their strength rests not in "faith" in the least but in a new social ethic.

We never violate the truth. We do not listen to false tunes. All we know is loyalty. We have closed the door to crookedness. We never lie. We do not see perversion even at night, in our dreams. We do not ask for what we do not need. When someone weakens we help and when misfortune comes we endure. Should any one of us suffer a loss we compensate him from our own pockets. We help him to recover his wealth. No one among us has more than the others. We are all of us justly rich and consider that all of us are equal. We do not laugh at the sorrow of others. We have no fear at all of thieves: there are no commanders in our cities or guards in the countryside. We do not take anything from other people and other people take nothing from us. We have no locks or bolts on our doors and no one guards our cows and our sheep. No one has taught us spiteful words. We mend the damages caused to others and should something happen to anyone among us we help him and lead no one astray. We seek no trouble and shed no blood. We suffer for each other and share our happiness. Gold or silver do not tempt us as no one uses them.

The people of that city never resort to violence, for no one needs excesses:

We do not raise a sword for a grain of barley. Wild beasts do not avoid us. We catch and use only as many as we need. The

ones we do not need we do not catch from fields and valleys.

They eat moderately:

We eat cold and hot meals according to our needs. No one among us dies in his youth. It is the old who die at an advanced age.

They accept death fearlessly. They are not hypocritical. Only those who share their convictions can live among them:

Whenever someone dies we do not sorrow, for he did not suffer from lack of medicine. We do not say behind one's back something we would not dare to tell him to his face. The ones who live among us are clean and as restrained as we. Should anyone betray our way of life he is excluded from our circle quickly.

Even though it is a question of a city with stores and, therefore, a market, apparently the population is engaged mainly in livestock breeding and crop growing. Their fields are common. They are not guarded and they are cultivated jointly:

We seed at sowing time and entrust the land to the feeders. We do not watch the oats and the barley. Six months later, at harvesttime, we gather 700 grains for each seed we plant.

As the reader may see, this no longer is a naive consumer utopia typical of ancient legends. It hints at joint farm tools and joint field labor. Iskander was so amazed by what he had seen and heard that he decided to cut his trip short:

I shall no longer roam around the world. I have acquired a great deal (in terms of experience) through what I learned from these people. If this is the way of life what do we want? Who are we then? They sent us to cross the seas and steppes in order to come here. Had I but seen this nation earlier I would not have crossed the world. I would have had this way of life and shared no other faith.

Iskander, "exultant, returned from this kingdom."

Here Nizami gives us a splendid, a truly Homeric image of Iskander crossing foreign lands—the picture of his armies marching through a valley in which their Asia Minor badges look like so many flowers:

Your silken marks of many colors covered the entire country.

The poem gives an almost precise location of this "city of the happy!" It lay on the way to "Khirkhiz." The time is given almost as precisely. The ancient manuscript of one of these "Alexandrias" has been preserved in Peter the Great's library. I saw it only a few years ago as an exhibit in Leningrad. In general, all these legends about towns and lands whose populations are unaware of words

such as "mine" and "yours" but only of "ours" almost always indicate their geographic location. Such legends are found in our country as well. They come from the ancient Christian apocrypha and (relatively) recent legends originating in the religious settlements deep in the Altays such as, for example, Bukhtarma. They are frequently encountered in the epics of our peoples such as Kalmyks and Kirghis, beautifully translated into Russian by Soviet poets. They originated at different times, sometimes separated by a century or several decades. Strangely, though, all legends invariably have some common features. They include a generous nature, a beautiful climate, fertile land, crystal clear, "white," "sun-filled" water (the adjective "white" as applied to water may be found in the writings of the Greek Aegimius in antiquity), the communal way of life and work and distribution of products, mutual aid, and absence of institutions of force and coercion.

May I also add that the ancient forms of such "communes" have been relatively little studied by historians of so-called Western "utopias."

After I sent to Academician V. P. Volgin, a specialist in European utopian theories, my "Nizami's 'Utopia'," from my "Studies on Nizami," he answered me with the following letter:

"September 1944

"Dear Marietta Sergeevna!

"I was very interested in the material you sent me. In my view, all this is highly valuable not only in the understanding of Nizami but in understanding the ideological history of the Middle East in general. A great deal of it was entirely new to me (naturally, however, I have not read very much about the East)...."

It was Volgin himself who included my chapter "Nizami's 'Utopia'" in "Izvestiya Akademii Nauk SSSR" [News of the USSR Academy of Sciences].

The purpose of all this is to point out that to a certain extent the word "utopia" as coined by Thomas More is somewhat inaccurate. It has come to mean, at best, the human dream of establishing an ideally just life on earth. More frequently it means something imagined, unreal and, above all, impossible to accomplish. No, mankind has not only dreamed of the practical organization on earth, among people, of a just, good and happy life. It has repeatedly tried to create this kind of life. These efforts have been revealed to us by the folk epics and the writings of antiquity.

I am writing all this as a preface to my main topic: the role and significance of the Paris Commune in Lenin's life and in the October Revolution. Lenin was no utopian at all. He believed that it was possible for man to live on Earth in a real commune, in a state of real equality and real justice, and to practice new socialist production relations.

To Lenin the Paris Commune was a factual attempt at a socialist change in human life, an effort to establish justice and equality, and to bring the working class to the foreground of the historical arena as the master of history. To Lenin it was a factual place, something which could be duplicated.

## Chapter 11

A very great deal has been written about the role and significance of the Paris Commune in Lenin's life and works even though, in my view, still not enough.

In the field of fiction I recall only the novel by E. Kazakevich, "Binyaya Tetrad'" [The Blue Notebook] in which the author discusses the work of the leader in Razliv on "The State and Revolution." In the novel, however, the writer's interest is not focused on the Paris Commune.

Lenin considered the Paris Commune as proof of the possibility of creating on earth a just life, the possibility of turning theory and human ideals into reality. The foundations of Bolshevism, the psychological transformation of knowledge into conviction and of conviction into inevitable action, Marx' and Lenin's demands to "crush" rather than preserve the old state machinery, the demand which drastically separates Lenin and Marx from Menshevism and from all kinds of opportunism, characteristic of Western social democrats, are rooted in the blending of theory with practice. These "theoreticians" are perfectly aware of it. It is no accident that in recent decades, in an effort to refute Leninism and "purge" Marx from Lenin, they slander the Paris Commune, claiming that it was full of errors and squabbles, that it was small, that it met with no response among the population and that, in general, it was wrongly idealized by the Bolsheviks. Sometimes, such shameful attacks on those who proved the reality of the Commune with their lives, and whose graves in the Pere Lachaise Cemetery are always decorated with the modest flowers brought by the workers of Paris and their wives, reveal a state of crass ignorance.

We find extensive references to the Paris Commune in Lenin's Complete Collected Works. The index lists volumes 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 44, 47 and 54.

Let us consider Vladimir Il'ich's approach to this topic in the first volume. In his work "Who Are the 'Friends of the People' and How They Fight the Social Democrats?" he writes: "Naturally, if we consider that the nec plus ultra of international solidarity is the system of "equitable" trade, as described with philistine vulgarity by the chronicler of domestic life in Issue No 2 of RUSSKOYE BOGATSTVO, and fail to understand the fact that trade, both fair and unfair, always presumes and includes the rule of the bourgeoisie, and that without the elimination of an economic organization based on trade international conflicts cannot be eliminated, we understand the mocking of the International (Lenin referred to Burenin's mocking of Marx--the author). It becomes understandable that Mr Mikhaylovskiy cannot eliminate the simple truth that there is no means for fighting national hatred better than the organization and unification of the class of the oppressed to fight the class of the oppressors in each individual country, or the unification of national workers organizations within a single international labor army to fight international capital. As to the fact that the International has not prevented the workers from fighting each other, suffice it to point out to Mr Mikhaylovskiy the events of the Commune which proved the true attitude of the organized proletariat toward the ruling classes waging the war" (p 155).



This early mention of the Paris Commune shows that while still a very young man (this was written in 1894!), Lenin had already described the difference between political trends which subsequently became known as Menshevism and Bolshevism. At that point he also described the true nature of the Paris Commune and his simple and clear belief that its principles could be implemented on earth. In 1902 Lenin wrote his most profound work, "What is to be Done?" In it he speaks precisely and most definitely about the Paris Commune as of a real experience and as an attempt to create a new social system, an attempt which lasted in excess of 2 months: "Where would we be now without the examples of the English trade unions and the political struggle of the French workers, without that tremendous impetus which the Paris Commune, in particular, provided?" (Vol 6, p 26).

Whereas, according to Lenin, the British trade unions and the revolutionary efforts of the French workers are merely prototypes of future revolutions and provide instructive examples for the organization and struggle of the proletariat, the Paris Commune is more than that. It is already a tremendous (what an adjective!) impetus (what a term!) for the future victory in the struggle and for the conversion of theory into practice. Lenin considered not only the features of the strategy of the class struggle of the proletariat but the specific structure and organization of the new social system in the Paris Commune a case of factual experience which was applied in the first months of the 1903 Russian Revolution.... On its eve, in 1903, his "Speech on the Party Program" (Vol 7, p 270) contains a third mention of the Paris Commune in connection with the Bolshevik solution of the problem of involving or not involving the peasantry in the movement of the proletariat. Here is what Lenin said: "You must further remember that Marx subsequently acknowledged as entirely correct the claim of the communards that the cause of the Commune is also the cause of the peasantry. I repeat, we should not doubt the fact that under certain circumstances the conversion of one or another toiling stratum to the side of the proletariat is quite possible. The entire matter is to define these conditions precisely. The condition under consideration is most accurately stipulated in the words "to convert to the viewpoint of the proletariat." It is precisely these words that most firmly prevent us, the social democrats, from participating in any allegedly socialist currents in general and separate us from the so-called social revolutionaries in particular."

In this case the problem of the Paris Commune is closely related to the views of the Bolsheviks, and Lenin uses its example as a contribution to "separating" the views of the social democrats (Bolsheviks) from all forms of opportunism in currents labeling themselves "socialist." It is highly instructive and interesting to trace this "high road" of Lenin's attitude toward the Paris Commune from the very early years of his political activities!

Finally, volumes 8-9 (vol 8, pp 483-493; vol 9, pp 328-330) no longer contain individual references to the Paris Commune but summaries and a plan for reports on the Commune to be made at different times (in connection with the 18 March Commune anniversary). Lenin made these speeches in Geneva and worked on them very hard, as confirmed by a number of library documents, preserved lists of books he read, and even the length of time he kept them. Naturally, these were books written immediately after the Commune events by its contemporaries and even its participants.

The memoirs of those who were present describe the way he delivered his speeches and the influence they had on the audience.

I shall cite what I consider the two most characteristic recollections, the one by Bolshevik N. M. Essen and the second by Lenin's friend P. N. Lepeshinskiy.

### Chapter III

The event took place in 1904, in Geneva with its library and the famous Karuzhka (Carouge) Street, as Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya used to call it. Following is Maria Essen's story:

"The first time I saw him was on the rostrum, in 1904, in Geneva, speaking on the Paris Commune. On the rostrum Lenin became an entirely different person. He was coordinated, neat, as though carved out of a single block. His entire power was concentrated in his voice, in his shining eyes, in his sharp words. I have had occasion to listen to very great speakers whose speeches were aimed precisely at amazing the audience, displaying a glittering style and wit, able to use strength and modulation and fluid movements and adopt a beautiful stance. Such were Plekhanov, Jaures, and Vandervelde, who were considered among the best in the world. Their speeches were very effective. However, I never lost the impression that there was something artificial in their speeches. This was not the case with Lenin. The power of his speech was indescribable. There was no external glitter. His words were simple and clear but, listening to Lenin, one forgot everything else. He captivated his audience entirely.... Other speakers may be admired but they are heard impersonally, while Lenin called for action."

All this is rather general and written in many memoirs. But here we come:

"Lenin spoke of the Commune and we experienced its powerful breath, its pathos, its tragedy, its universal significance. The Paris Commune arose in front of us like the glimmering dawn of a new life, like the first attempt of the workers to seize the power. We mentally saw the besieged Paris, the cowardice and treachery of the ruling classes, and the corrupt government which had escaped to Versailles and betrayed the homeland. We saw the heroic working class who had assumed the task of defending the fatherland and of building a state on a new basis. Lenin described all the difficulties related to these tasks and all contradictions and errors of the Commune. He described its doom. To this day I remember the speech and the enthusiasm it created. Lenin's inspired and fiery speech made it clear that the Paris Commune was not only a heroic historical event depicting the power and strength of the working class but an inspiring example to us."

This is followed by a remarkable excerpt for the sake of which I included this entire lengthy excerpt:

"A small happily excited group left the meeting. I asked Lenin:

"Will we live to see the time when the Commune will rise again?"

"Lenin was startled:

"Is that the conclusion you drew from my speech?" he asked.

"Yes, I and whoever listened to you today." (N. Essen, "Vstrechi s Leninyu" [Meetings With Lenin], Politizdat, Moscow, 1972, pp 15-17).

Unquestionably, the author of these memoirs had a literary gift or, more accurately, the gift for intuitively capturing details. She was sensitive to Lenin's reaction to her words. He "was startled." He responded to the pleasure the answer gave him not only with his mind but with his entire being, his entire motor apparatus.

At this point we literally feel the presence of the living Lenin. He was startled, which means that he had received an important news and was overcome by it. He was all motion. This shows, we feel at this point, how important it was to him for his speech to sound like a hope, to strengthen the belief that there will be a commune, that its day on earth will come.

I am describing this quite vaguely even though I feel particularly deeply Lenin's particular impulsiveness. His feeling was not merely a reaction to what he had heard. At this point I recall what N. L. Meshcheryakov said. The event occurred in Brussels, while Lenin was in transit and had to be very cautious not to draw the attention of the police. Lenin was walking on the street with the author of the memoirs. Suddenly there was commotion. There was a mass of people... It was a wave of human protest known as a demonstration. With a great deal of effort Meshcheryakov blocked Vladimir Il'ich's eagerness to join the crowd....

Here again we have the reaction of an entire being--an amazing, alive, immediate reaction to events, typical of Vladimir Il'ich.

Lepeshinskiy's recollections are of a different nature. He starts with the fact that the political exiles in Geneva deemed it a great honor to attend Vladimir Il'ich's traditional speech commemorating the Paris Commune. His description of these speeches is general. However, unexpectedly, we come across an unusual word which reminds us of Essen's memoirs. Following is some of Lepeshinskiy's story containing the amazing word I mentioned. I leave it to the reader to identify it by himself.

"The 2,000-strong crowd tensely listened to every word of the speaker. Something tremendous and prophetic could be felt in his fiery speech. At that moment he was able to fan even in people hostile to the Bolsheviks the little spark of revolutionary passion they carried in their hearts.... Coming out of the meeting, even some Mensheviks (the simpler ones, closer to the lower strata) willingly acknowledged that, yes, this is precisely the man who, in fact, could become the leader of the proletariat." (P. N. Lepeshinskiy, "Il'ich o Parizhskoy Kommune" [Il'ich on the Paris Commune]. MOPR, 1925, pp4-5).

The adjectives "inspired" and "fiery," and the statements I cited, "the crowd tensely tried to catch every word," and "Lenin calls for action," and "he spoke of the Commune and we felt its powerful breath....," and other similar and frequently encountered descriptions of Lenin's speeches are quite familiar to the reader.

Lepeshinsky noted something special:

"Something tremendous and prophetic could be felt in his fiery speech."

Essen speaks of the possibility of a new commune in the future, thus triggering Lenin's excited reaction.

Lepeshinsky hears in Lenin's words on the Paris Commune "something prophetic." In other words, Lenin's speech, dealing with the past, is addressed to the future, to a phenomenon which promises to repeat itself, to be carried out. The anniversary of the Commune becomes not a recollection of the past but a harbinger of the future.

#### Chapter IV

Thirteen years passed since those Leninist speeches and the tremendous impression they made on the audience. The 1905 revolution, with its visible features of the Paris Commune, defeated by czarism, was already a thing of the past. The bourgeois February Revolution which destroyed czarism came. However, it did not destroy the old machinery of the Russian state and did not improve the life of the people. Lenin fiercely attacked Kerenskiy's bourgeois government. The fatal summer of 1917 came. In July the Bolsheviks suffered a temporary defeat. During those memorable days I personally heard on the streets petit bourgeois say that, "Only an idiot could now believe that the Bolsheviks will come back!" Had Lenin forgotten his thought of the Paris Commune? No! There is proof that he lived and armed himself with it.

A reproduction we frequently see on the dust jackets of books is one familiar to our children and adults. A neat stack of hay stands in the middle of a field next to a small cabin. Lenin is sitting, relaxed, on a stump, peacefully writing something in a notebook open on his knees. Many people believe this to be a photograph. It is not. Travel guides describing this beautiful and peaceful site near Sestroretskoye usually state that it was here, in this cabin, that Vladimir Il'ich Lenin wrote his book "The State and Revolution." This, however, is not a photograph but the work of a painter on a historical topic. In fact, it was not in this resort area, in full view of the mowers and passersby, that Lenin wrote one of the most brilliant works ever written. He wrote it in the middle of a thick grove behind the haystack. It was here that N. A. Yemel'yanov cleared a small area of shrubs, making something like a gazebo, invisible to outsiders. It was here that Lenin worked, using a log for a desk.

As we know, Nikolay Aleksandrovich Yemel'yanov was the Bolshevik worker in whose apartment Lenin hid for a while. When this became risky the Yemel'yanov family moved Lenin across the lake to a field which was being mowed. They settled Lenin in the cabin next to the haystack inside which one could sleep...

Why do I object to this beautiful picture liked by children and adults? Not only because it has been embellished and is not entirely consistent with reality but because it creates a happy background for two of the most important, most dramatic, and most intense months in Lenin's life as he awaited the final and decisive



battle. To sweeten, to sugarcoat, to weaken the truth of the events preceding the October Revolution itself means to reduce the significance of everything Lenin felt.

When did this happen? Exactly when? Literally! Be precise as though taking a political literacy test! This occurred immediately after the July defeat of the Bolsheviks, when the philistine "Thank God, this is the end of Bolshevism!" could be heard on the streets of Petersburg.

Meanwhile, it was precisely then that Kerenskiy's provisional government knew perfectly well that this was far from being the end! There would be no end as long as Lenin had not been caught, arrested, and eliminated. Only this would prevent Bolshevism from returning! The government threw all its forces into the detection, detention, and execution of Vladimir Il'ich. This included all military cadets, the cossacks, soldiers, the police, secret agents, petit bourgeois volunteers, border troops along the internal Finnish border, and both Russian and Finnish officials. But this area seems so small, and the crossing lines so visible and well guarded! Even Tref, the famous hound dog, was turned loose in the hunt for this person unique in the world.

A note to Lenin's work "The State and Revolution" reads as follows: "Written in August-September 1917." August-September. The eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

I believe that every Soviet person, from the humblest to the greatest, should be familiar with these two months--August and September 1917--and know that it was within that time that what Lenin had thought and done took place. Yet, we frequently either do not know or know vaguely and superficially or, which is even worse, we tend to embellish this most important dramatic bit of Lenin's life and of our party's history. We do not read and reread even the attractive memoirs, which read almost like an "adventure" novel, the sharp recollections of Shotman and Rakh'i and even of locomotive engineer Yalava (in whose apartment I have been and with whom I drank tea asking him for endless details!)...

And so, what did Vladimir Il'ich experience and think about in these 2 months--on the very eve of the October Revolution? We know that he wrote "The State and Revolution," as the manuscript of this book precisely notes that it was written in August-September, 1917." But what were the conditions, the circumstances in which it was written? Lenin's biography, which is strictly factual, bases everything on the precise study of the "chronicles," i.e., of Il'ich's "days and actions." However, they almost totally lack something which could be described as the psychological aspect of his life. Almost no attempt has been made to make us feel the inner world of this short but strikingly outstanding and comprehensive life, full of tremendous contrasts and, at the same time, pierced as with an arrow by a single will.

Particularly notable is the lack of attempts in Lenin's biography to include even a basic study of his experiences in the course of these 2 months of August and September 1917. Many adventurous details are provided on the actions of those who were instructed by the party to hide Lenin safely. However, not even memoirs contain a single word of what he himself experienced and the way he protected his precious manuscript in the swamp, in the forest, or when he crossed a river....

It is hard to believe that Lenin gave it to someone for safekeeping. It is hard to believe that he did not carry it close to his chest or over his head as he crossed a river. I imagine Lenin, half frozen, warming himself by a campfire at night. What about him? Did he catch a cold, was he tired, was he tense? We have no knowledge of this and nothing is revealed in documents. Unwittingly, however, we think of something dictated by practical experience. When life is threatened, a person is concerned not only with himself but with something he carries for the sake of the future. Sometimes a child will save his mother who is trying to save him. A tree will save a person who refused to cut it down. Such events occur not only in stories. I most seriously believe, remembering the entire chain of trials Lenin had to experience during these two months, that he was protected from all sorts of accidents by the valuable manuscript which he himself was forced to protect at all times if he were to complete it on time. But, to go back from our assumptions to what occurred, we are drawn by Lenin's amazing calm and behavior, as a disciplined party member doing everything which the party required in order to insure his safety.

The area of Razliv where Lenin was hiding was becoming dangerous. Every bit of land around him had been fine-combed by the cadets, every single path had been explored. Lenin had to be moved to Finland. The Finnish comrades loyal to the revolution were ready: locomotive engineer Hugo Yalava at Udel'naya Railroad Station of the Finnish Railway; Emil Kalske, the owner of the apartment where Lenin spent the night and, the most reliable shelter--the comfortable apartment of Gustav Rovio, the social democrat... and the chief police master of Helsingfors, to name Helsinki by its old Swedish name.

This overall plan had a weak spot. Somehow Vladimir Il'ich had to be moved from Razliv to Udel'naya. This "somehow" was the weak link in the chain. The loyal worker-Bolshevik Nikolay Aleksandrovich Yemel'yanov was instructed to work out the details of each step of this "somehow."

Yemel'yanov was a local resident and knew the area to perfection. His plan was... To be honest, however, every time I come to this point my memory begins to wander between two railroads, the Finnish and the Russian, and Levashevo, Dibuny, Ozerki, Udelnaya and Lakhti stations...which are both Finnish and Russian. To cut it short, late that evening, leading Lenin out of his cabin, Yemel'yanov, the local expert, with his companions Eino Rakh'1 and Aleksandr Vasil'yevich Shotman (accompanied by Zinov'yev) crossed the swamp to Levashevo. According to Yemel'yanov's plan this "somehow" detail was about 10 to 12 versts long (we switch here to the dear old measurement of distance, from the cold ubiquitous kilometers to our own Russian versts). Our night travelers walked and walked or, rather, did not walk but made their way through wet grass, swamps and forests, following a small path. The versts went on and there was no Levashevo. It turned out that Yemel'yanov, the area expert, had taken a wrong path and that they had become lost. The reaction to this was stormy, as Il'ich "exploded" when, finally, they reached not Levashevo Station but...Dibuny. Honestly, I too, at this point, was angry at the poor Yemel'yanov. I can imagine how in his embarrassment he scratched his head and tried to justify his error.

As I mentioned, Levashevo was 10 to 12 versts away from Razliv. The memoirs state that Dibuny was 7 versts away from the Finnish border. I do not know how long it took them to travel from Razliv to Dibuny. Vladimir Il'ich was angry throughout the trip. It is interesting to note, yet once again, that he was not angry at the thoughtless way in which his life had been endangered (Yemel'yanov was arrested by the cadets while Lenin with his fellow travelers hid behind a hillside). Lenin's swearing, Lenin's energetic swearing which insulted virtually no one had to do not with the people but with the carelessness of the planning. If there is a plan you must study it down to its finest point and all details! Only thus could a plan be carried out. Without precise knowledge of each part of the plan the plan itself is worthless.

Their many subsequent adventures, described by both Shotman and Rakh'ya, deal not only with the way they "transferred" Vladimir Il'ich to Finland but also the way they brought him back to Russia. In the train Rakh'ya addressed Lenin in Finnish. Lenin answered with Finnish words for "yes" and "no" he had learned, frequently giving the wrong answer. But "make up" was considered the most reliable means for hiding Lenin. Through the police the provisional government had forbidden all barbershops to sell wigs without identification. The very purchase of a wig could lead to a police investigation. They were able to purchase a wig in a barbershop with a certificate issued by the theatrical circle of the Finnish railroad workers in Vyborg. Lenin shaved his beard and moustache. He dressed like a Petersburg worker. According to the memoirs Vladimir Il'ich became unrecognizable! He looked entirely different! At this point of the story I was lucky enough to make a small discovery.

The photograph for the forged passport shows Lenin "made up," wearing a worker's cap, with his beard and moustache shaved off. However, in the book "Lenin v Vospominaniyakh Finnov" [Lenin as Remembered by the Finns] the photograph takes a full page and my old eyes were able to distinguish his features. The caption under the photograph reads, "Lenin Wearing a Wig. 1917." Vaguely, with my mind's eye, I felt something quite familiar, something.... Lenin's comrades said with admiration that he was "absolutely unrecognizable!" I, however, understood why they could not see the true, perhaps the only true Lenin, amazingly resembling his real self, "like two drops of water." Unlike the present, at that time there were no photographs of the young Volodya, of Ul'yanov, the high school student. The party members who were helping Lenin to "make himself up" had not known him in his childhood and adolescence while his relatives were not with him in those days and months. Lenin already had a beard and a moustache when Nadezhda Konstantinovna herself met him for the first time.

I ask of you, the reader, to look at the photograph of the small Volodya Ul'yanov by the armchair in which, looking like a little doll, sits his younger sister Ol'ga. He himself is wearing a shirt and breeches too big for his size, for Mariya Aleksandrovna, who sewed her children's clothes, always made "allowances" for the year to come. Put side by side with this well-known photograph, the big photograph of Vladimir Ul'yanov in his high school uniform, 17 years old (the signature under the photograph reads "Vladimir Ul'yanov, 1887"). Also add at this point the photograph of the "unrecognizable"... Lenin. The timespan is indeed substantial (17-47). The 47-year-old Lenin had his hair cut off and a wig put on, topped by a cap, making him "unrecognizable" to all others but, in my

view, immediately identifiable. That is precisely how he looked in his childhood and early youth--the wide, open Leninist forehead under the wavy hair, the broad oval face, the piercing eyes with a barely noticeable sparkle of youthful mischief or humor and, above all, the typical lower lip, rather chubby like a child's. All three photographs, taken at different ages, show the same features.

This was something he had retained from the day of his birth to the age of 47... and which was perceived (let us note incidentally) in such a brilliant way by Maksim Gor'kiy, the great artist of the word: a great child of the accursed world. The "makeup," to tell the truth, had reverted his face to his childhood and adolescence, as though turning him back toward his old self. Naturally, this small "discovery"--the fact that the wise leader of toiling mankind had retained his childhood features--the sparkles of "mischief," and this good chubby lip--may be disputed. To me and in terms of my latest study of Lenin, it is important and necessary, for on the eve of the October Revolution Lenin displayed so much of what was uniquely pure, impetuous, direct, and original.

During these 2 months of August and September, running away from persecution and doom, entirely forgetting himself, he wrote his book "The State and Revolution." This occurred immediately after the July defeat and before October. It was when not even a ghost of a Soviet state existed. Meanwhile he wrote, he was already writing not only about the type of state the Soviets would set up on earth but about precisely the way such a state should bring about the withering away of any state in general. It is difficult to believe this, it appears superhuman, considering the circumstances and the time and place. There was not even a mention of a Soviet state while he was already writing how precisely such a Soviet state, developing, would bring about the triumph of communist social self-management. And always, clearly in his mind he saw the Paris Commune as the source of his books, as a prediction.

## Chapter V

All this seems so close I could almost touch it! My generation sharply reacted to the film "Karl Marx. The Young Years," when we saw on the screen people wearing top hats, people dressed up, wearing frock coats. All this seemed so recent, almost my time, a few decades before Volodya Ul'yanov was born. French booklets on the event of the Paris Commune, written by contemporaries probably carried illustrations of the events and, perhaps, daguerrotypes of the great communards. We know that Lenin read them as an exile, in the libraries in Geneva and Paris. This had taken place not somewhere in the remote sands and oases of Asia, not in the "smart city" seen by Alexander the Great over 2,000 years ago.... He saw in his imagination not people wearing some kind of tunics but people of the administrative districts of the real Paris, wearing jackets and trousers like those of today....

In his book, he exclaimed:

"...The old official machinery must be wrecked immediately and immediately a new machinery must be built which will enable us gradually to reduce to naught any kind of officialdom. This is no utopia. This is the experience of the Commune, it is the direct, the immediate task of the revolutionary proletariat" (Vol 33, pp 48-49).



Therefore, what Lenin singles out most strongly is the word "NO:" the Paris Commune is no utopia. It is experience.

Every word here is important. Not utopia but experience.

What kind of experience? The real practical experience of a true socialist revolution. It is precisely the study of this experience, its slogans, and its practical activities in their inseparable inner connections that Lenin described in his book, chapter by chapter, before plunging into the great historical October battle. Once and for all he cleared the Paris Commune from any touch of "utopianism." He stipulated precisely and clearly that it is reality and not utopia.

Lenin fiercely opposed Kautskiy's attempts to belittle, to question the possibility that the slogans of the Paris Commune could be fully implemented. Together with Marx, Lenin fiercely struggled, citing Marx, and expressing his own Leninist position, showing to his readers the unity between the program and practices of the communards. Frequently repeating that "we are not utopians," he demanded the following:

"We shall learn revolutionary daring from the communards. We shall see in their practical measures their planned practical, vital and immediately possible measures and then, following this path, we shall undertake the total destruction of bureaucracy.

"The possibility of such destruction is insured by the fact that socialism will shorten the working day, lead the masses to a new type of life, and offer the majority of the population conditions which will enable everyone to carry out "governmental functions." This will bring about the total withering away of the state in general" (Ibid., p 117).

This cluster of thoughts in which the adjective "practical" is emphasized as applicable to the entire content (Lenin emphasized this with his word "note") shows the way to the withering away of any state in general. Let us not confuse the lengthy process of withering away of statehood as such, which greatly depends on foreign political conditions and circumstances, with the instant, "immediate" destruction of the former exploiting capitalist state. This is the first practical measure of the battle clash between the old and the new.

Lenin refers to Marx' authority:

"Marx derived from the entire history of socialism and of the political struggle the fact that the state must disappear and that the transitional form of its disappearance (the transition from state to non-state) will be 'organized by the ruling proletarian class'" (Ibid., p 56).

In the old theories of the state (we still remember the way they were taught in prerevolutionary universities) the researchers approached the topic as something mystical (like Hobbs' "Leviathan").

In one fell swoop Lenin put an end to all this.

He described the state as the machinery for the suppression of one class by another with its beginning, history and prerequisites for disappearance to be witnessed by the generation which will grow up under new and free social conditions.

Lenin thoroughly studied everything which Marx wrote about the Commune and with the piercing clarity of his brilliant mind selected the proper excerpts.

"...The Commune's first decree was the abolishment of the regular troops who were replaced by the people in arms.... The Commune consisted of city councillors elected in the various Paris districts through general elections. They were answerable to the people and revokable at all times.... The police which, until then, had been the tool of the state's government, was immediately deprived of all political functions and turned into an organ answerable to the Commune and replaceable at all times.... The same applied to officials in all other administrative sectors.... The Commune immediately undertook to break down the tool of spiritual oppression, the power of the priests.... The judiciary lost its seeming independence.... Henceforth its members were to be elected openly and be answerable and revokable...." (Ibid., pp 41-42; see K. Marx and F. Engels "Soch." [Works], Vol 17, pp 342-343).

He listed all the practical measures taken by the Commune, clearly singling out those which he considered essential from the viewpoint of the abolishment of bourgeois statehood. He wrote:

"Instead of special establishments for the privileged minority (privileged officialdom, and the regular army command), the majority itself can accomplish this directly. The more the fulfillment of the functions of the state becomes a matter of the whole people, the less need there is for such authority. Particularly noteworthy in this respect is the following measure taken by the Commune, emphasized by Marx: the elimination of all pay for representative positions and reducing the wages of all officials in the state to the level of the "worker's wage." It is this, precisely, that most clearly reveals the transition from bourgeois to proletarian democracy, from oppressing democracy to the democracy of the oppressed classes, and from the state as a "special power" used for the suppression of a specific class to the suppression of the oppressors by the joint power of the majority of the people, the workers and the peasant. It is precisely in this particularly clear matter, the matter of the state, that the most important items of Marx' lessons have been most neglected!" (Ibid., pp 42-43).

Our children and our children's children are quite familiar with the event in Lenin's life when he angrily objected to V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich who had decided to add another 300 rubles to the salary of the first head of our state, without the latter's knowledge and agreement. The source of this anger is Lenin's statement written on the even of the October Revolution that "Marx' main lessons" had been the most neglected!

At this point Lenin faced a person, an ordinary person, like most of us with our different characters, gifts, capabilities, and thoughts, a person with whom he had to deal. Could a socialist revolution be made with this person? According

to the Mensheviks socialism needed a kind of trained, improved "breed" of people, which the masses had not yet attained. What did Lenin say? "We are not utopians... No, we want to make the socialist revolution with the people as they are now..." (Ibid., p 49).

"We are not utopians," said Lenin, discovering something which was growing from the depth of Bolshevism: great faith in mankind, love for man as he is, not for a special man, but for the people as they are today, with all their shortcomings and faults, for it was precisely with the help of such people that a socialist revolution had to be made at that point. If the Commune, which had lasted over two months, governed by the laws of justice and equality, was not utopia but experience, as Lenin teaches, one should equally trust the real existence of good in man, in any man, the way one should trust that anyone has the possibility to experience a great spiritual upsurge, the way one should love mankind, the way one should believe that mankind can, even though slowly and stumbling, advance toward goodness and justice and will indeed achieve goodness and justice!

Such was the atomic energy with which Lenin's entire being was charged on the eve of the Great October Revolution.

However, a "utopian," a skeptic, a descendant of Kautskiy and of those whose knowledge has not become conviction, may once again block the path of these considerations and of the slogans of the Paris Commune. He thinks, he hesitates, he does not like the slogan of the Paris Commune or the fact that wages will equal those of Commune workers (incidentally, he may not even know that as late as 1940 the wage of an administrative official exceeded the earnings of an industrial worker by an average of 20 percent whereas today it is lower: in 1979 it averaged 147.8 rubles compared with 180.3 rubles). He is unwilling openly to oppose Marx and Lenin but grumbles: "Who do you have in mind? Who will agree to assume responsibility for such a salary? Dream! Utopia! Impossible to achieve!"

Lenin answers: "It is achievable!" His inspired book discusses the theory of habit, the practice of daily and hourly habit. The people say that habit is second nature. The constant actions of the human masses guided by the measures of the Commune may change the nature and features of the older people, the way water sharpens a stone, even though for centuries on end these people were raised under the conditions of private ownership statehood. They could become new people, communards, people created by a semistate, by a "nonstate."

In his book Lenin poses and resolves many most delicate socialist problems. He explains with striking depth the difference between formal and factual equality, between formal and factual democracy. This analysis is one of the most profound sections of "The State and Revolution," and failure to understand it would lead the reader to ignore many of the other facts contained in the book.

Again the skeptic could object: You claim that the short life of the factual Paris Commune would be extended "by centuries" on earth? What other than this 2-month experience of the Commune could you cite in comparing it with the past?

At this point, the reader may believe it or not, I was shaken up by the unexpected, the sudden, the striking answer he gave to this possible utopian question:

The early Christians....

"Primitive Christianity, with its democratic-revolutionary spirit."

I have discussed this unexpected statement in "The State and Revolution" with many researchers. Not one of them had noted it. They all doubted that such a statement could be found in Lenin's works. They did not believe and denied such a possibility. They asked, where? Where? I answered: Find it yourselves.

Before I go on with Lenin's idea in that same page of "The State and Revolution," let me recall the end of the previous statement. It was a question of the fact that "Marx' most important lessons have been the most neglected!" In my view, they were "neglected" because subsequent theoreticians considered them unattainable and, therefore, obsolete and naive.

Let us now end up the quote.

Lenin writes that the radical measures of equality applied by the Paris Commune were forgotten by the socialists and that these lessons were forgotten by the historians of socialism:

"They are not mentioned in the innumerable popular commentaries. It is 'accepted' to ignore them, precisely because of their 'naivete' which has become obsolete, in the same way that when Christianity became the religion of the state, the Christians 'forgot' the 'naivetes' of original Christianity with its democratic-revolutionary spirit" (Ibid., p 43).

In this excerpt Lenin states another very valuable thing: his thought, retreating thousands of years into the past, provides a caution for the present. How did Christianity change and degenerate from its initial similarity with the Commune? It was because, "gaining the status of state religion," and acquiring material wealth and a spiritual monopoly, it became an appendix to the exploiting society. It did not heed the danger of the intoxication with power, of canonizing, of losing its ties with the real needs of the oppressed which originated it. What an amazing daring he displayed in presenting the backlash of history!

I say this only in passing, however, thinking as I go along. Generally speaking, I can hear at this point the sound of books closing....enough! In the conclusion to his amazing book, a book written not by a "utopian," in the sense of the word coined by Thomas More, but of a great revolutionary transformer with belief in mankind, Lenin was to say that, "...It is more pleasant and useful for the 'experience of the revolution' to be experienced than written about" (Ibid., p 120).

But even after he "made" the socialist revolution and was already at the head of the Soviet state, his thoughts turned again to the Paris Commune: "In our soviets there is still a great deal of something unquestionably rough, unfinished. This is clear to everyone looking at their work. What is important, however, what is historically valuable, what is a step ahead in the worldwide development of socialism is the fact that a new type of state has been established here. In the case of the Paris Commune this lasted only a few weeks, in a single city, without



any awareness of what was taking place. Those who made the Commune did not understand it. They created it through the brilliant sense of the awakened masses and no single French socialist faction was aware of what it was accomplishing. We find ourselves in circumstances in which, thanks to the fact that we are standing on the shoulders of the Paris Commune and the long development of German social democracy, we can clearly see what we are doing by creating a Soviet system" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 36, p 50).

On the shoulders of the Paris Commune!

## Chapter VI

### Conclusion (Pro domo sua<sup>6</sup>)

I witnessed the October coup d'etat as a mature person. I was already 30. Fortunately, I experienced it together with the entire people, rather than the then intelligentsia of Moscow and Petersburg, or the bourgeois writers' circles weakened from hunger, from the February government's chaos, a lack of understanding of what was happening and a loss of a true sense of history.

Revolutions are not political only. The moral need of mankind for truth, justice, and good on earth plays a tremendous role in the revolutionary explosion. When Lenin is mentioned only as a politician the tremendous moral force he invested in the October Revolution is forgotten. It was the moral strength of his faith in mankind and in man. It was precisely this captivating moral power that drew the masses to him, that made him the beloved leader of the people. Lenin's great humanism is expressed in the political formulas of "The State and Revolution," and even in the choice of Lenin's words. Instead of endless repetitions of the words "working class" and "class struggle," how warmly we react to his frequent use of the simple words of "the oppressed," "the oppressors," "the poor," and "the rich." In these qualitative definitions class division and political language become inventive and graphic. The reader can see living people and sense a moral attitude toward them. True humanism shines through politics. I am writing this because at that time I considered Bolshevism close and precious to me not only as a radical political trend but because of its profound humanism. That is why I considered the October Revolution a great happiness, the happiness that justice and goodness had won on earth. I deem it great luck that in the war in 1914, I stopped in my mother's native city, Nakhichevan-na-Donu, returning to Russia from the university in Heidelberg, crossing into Russia through our southern border. This was a suburb of the big workers' revolutionary city of Rostov-na-Donu. After the October Revolution broke out in the north, we, in the south, found ourselves under Denikin's rule. Why do I say that I consider this lucky? Because my previous circle, the bourgeois poets and writers of Petersburg and Moscow, some of those whose circles I frequented, welcomed the October Revolution with a lack of understanding of what it brought to the world, a lack of true sense of history, with bitterness and hostility. We in the south, in my environment, living in a monstrous atmosphere of the last throes of the obsolete system, with its baseness and cruelty, were waiting for the change which would bring us salvation and freedom. We awaited it actively. We had clandestine circles and met with the workers' proletariat of Temernikskiy Rayon. Sometimes we received banned Bolshevik publications. Subsequently, I repeatedly wrote of

the tremendous role which our initial reading of Blok's "The Twelve" played in our lives....

When the October Revolution came to us, even though with some delay, it gave me the greatest happiness of my long life. It would be difficult to describe the nature of this happiness which befell on our generation. Our distant offspring will envy us for having witnessed this miracle--the October Revolution. There is in man's language a word which is neither medical nor psychological nor philosophical: "euphoria." It pertains to the greatest, the highest uplift of the best qualities of man, as though a total metabolism, a feeling full unto itself, with no other shades, a feeling of liberation, of total weightlessness, as though someone's heavy steel hands had been lifted from one's shoulders and one acquires a light and total feeling of absolute truth, absolute freedom and happiness in which there is no "I" or "you," but there an entity--mankind--and you and mankind are but one.... That is how I and my generation of like-thinking people experience the miracle of the October Revolution.

It is regrettable that neither art nor literature have developed as yet means powerful enough to transmit to our descendants the air of the October Revolution, the completeness, purity, and selflessness of this happiness, the freshness and uplift of the atmosphere of the Great October.

I do not know whether this could be understood in full by scientific theoreticians and artists, including those who work on Lenin's image, without having experienced themselves this "instant eternity." Its reflection, however, was felt by all mankind. It gave the people new standards for goodness and happiness. It was felt by all the oppressed. How many countries went to war against us at that time for the sake of preserving the power of the exploiters and the obsolete human system! We were hungry, exhausted, tired, faint from the wars! But we were warmed by the flames of the October Revolution. The moral greatness of what our people had accomplished fired the hearts of the workers and of the best people of the old world. They refused to help their states in their intent to strangle us. They were unwilling to hammer weapons against us. Port workers refused to load it, seamen refused to haul it, and soldiers refused to fire at the heart of the revolution.... We won at that time with our moral greatness, with the absence of any ostentation, with the light of everything that was true. It was a time when theory totally blended with practice--the two parallels came together, idea and reality became one.

Lenin said that no improvement in the human breed should be awaited for making a socialist revolution. He said that such a revolution must be made now, with the people as they are, with real people rather than some kind of "improved" people. Our generation witnessed how these ordinary people, with all their weaknesses, were transformed and the way we ourselves became new, real people. The heavy burden of the inhumanity of the production relations was removed from the air of the October coup d'etat, by the happiness which it brought the people, the freedom of our breathing, our thrust, and the upsurge.

I remember the first years of the building of the Soviet system, first in the south, in Rostov, where I taught weaving, lectured on upgrading workers labor

productivity, and was the bookkeeper of the rural soviet in Chal'tyr', an Armenian village, and, subsequently, in my favorite Petersburg and Moscow, where I returned already armed with the experience of new, Soviet-type work with workers and peasants. I began truly to dedicate my newly acquired understanding and labor experience to the people through professional writing. It was at this point that I was able to note the slow and steady progress of the new, the socialist system toward the future, toward communism. Socialism develops properly, and if objective conditions throughout the world do not hinder this proper development, inevitably it begins to create small yet unquestionable communist trends. The formula expressed by Marx and Lenin to the effect that socialism inevitably grows into communism began to be implemented under the very eyes of the people. I remember how this trend appeared in the first initiative of the 1920s in a most simple matter such as housing, architecture. I remember the initial attempts of Soviet architects. It was in Moscow, in No 2 Khudozhestvennyy Teatr Passage, that we, the writers, were issued our first Soviet apartments. They were small--two rooms, a bathroom and a small kitchen. Under us, however, our "private life" was practically extended into our social life. The lower floors contained a vast common laundry room with all washing facilities. The residents of all apartments came here with their laundry. They became acquainted, friendships and arguments developed, i.e., they communicated in the course of their collective work. It was there, under us, that a "red corner" was set up, a room for the house committee with a small library containing the first books about communism. There was also a room with a teacher for children who had nowhere else to go when their mothers took their first Soviet jobs. This trained, this developed in our children the simple and good feeling of collective life.

How great was our first, our early Komsomol! Today this seems most "naive," and obsolete for the skeptics, a naivete created by real life and by the thorough reading of Lenin's "The State and Revolution!" strictness and pure moral behavior, scorn for ostentation and vaingloriousness and pursuit for the temptations of the past or running after girls who made up their lively and healthy faces and fresh lips and young hair... The Komsomol meant love for labor and collectivism and helping friends in trouble and at school, and passion for science... Science, however, was difficult for this first youth from the people and led to the monstrous aphorism of "nibble at the granite of science." But what great interest was displayed for knowledge and for science in these first-born of the October generation! I have a short entry in my diary from that period. I was in one of the private sanatoria in Lugi, near Petersburg. The owner of the sanatorium was a famous neuropathologist (such private places could still be found in the early October years, they were helping our system). At one point this physician told me: "You cannot imagine how many young people are today suffering from nervous diseases because of the tremendous mental stress from learning." In my diary I wrote: "My heart is full, not with pity but with tenderness toward them. How greatly they strive toward science! What great differences existed between them and the old "white collar workers" down whose throats science was rammed while they spat it out. Meanwhile, these first-born of the people had finally gained the right to read, to learn, to learn this precious science."

What about our dear "new Soviet intelligentsia," new even though it included old cadres who were enthusiastically going into their new jobs! It was a happiness

to share with the people the knowledge one had! I was particularly attracted by the work of the librarians, radio and motion picture reporters, lecturers, and educators who had become Soviet enthusiasts (there were many of them!). I remember being a bedridden patient in a Soviet hospital. At that time all of them seemed alike like our entire daily life with, as I mentioned, the valuable features of factual rather than official equality. At that time I was pleasantly surprised by an innovation: radio earphones had been installed by each hospital bed. This was a new achievement of technical progress and the pride of our hospitals. One hospital followed the example of another. I put on the earphones and listened to the lively, happy and, I would like to say, "blossoming," voice of an elderly woman whose voice was slightly choking from the pleasure with which she was sharing her knowledge: she was describing the life of the French composer Bizet, the failure of his opera Carmen, his tragedy and, subsequently, the worldwide triumph of this outstanding opera. I personally had long been familiar with this and knew it far more extensively. However, I had a feeling of something vividly new-- a newness of how this was said and to whom it was addressed. Unwittingly I cried: How dear and wonderful was this elderly woman who was sharing her knowledge with the simple people, happy to be able to share something and to have something to share....

People who do not know how to live, people who live with a petit bourgeois feeling of security, contentedly, pragmatically, who cannot see the truly human and creative or the extension of themselves in someone else, would say that these are obsolete naivetes.... We, however, lived in the great world of such "naivetes," leading to the future, to communism, and we were happy. I am confident that the first Soviet literature created by writers such as Soyfullina, Serafimovich, Furmanov, Fadeyev, Gladkov and Sholokhov was created with the feeling of understanding of what the October Revolution had given us. We were close at that time to the full understanding of the slogan "From Each According to His Capabilities and to Each According to His Needs," for this slogan contained the greatest happiness of giving!

That is how we must remember the miracle of the October Revolution accomplished on our earth, the true rather than imagined miracle of the blending of theory with practice not as a utopia but as the greatest human experience.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. From the Greek "topos," meaning place and "u," a negation prefix--the editor.
2. Nizami Gyandzhevi, "Iskander-Name." Part 2, "Ikbal-Name" (Book on Happiness). Further quotes are borrowed from this textual translation. Together with my comments they were published as a chapter in my book "Studies On Nizami" in "Izvestiya Akademii Nauk SSSR" [News of the USSR Academy of Sciences], Department of Literature and Languages, Vol 6, No 4 July-August, Moscow 1967.
3. Extreme limits--the editor.
4. Latin for in defense of oneself and one's actions (literally, "for one's home").



IN NOVEMBER 1918

Moscow KOMBUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 80 pp 108-115

[Article by A. Bovtunov, editor of LENINSKOYE ZNANYA, the Unechskiy Rayon newspaper]

[Text] In November 1918, in one of the most difficult periods of the war imposed upon the Soviet republic by the imperialists and the domestic counterrevolution, for an entire week Unecha, a small railroad station in the Bryansk area, drew the attention of V. I. Lenin, the leader of the world's proletariat. The historical event which occurred here is worth particular mention.

We know that at the outbreak of World War I Lenin was already ascribing great importance to international actions against imperialism such as the fraternizing among soldiers of the warring powers on the front. In the summer of 1915, in his work "Socialism and War," he noted that the increased cases of fraternizing indicate "the extent to which it could be possible to cut short the current criminal, reactionary and slave-owning war and to organize a revolutionary international movement..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 26, p 326).

In 1917 mass fraternizing developed on the Russo-German front. The Bolshevik organizations organized the movement and encouraged the spreading of revolutionary ideas among the soldiers' masses and their making clear political decisions against the war and for the overthrow of the capitalist system. In the initial months which followed the victory of the Great October Revolution fraternization actively contributed to the termination of military operations. It became one of the effective methods of Bolshevik influence and of providing specific practical international aid to revolutionary forces in Germany and other countries. In the autumn of 1918 internationalist contacts with workers and peasants serving as soldiers in the German army were further developed and acquired a new and deeper meaning.

....The Soviet republic was celebrating the first anniversary of the October Revolution. Exultantly the people's masses took to the streets of towns and villages to demonstrate their loyalty to the revolution and the young republic squeezed inside an enemy ring. In the West the 700,000-strong German army, which was occupying the Ukraine, Belorussia, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, was hanging over the land of the soviets like the sword of Damocles.

In a period of such great difficulty for the country, on 9 November 1918 the radio brought to the Kremlin the important announcement that a revolution had taken place in Germany and that Emperor Wilhelm had been overthrown. The same day Lenin sent telegrams to Orel and Kursk:

"...Urgent top priority.

"Copies to:

"Orel, Guberniya Executive Committee and Guberniya Communist Party Committee

"Kursk, Guberniya Executive Committee and Guberniya Communist Party Committee

"A radiogram has been received from Kiel, addressed to the international proletariat, announcing that the power in Germany has been seized by the workers and soldiers.

"The radiogram is signed by the Soviet of Sailors' Deputies of Kiel.

"Furthermore, German soldiers at the front have arrested the peace delegation representing Wilhelm and have initiated themselves peace talks directly with French soldiers.

"Wilhelm has abdicated.

"All efforts must be made to inform as soon as possible of this fact the German soldiers in the Ukraine and advise them to strike at Kraxnov's forces, for in such a case, together, we shall capture dozens of millions of poods of grain for the German workers and throw back the invasion of the British who are now moving a quadron toward Novorossiysk.

"Acknowledge by telegram receipt and execution.

"Lenin, Sovnarkom chairman" ("Poin. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 50, pp 202-203).

The following day, on 10 November, a radiogram announcing the revolution in Germany was cabled from Moscow to all quarters.

"To all border soviets of workers', peasants' and Red Army deputies.

"...It is quite likely that all this will be concealed from the German soldiers on the eastern front and the Ukraine. Use all means at your disposal to inform the German soldiers of these facts.

"Chicherin, people's commissar of foreign affairs.

"Lenin, Sovnarkom chairman" ("Dekrety Sovetskoy Vlasti" [Decrees of the Soviet System], Vol IV, Politizdat, Moscow, 1968, p 7).

The most crucial stage in the struggle against imperialist intervention and domestic counterrevolution in the Ukraine, Belorussia, and the Baltic area was

beginning. It was necessary to "stress all efforts" to speed up their failure inevitably and quickly.

The party members of the Unecha party organization drafted an urgent plan for action. In particular, they decided to send two delegations of parliamentarians to the German soldiers from the Bogunskiy regiment deployed here, commanded by Nikolay Shchors: the first to the Robchik Railroad Station; the second to Lyschichi village where the 19th and 106th German regiments were deployed.

In the morning of 11 November one of the delegations, headed by Shchors, started for the Robchik Railroad Station. It occupied two freight cars coupled to a locomotive engine. A red calico flag was waving from the locomotive engine while red bands with slogans in Russian and German girdled the freight cars: "Long Live the World Revolution!" and "Long Live the Revolution in Germany!"

This peaceful train was rolling toward the Germans armed with a single weapon: the Bolshevik, the Leninist word. No one of the parliamentarians could tell how the Germans would react to the news they were bringing. It looked as though the externally calm Bogunskiy soldiers feared one thing only: a stray bullet which might hit their beloved and fearless commander who was traveling with them in the direction of the well-armed German army regiments. Recently they had fought this regiment on the battlefield. The wounded had still not recovered and the memory of the dead was still fresh. The ill feeling of the battle had not cooled off. The calm which prevailed in the peaceful decorated train was on the surface only. However, what reassured the parliamentarians was the fact that they were traveling toward workers and peasants like themselves, dressed in soldier's overcoats, misled by their officers, traveling toward brothers, carrying the exciting words of "Revolution in Germany!"

The tracks came to an end, dismantled at the demarcation line. Beyond it lay strings of barbed wire. Shchors was the first to jump off the freight car, followed by the others. The Germans began to stir and rush about. The decorated train made them both suspicious and curious.

Usually, a quick motion of Shchors' arm would be followed by the firing of guns and rifles. Now it was followed by a solemn rendition of the proletarian anthem:

"Arise ye prisoners of starvation,

"Arise ye watched of the earth...."

Hearing the International, the German soldiers, approached the Bogunskiy soldiers, walking or running, ignoring the officers' shouts.

Shchors greeted in German the soldiers, announcing the revolution in Germany.

"Hurray!" the Bogunskiy soldier shouted.

"Hoch! Hoch!" the Germans answered.

The Bogunskiy and German soldiers hugged each other. They felt close by their class origin and the revolution. Pamphlets announcing the revolution in Germany were passed on from hand to hand.

The rejoicing quieted down. The parliamentarians informed the soldiers of the Robchik Village garrison of the content of Lenin's telegram and agreed to meet with a German delegation in the area of their own regiment, at Unecha Station.

The talks between the 10 parliamentarians from the Bogunskiy regiment were equally successful at Lyshchichi. The Germans shared with the Red Army men their soldiers' grub like brothers. They too promised to send a delegation to Unecha.

Meetings hastily convened in the subunits of the 19th and 106th German regiments were held at which soldiers' councils of companies and battalions were elected. The decision was immediately taken to send parliamentarians to Unecha for further talks.

In turn, the Bogunskiy soldiers were preparing to meet the German guests: They cleaned up the area and the barracks, and hung slogans and red flags.

As agreed, on 12 November Unecha welcomed the German delegation which arrived from Robchik on a decorated trolley and, from Lyshchichi on horseback. All nine parliamentarians wore red ribbons on their chest as a sign of solidarity with the Russian revolution.

The column of Bogunskiy soldiers lined up on the Unecha platform was also festively dressed. A meeting was held addressed by N. I. Ivanov, chairman of the Unecha organization of the RKP (b), N. A. Shchors, commander of the Bogunskiy regiment, and representatives of the German and Bogunskiy soldiers. S. I. Aleksandrovich, former deputy commander of the Bogunskiy regiment, recalls that, "In the afternoon we marched to the meeting where we met with the German delegation which had arrived for talks. They arduously spoke in their German language which we understood as well. A revolution had taken place in Germany too. After the meeting, the Bogunskiy and the German soldiers were photographed together."

Former parliamentarian Friedrich Klippgen wrote the following in the book "Flags of Friendship," published in German by the German-Soviet Friendship Society:

"I was elected to the soldiers' soviet as a representative of the first company of the 106th Landsturm regiment. The soldiers' soviet of the first three companies were the battalion soviet. At that time we were in the vicinity of Starodub City. Unlike the other battalions, we decided to terminate all military operations against Russia. This led to talks with the Bolshevik detachment which operated in the vicinity. The talks took place in a spirit of exceptional benevolence. Since I understood a little bit of Russian, I was asked to say a few words. We had no other interpreter. Nevertheless, the talks were rapidly and favorably concluded. We wanted to go home as soon as possible and the Russians wanted us out of their country as soon as possible as well. The final part of the talks was organized quite solemnly by the Bolshevik commander. He unfurled a red flag and presented it to us as a reminder of the successful talks."



Friedrich Klippgen, a World War I soldier, kept this flag for almost 40 years. In May 1958 he presented it to the Leipzig City Party Committee. This flag is among the first or, perhaps, even the very first of the flags of the young Soviet republic found in Germany.

The talks began after the meeting. The German parliamentarians promised to arrest officers who would oppose the soldiers' soviets of deputies. According to the agreement, the entire Bogunskiy regiment was to hold a fraternal and friendly meeting with the German soldiers in Lyschichi.

A supper was organized at the railroad station's barroom in honor of the German delegation. The same day some of the German soldiers' representatives returned to their subunits to report on the results of their talks while the others spent the night in the barracks of the Bogunskiy regiment in order to accompany the Red Army men to Lyschichi the following day.

The same day, at 2330 hours a telegram was sent to Lenin. "The representatives of the revolutionary soldiers of Germany and the delegates of the Lyschichi Soviet of Soldiers' Deputies, together with the Unecha organization of the RKP(b)," the telegram read, "greet you as representative of the world revolution" (see V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 50, p 453).

...The November morning was sunny and slightly cold. The Bogunskiy soldiers, wearing red bows on their tunics, marched on the Unecha streets in step with the band. The entire population came out of their homes to send off the Red Army men on their trip leading to fraternal international friendship. The Bogunskiy soldiers approached the German positions not with rifles and machine guns but with the red flags of the October Revolution, with an open heart, offering the German people eternal friendship.

Nikolay Shchors marched at the head of the column. He had refused to ride his horse.

The regiment left and the streets emptied. Somewhat later a horseman appeared, rushing to catch up with the regiment. Ivanov, the chairman of the Unecha party organization, hastened to report to the Bogunskiy soldiers the content of the just received telegram from Lenin:

"13 November 1918

"Unecha, Ivanov, chairman Unecha RKP

"Thanks for the greetings. Particularly touched by the greetings of German revolutionary soldiers. It is extremely important now for the revolutionary soldiers of Germany immediately and actively to participate in the liberation of the Ukraine. This requires, first of all, the detention of the White Guards and the Ukrainian authorities; secondly, the revolutionary German forces must send delegates to all German army units in the Ukraine to insure their rapid and joint action for the liberation of the Ukraine. Time is short. No single hour must be lost. Inform immediately by telegraph if the revolutionary German soldiers accept the suggestion.

Lenin, Sovnarkom chairman

"Note: urgent. Top priority. Report to me the time of arrival of the telegram to Unecha" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 50, pp 205-206).

A second telegram went to Orel addressed to the Ukrainian comrades. "I have just received from Unecha," Lenin wrote, "greetings sent by the revolutionary soldiers of Germany. I deem it extremely important for you to cable this news to all border points with the Ukraine and, expressing my thanks for the greetings of the revolutionary soldiers of Germany, to ask them to help through fast and decisive action in the liberation of the Ukraine" (Ibid., p 206).

Lenin's instruction of not losing a single hour in engaging in agitation work among the German soldiers became the program of action of the Unecha communists. Now the outcome of the talks with the German army soldiers was a matter not of days but of hours.

The Kremlin's telegraph tapped the last words of Lenin's telegram at 1355 hours; by 1500 hours a report was already received sent by Ivanov and Shchors from Unecha, in which they reported to the leader of the revolution the results of the talks with the representatives of the soldiers soviets of the 19th and 106th regiments. "The measures stipulated in the telegram," the report stated, "were accepted. Representatives and communist agitators have been on their way since the morning. The German soldiers agree to arrest their officers. Further reports will follow" ("Bor'ba Trudyashchikhsya Chernigovshchiny za Vlast' Sovetov (1917-1919 gg.)" [The Struggle of the Working People of the Chernigov Area for a Soviet System (1917-1919)], Chernigov, 1957, p 196).

On 13 November an extraordinary meeting of the Orel'skaya Guberniya Executive Committee was held to discuss the telegram sent by Fokin, chairman of the Bryansk Executive Committee on the revolutionized German troops. Fokin reported that "bands and Soviet red flags of the communists' committee have gone to the 106th regiment and the decision was taken to march today to Klinty where a soviet has already been set up consisting of our workers and German soldiers, and in other directions as well" ("Oktyabr' na Bryanshchine. Sbor ik Dokumentov i Vospominaniy" [October in the Bryansk Area. Collection of Documents and Recollections]. Bryansk, 1957, p 192).

The same day, at a communist meeting in Unecha, Lenin's telegram was read answering the greetings sent by the representatives of the German revolutionary soldiers, the delegates of the Lyshchichi Soviet of Soldiers Deputies and the Unechi party organization. At the same meeting the problem was discussed of communist activities "for strengthening the rear and organizing a Soviet system in areas occupied by revolutionary Russian-German units (BPA, Archive 8,283, File 3, Sheets 9-10, copies).

....After a 15-kilometer march the Bogunskiy regiment approached Lyshchichi. The commanders tightened up the ranks while the soldiers straightened up their uniforms. The band struck the "International." Like a huge worm the column followed the twisting road. Near the village the German soldiers were lined up in parade formation. Their band also struck the "International." The sounds of the two bands

merged. A few German soldiers, leaving the ranks, walked to the marching Bogunskiy regiment. A red flag rose over the column. Hurriedly, the Germans reached the head of the column. Opening his arms, Shchors rushed toward them. A few seconds later he was in the arms of the German soldiers.

"Hurray! Hurray! Huraay!" the Bogunskiy regiment shouted.

"Hoch! Hoch! Hoch!" the German ranks shouted.

The Bogunskiy soldiers then broke their ranks and rushed ahead. There was a movement in the German army ranks and the soldiers rushed to the Russians.

The entire area echoed with the sounds of music and happy shouts. The people were exultant. They cried and hugged one another like brothers.

That day Shchors reported to Orel the solemn birth of international friendship:

"14 November 1918.

"Comrade Shchors on the telephone.

Also on the telephone are Comrades Isakovich and Kotsar'. Orel."

Shchors: "Everything settled with the Germans. A soviet has been formed. Communications have been established. Extensive agitation activities are taking place between them with music and banners. Our soldiers are fraternizing with the Germans. The German soldiers paraded in front of our soldiers.

"A red flag is waving over the German barracks. On 13 (November) at 2200 hours a meeting was held between the German soldiers and our representatives headed by Comrade Shchors and Petrikovskiy. A common platform was adopted and it was announced that a soviet has been set up in this unit headed by a chairman and a secretary.... (I and Petrikovskiy have copies of the minutes and the original). Subsequent instructions were adopted. Three of our men remained with the Germans while three Germans came with us. Telephone connections were established.

"The Germans are concentrating all the forces of the regiment in Klintsy where a general regimental soviet of soldiers deputies will be elected. Several Germans will remain with our regiment.

"Delegations are being exchanged every hour. The regiment has crossed the Ukrainian demarcation line. All units have been deployed by orders issued by me and Comrade Petrenko (Petrikovskiy). Tomorrow we shall consider what to do. Meanwhile, committees of the poor have been elected in Lyshchichi and Kustichy.

"On Comrade Lenin's direct instructions we have been granted the power to act on our own full discretion and as we deem it necessary to insure the liberation of the Ukraine....

"All forces on the front are under my and Petrenko's command and no switches are possible.

"We are waiting expectantly.

"Regimental and brigade headquarters are in Lyshchichi.

"Shchors.

"Goodbye" (from exhibits in the N. A. Shchors Memorial Museum).

Severely defeated in the imperialist war and economically exhausted, in the autumn of 1918 Germany and Austria-Hungary were on the brink of national catastrophe. At the beginning of November the monarchic regimes were overthrown in Germany and Austria-Hungary. The extremely harsh Brest Peace Treaty imposed upon the Soviet republic in March 1918 was now invalidated and the All-Russian Central Executive Committee abrogated it on 13 November 1918. On 11 November 1918 the Soviet government issued a directive to the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic to make ready within 10 days troops to help the working people of the Ukraine in their struggle for the expulsion of the occupied forces and the internal counterrevolution. On 17 November a Revolutionary Military Council of the group of forces for the Kursk area was created in Moscow. The forces included the First and Second Ukrainian Insurrectionist divisions, the Moscow Workers Division and other units.

The liberation of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia was considered by the communist party and the Soviet government as the common cause of the peoples of Russia, and a demonstration of revolutionary proletarian internationalism and of the greatest possible friendship among peoples whose fate was to become closely united.

It was precisely then that the commander of the First Ukrainian Soviet Division sent the following cable: "I am in possession of a telegram and a record of an open telephone conversation according to which talks with the insurgent units and joint actions with us against the haydamaks and the hetman authorities are assigned to the chairman of the border revolutionary committee and the commander of the Bogunskiy regiment. In accordance with these instructions I have ordered the commander of the Bogunskiy regiment to act jointly with the German garrisons of Lyshchichi and Kustichi. Currently regimental headquarters are in Naytopovichi. The Robchik garrison is still wavering" (Central State Archives of the Soviet Army, Archive 103, List 3, File 102, Sheet 67).

Informed of the talks between Red Army men and German soldiers, the enemies of the revolution became frightened. Urgent communications were sent to Kiev with requests for additional troops. In his last communication, dated 30 November 1918, the Chernigovskaya Guberniya elder reported the following to the minister of internal affairs of the Skoropadskiy cabinet: "Starodubskiy Uyezd. On 14 November a Bolshevik battalion in full strength arrived in Lyshchichi Village. The Bolsheviks were welcomed by the Germans and billeted in the barracks together with German soldiers. Bolshevik delegations showed up in Kustichi and Pyatovsk villages and, finally, at Starodub Railroad Station and, subsequently, in Starodub



itself. Everywhere the Bolsheviks were welcomed by the Germans. The latter are fraternizing with the Bolsheviks and are letting their detachments cross the border....Surazhskiy Uyezd. Increasing numbers of Bolsheviks were noted along the demarcation line. In Robchik and other areas along the demarcation line Germans fraternized with the Bolsheviks" (Bor'ba Trudyashchikhsya Chernigovshchiny za Vlast' Sovetov (1917-1919 gg.)," p 203).

Meanwhile, in Moscow, Lenin continued to receive information on the talks between the Bogunskiy regiment and the German soldiers.

The 16 November 1918 telegram read as follows:

"Unecha. Talks were held by the headquarters of the Bogunskiy regiment with five garrisons. The predominant feeling of the German soldiers is in a communist spirit. Ten percent are supporters of Scheidemann. Officers have been removed from their command and are participating neither in the talks nor the elections of committees. No measures have been taken against them despite our advice. Elections for regimental committees will be held tomorrow. On Tuesday divisional elections will be held. It is hoped that by the end of the week an army congress will be held in Kiev. Measures have been taken to insure the presence of internationalists. Major forces from the center must be sent.

"Aussem, division commander.

"Shchors, commander of the Bogunskiy regiment" (Bor'ba Trudyashchikhsya Chernigovshchiny za Vlast' Sovetov (1917-1919 gg.)," p 198).

It was thus that in the Unecha-Starodub area (meanwhile, talks were being held also with soldier's soviets of German troops in other cities) energetic measures were taken to involve the German soldiers in the struggle against the imperialists and their accomplices. The talks were quite successful. Meanwhile, the circumstances were changing more and more rapidly. The outcome of the struggle against the German army of occupation in the Ukraine, Belorussia and the Soviet Baltic area, and of the struggle against the internal counterrevolution is well-known. The implementation of imperialist and aggressive plans by the German army undermined the combat capability of its troops, while exposure to the land of the soviets and the ideas of the Great October Revolution demoralized the ranks and intensified the opposition of the soldiers' masses to the war. Under the influence of the offensive operations of the Soviet troops and the powerful upsurge of the people's insurrection, and the implementation of the principled and flexible Leninist political and military strategy, the German forces hastily withdrew from our country. The events we described played a major role in this connection.

....Today Unecha is visited by tourists. They can be frequently seen in the square outside Lyshchichi Village. So far, however, this is not a square but simply a meadow. No monument has been erected as yet to commemorate the historical event which took place here six decades ago. The old people, however, remember it well. The internationalist contacts between the Red Army men and the German army soldiers have become part of the history of our country as of the history of the antiwar movement of the German people.

5003 CSO: 1802

## IN THE NAME OF THE CAUSE OF THE WORKING CLASS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 80 pp 116-120

[Article by Jan Galandauer on the occasion of the centennial of the birth of Bohumir Smeral. Reprinted with some abbreviations from Nova Mysl, No 10, 1980, the theoretical and political organ of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee]

[Text] Bohumir Smeral, a noted leader of the Czechoslovak and the international workers movement, fought for over 40 years in the leading ranks of the working class. Long before the outbreak of World War I he was one of the leaders of the Czech workers movement. He was one of the founders of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and a loyal and dedicated fighter for the ideals of communism. He represented the best segment of the activists of the senior generation in the labor movement which operated even before 1914, a generation which came from the social democratic movement and was able to find its way under the banners of the Communist International so that honestly, shoulder to shoulder with the new revolutionary generation of the working class, it may fight for its liberation.

Bohumir Smeral was born on 25 October 1880 in the Moravian town of Trsebice. While still in high school he joined a social democratic circle and became acquainted with Marxism. In 1898 he enrolled in the school of law of Charles University in Prague and entirely dedicated himself to serving the Czech workers movement. He propagandized the ideas of socialism among the students and became a contributor to the newspaper PRAVO LIDU in which he headed various sections, including the most important political ones. Before World War I he factually defined the political line of the Czech Social Democratic Party.

Bohumir Smeral was firmly convinced of the need for a theoretical base for the organized workers movement. He was perfectly familiar with socialist literature and, above all, with the works of K. Marx and F. Engels. He fully and unconditionally shared the Marxist outlook. He considered that the purpose of the workers movement lay in its final objective--the overthrow of capitalism and the building of a new society.

At the same time, however, in that period B. Smeral conflictingly combined his loyalty to Marxism with a reformist view of the means to be used in the struggle against capitalism and, above all, the idea of the exaggerated role of universal elections and parliament. Above all, however, B. Smeral's ideological convictions

were based on its total agreement with Marxism and firm faith in the realistic nature of its end objectives and of internationalism.

The victory of the proletariat in Russia showed B. Smeral the way which, in the final account, led him to assume consistently revolutionary positions. With the very first reports on the October Revolution he realized that an event of tremendous importance was taking place. Inspired by the example of the Russian working class, he mounted a counterattack on the nationalistic forces of the Czech social democratic movement.

The journal ACADENIA, the theoretical organ of the Czech Social Democratic Workers Party, carried Smeral's article "The Communist Manifesto and Our Governmental-Legal Declaration." In it he called upon the working class to disobey the dictate of the bourgeoisie in the national-liberation struggle and defend its class objectives. He favored the resumption of the internationalist relations of the working class in Austria-Hungary and the merger of the workers movement with the broad national-liberation and the democratic movements. He was in favor of a proletariat revolution and the creation of a socialist republic.

The founding of an independent Czechoslovak state on 28 October 1918 represented not only a major turn in the history of the Czech and Slovak peoples but a new stage in the history of the Czechoslovak workers movement as well. The right-wing social democratic leaders considered the Czechoslovak Republic a country in whose building the working class should contribute as well but only through the participation of social democratic ministers in the government. In December 1918, however, an opposition developed to this policy of cooperation with the bourgeoisie during the 12th Congress of the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party. The report and final words of B. Smeral at the congress expressed most vividly the negative attitude toward the tactics of the right-wing leadership. He foresaw the negative consequences of this cooperation and demanded that the party of the Czechoslovak proletariat pursue an autonomous revolutionary class policy. At that time the outlines of the future left-wing opposition, known as the Marxist Left, had become clearly visible. It also became clear that only a politician of B. Smeral's standing could head it.

In March 1920 B. Smeral visited Soviet Russia. He met with V. I. Lenin and other leaders of the Russian Bolshevik Communist Party and the Soviet government. He visited plants, schools, and military training institutions and attended party meetings. Familiarity with the life of the state of workers and peasants made a lasting impression on him. He wrote the book "The Truth About Soviet Russia" which provided the Czech readers with the most complete and truthful information concerning the young proletarian state. B. Smeral returned to his homeland with the firm resolve to dedicate all his forces to the founding of a revolutionary workers party in Czechoslovakia.

B. Smeral was the main speaker at the 13th Congress of the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Workers Party (leftist), held in September 1920. His report was entitled "The Party's Tactic and Future Tasks." Both the report and the "Action Program" passed by the congress emphasized that the unification of the working class and the struggle for proletarian dictatorship and for joining the Third

international was the primary task in the preparations for a socialist revolution. At the congress B. Smeral was elected deputy chairman of the party's executive committee. At the same time, he was made editor in chief of the newspaper RUBE PRAVO, whose first issue came out on 21 September 1920.

B. Smeral was firmly convinced that the working class can fulfill its historical mission only with the help of a mass revolutionary party in whose founding he played a key role.

The 16th Congress of the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Workers Party (leftist) was held in May 1921. It was also the constituent congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. In the main report submitted to the congress B. Smeral called for the creation of a communist party--a mass revolutionary workers party.

Despite isolated errors, B. Smeral held clear-cut positions on basic problems. He supported the 21 stipulations for joining the Communist International.

The importance of his report is confirmed by the fact that Lenin paid close attention to it. On his request the secretary prepared a translation of the report which has been preserved to this day. Frequent underlinings and notes on the margins prove that Lenin studied it thoroughly.

The process of the establishment of a single international Communist Party of Czechoslovakia was completed at the unification congress (30 October-2 November 1921). A single party rallying all the communists in the country was founded. The main speeches at that historical congress were delivered by Bohumir Smeral and Karel Kreibich, the head of the German communists in Czechoslovakia. Both reports were imbued with the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

Between 1921 and 1924 B. Smeral headed the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. He devoted all his forces to its organizational and ideological strengthening. He paid great attention to the problems of strategy and tactics of the workers movement and to summarizing the practical experience of the CPC. He made a particularly substantial contribution to the creative solution of problems of a united front and a workers government and to the methods by which the tactic of the single front could be applied under Czechoslovak conditions.

B. Smeral considered the struggle for the economic demands of the working people and the recognition of Soviet Russia the main topical problems which would provide a specific ideological base for the implementation of the ideas of a united front. The struggle for a trade union movement--the most widespread form of organization of the working class--was another component of the efforts to create a united front. In accordance with the decisions of the Third Congress of the Communist International he insisted that the party devote its entire energy to gaining or even maintaining its strong positions in the social democratic trade union association of Czechoslovakia, the largest of its kind. He emphasized that it is a question not of dividing the trade unions but, conversely, of preserving their unity, for this would enable the communists to retain their ties with that part of the working class which is under the influence of reformists or is politically indifferent. He pursued this line despite the adamant opposition of the "extreme



left" whose pseudorevolutionary and unrealistic positions hindered the creation of a single front, particularly on the basis of the trade union movement.

During that period, as head of the CPC, B. Smeral actively worked in the Communist International as well. He was a member of its Executive Committee, Presidium and Secretariat and member of the Organizational Bureau of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. He carried out a number of complex assignments for the Communist International, which required the study of various problems and trips to numerous countries.

In 1927 B. Smeral focused on problems of the Chinese revolution. The very fact that the Executive Committee of the Communist International assigned him to study the Chinese problem, which was quite topical and important at that time, indicated how highly his capabilities were valued. His book "The Struggle for the Liberation of China" proves the extent to which he studied this problem.

Another important assignment handed to B. Smeral in 1928 was the preparations for and participation in the Seventh Congress of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party. His reports and addresses were of major importance in resolving the political and ideological problems of the party. They also contributed to the further elaboration of the problems of the noncapitalist way of development to socialism and contained a profound study of the role of nationalism in colonial and dependent countries.

Despite his heavy duties in the Communist International, B. Smeral consistently followed the activities of the revolutionary party of the Czechoslovak proletariat. In October and November 1927 he published in RUDE PRAVO a series of articles on the October Revolution and the building of a socialist society in the Soviet Union. In the spring and summer of 1928 B. Smeral participated in a campaign organized by the CPC against the toughening of the law on social security.

Starting with the beginning of 1930 B. Smeral began to spend more time in his homeland and was able to pay greater attention to the Czechoslovak communist movement. At that time he ascribed great importance to familiarizing the Czechoslovak public with the successes achieved in the building of socialism in the Soviet Union. He made several trips around Czechoslovakia. He delivered a major speech entitled "Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union and International Proletarian Solidarity" and spoke on similar topics in Brno, Moravska Ostrava, Kolin, Nemecky Brod, Liberec, Chomutov and other cities. B. Smeral was a member of the "Union of the Friends of the USSR" organization and took part in the creation of its printed organ, the journal SVET SOVETU whose editor in chief he became. Many of the journal's issues were dedicated to acquainting the Czechoslovak readers with the life and work of the Soviet people.

B. Smeral joined the antifascist and antiwar movement because of the growing threat of fascism and war. In August 1932 he took part in the meeting of the international antiwar congress held in Amsterdam at which he spoke on the struggle against preparations for war and was elected member of the permanent worldwide committee for the struggle against imperialist wars.

in 1933-1934 B. Smeral continued to work for the Comintern. He traveled to Berlin, Paris and Brussels, and the Middle and Near East on assignments by the Executive Committee of the Communist International. In the autumn of 1934 he visited Mongolia again.

The Seventh Comintern Congress (1935), which formulated the new strategic line of the international communist movement, was a turning point in the antifascist and antiwar struggle. B. Smeral participated both in its preparations and its proceedings and was elected member of the Comintern Control Commission.

The Seventh CPC Congress (April 1936) formulated the political line of the struggle against fascism and for the defense of the republic in accordance with the decisions of the Seventh Comintern Congress. The Seventh CPC Congress reelected B. Smeral member of the Central Committee.

In 1938, when Czechoslovakia was directly threatened by Hitlerite nazism, B. Smeral returned to his homeland. He frequently participated in demonstrations in support of democracy and the republic. His publicistic activities were dedicated to the energizing of antifascist forces. He wrote a series of essays entitled "Palatskiy and his Time" and "Development and Objectives of Racist Fascism," as well as a number of articles in which he exposed the roots of Nazi chauvinism and warned of the tremendous danger facing the Czechs and the Slovaks, all of Europe, democracy and peace, and called for a reliable protection of the republic through the united front of all antifascists. He emphasized that the Soviet Union was ready to give aid to Czechoslovakia, which was threatened with occupation, and that the neutrality slogan concealed the desire of the reaction to annul the Soviet-Czechoslovak Treaty. He adamantly demanded that the president and the government turn to the Soviet Union for help. This, however, was not done.

After the Munich catastrophe Bohumir Smeral engaged in extensive organizational and political work. In November 1938, by decision of the party's leadership, he flew to the Soviet Union. In Moscow, in close cooperation with Klement Gottwald, he actively participated in the formulation of the CPC line under the new circumstances. He helped to formulate the basic theoretical conclusions for the establishment of a policy of a broad popular front, a policy which the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia most successfully pursued within the resistance movement.

During this final period of his life, B. Smeral undertook the writing of a "Text-book of the Struggle for National Liberation" and a "History of the Proletarian Revolution." He was unable to complete them. He died on 8 May 1941.

The eulogy delivered by Klement Gottwald voiced not only the sorrow felt for the loss of a friend and fellow worker in the difficult struggle of the native land seized by the Hitlerite invaders, but confidence in the bright future of the homeland, when the dirty swastika rag would be lowered from Hradcan and the flag of freedom will be hoisted.

This became reality with the arrival of the Soviet army which brought freedom and springtime for our nations. Bohumir Smeral's cherished dream, a dream which had

led him into the ranks of the workers movement and to whose implementation he had devoted over 40 years of his life, became reality: the power of capitalism was overthrown in the heart of Europe and the toiling people became the masters.

5003

C50: 1802

## TO WORK LIKE LENIN

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 80 pp 121-128

[Review of the book by K. U. Chernenko "Voprosy Raboty Partiyynogo i Gosudarstvennogo Apparata" [Problems of the Work of the Party and State Apparatus]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 398 pages]

[Text] The Leninist party and the entire Soviet people are working with tremendous enthusiasm for the implementation of the great program of the building of communism. The most important prerequisite for the solution of this problem is the further upgrading of the leading role of the party in society and the intensification of its theoretical, political and organizational activities.

As it implements the Leninist ideas, the CPSU has formulated and is systematically implementing a scientific economic strategy aimed at achieving the basic long-term objectives, the most important among which is the steadfast upsurge of the material and cultural living standards of the people. The current period of accelerated sociopolitical processes, the more complex economic and production programs, and the all-encompassing scientific and technical revolution formulate new and bigger problems to be resolved by the system managing the socialist society and by the party and state apparatus.

Problems of improving management and the work of the party and state apparatus have always drawn the close attention of the party members and of the broad Soviet public. This explains the great interest with which the readers have responded to the publication of a book on such problems, written by Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CC CPSU Politburo member and CC CPSU secretary.

In the description of the historical road leading to the creation and establishment of the party and state apparatus and the other management units of the first socialist state in the world, the monograph pays particular attention to the outstanding role played by Vladimir Il'ich Lenin and his fellow workers in the creation of the administrative apparatus and the formulation of its structure, functions and principles of activities, and in defining cadre policy. In the pre-October period, the author writes, as he developed problems of party strategy and tactics and its struggle and relations with the masses, V. I. Lenin earmarked the outline of the structure and the basic principle governing the activities of the future power of the working people and the socioeconomic and organizational-political principles governing the activities of worker-peasant government, its organs, and its administrative apparatus. In his long-term anticipation of the



ever growing role and significance of the party and state apparatus in the socialist society, Lenin particularly strongly emphasized that, "...If we truly study our apparatus and work on it year after year, this would represent a tremendous accomplishment and would guarantee our success" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 43, p 230).

On the basis of party and government documents, some of which published for the first time, and of rich personal experience in party and state work, the author describes extensively and in detail the way the new apparatus was crystallized, molded and developed. One of the merits of the monograph is the convincing proof it offers that the implementation of the party line of developing management organs of a new type and of strengthening their apparatus was far from simple. It was a new undertaking involving great difficulties.

In this connection the author notes that, "In the long struggle against autocracy the communist party united the working people and trained itself for its leading and guiding role in Soviet society and, after taking the power, singled out among the workers, peasants, and progressive intelligentsia the capable leaders and personnel for the Soviet state apparatus. The history of the party and the country contain a number of examples of rank and file workers and peasants becoming major statesmen. The difficulties in the organization of the administrative apparatus were intensified by the fact that no example and experience could be found in the world applicable to the specific conditions of Russian reality. The solution of the problem was facilitated by the fact that V. I. Lenin had developed the theory of the organization of the governmental system in Russia as a Soviet republic, that he headed the first socialist state of workers and peasants in the world and that he directly participated in the creation of the state administrative apparatus" (pp 63-64).

The author traces the way our party adamantly and systematically implemented Lenin's ideas on managing the state of the working people and created and strengthened the party and state apparatus, considering it an important means for the solution of the problem. Thanks to such purposeful work an outstanding detachment of administrative workers loyal to the party and the people developed in our country, a detachment which is of great help in the execution of communist party policy.

The party and state apparatus played a tremendous role in the period of establishment and consolidation of the Soviet system, the laying of the foundations of socialism, and the period of the Great Patriotic War.

The author describes the extensive work done by the CC CPSU Central Committee and by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, on the further improvement of the style and ways and means of party and state work. He describes the way the communist party, which was always concerned with improving the work of the party and state apparatus, is continually enriching and analyzing the experience and practice of its activities under contemporary conditions, and is defining its role and place in the management system of the developed socialist society.

The decisions of the October 1964 CC CPSU Plenum played an outstanding role in the elaboration of the political course consistent with developed socialist conditions. The plenum censured the errors made in managing the development of the economy and the unjustified reorganizations of party, soviet and economic organs. It took the necessary measures for the restoration of the Leninist norms of party life and management principles and for strengthening the ties between the party and the broad toiling masses.

The October plenum had a tremendous positive influence on all aspects of the life and activities of the party and the state. It was an outstanding confirmation of CPSU unity, political maturity and ability daringly and boldly to eliminate anything that hinders progress. The decisions of the plenum became the foundations of the party's political course, subsequently expressed in the documents of later congresses and Central Committee plenums (see pp 256-257).

The author emphasizes that the enhanced level of the work and increased prestige of the party and state apparatus are related to the implementation of the decisions of the 23d, 24th, and 25th party congresses and Central Committee plenums, and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's instructions and recommendations. The party documents of that period contain a number of essential theoretical concepts and practical stipulations on the work of the apparatus, which creatively develop, in accordance with the growing role of the party under mature socialist conditions, the Leninist ideas related to the style of party and state work and to the scientific approach to it. Naturally, the most important principles of party management are refracted in the work of the apparatus: unity between theory and practice, a scientific approach to the solution of political, economic and organizational problems, a strictly class assessment of social phenomena, collective management, ties with the masses, proper selection, deployment and upbringing of cadres and control over implementation of decisions.

K. U. Chernenko's book is focused mainly on the elaboration and interpretation of the problem of the work style of the party and state apparatus and the fact that the Leninist style embodies the great class interest of the working people, the experience of the revolutionary struggle and the inexhaustible energy of the masses and the courage, will and aspiration of the party and the people for building a communist society.

Chapter 4 of the monograph, entitled "Creative Development of the Leninist Style in the Activities of Party Organs," deals with this particular topic. It describes the significance of the Leninist work style as a great acquisition of the party of tremendous stimulating, organizing and educational significance.

Lenin included among the basic qualities needed by the party and state apparatus consistency between the political and economic problems resolved by the party and the Soviet state; strict implementation of the party's policy; steady expansion and strengthening of ties with the masses; loyal service to the toiling people; and comprehensive protection of the interests of socialism. He also emphasized important features which the Soviet apparatus must possess such as efficiency, expediency, precision, operativeness and coordination.

The Leninist style embodies the enthusiasm and optimism of the working class and the long experience, wisdom and energy of the party which has formulated and is successfully resolving the problems of the revolutionary reorganization of the country and the reaching of the final objective: the victory of communism. The Leninist ideas and style remained an inexhaustible source of revolutionary thought, daring decisions and actions, and inflexible faith in the triumph of communist ideals of all truly revolutionary parties.

The practice of the building of socialism and communism in the USSR brilliantly confirmed the vital need for the work style developed and applied by Lenin--a scientific and creative style which combines high exactingness with great trust in cadres. This style has been firmly adopted by the party and state organs. It clearly and fully embodies the revolutionary-transforming period of Marxism-Leninism, the tremendous experience acquired by the CPSU and the Soviet state in their political and organizational activities and the humanism of the communists whose supreme objective is to serve the working person.

The communist party has always considered the Leninist style as the strongest ideological and organizational weapon in the struggle for the revolutionary renovation of the country. The CPSU proceeds from the fact that the Leninist style is a live and creative work method which is itself steadily developing and improving. A continuing creative search is a vivid manifestation of the Leninist style and a confirmation of its high moral motivations; those who adopt it create around themselves a moral atmosphere of growth, development and advancement inherent in the socialist way of life and worthy of the great tasks of the building of communism.

The features of the Leninist work style are comprehensively embodied in the activities, speeches and works of L. I. Brezhnev. Leonid Il'ich emphasizes the exceptional significance of Lenin's ideas and of the historical experience of the party and the party organizations at the contemporary stage of development of Soviet society. It draws attention to the fact that the proper solution of the topical problems of the building of communism is possible only on the basis of the further development of the Leninist ways and means of work.

The Leninist work style, the author emphasizes, is an indivisible entity, and a set of most important and steadily developing ways, means and methods of party and state activities based on the theory of scientific communism and the Leninist principles of party and state management. It encompasses the sum total of most important features such as ideological conviction, loyalty to the communist cause, a scientific approach to the work, unity of theory and practice, revolutionary scope and efficiency, democracy and ties with the masses, collective management and personal responsibility, organization of control and control of execution, selection, placement and education of cadres, and many others (see p 164).

The party's theoretical and practical activities are built on the solid foundations of the latest achievements of science and technology, comprehensive assessments, accurate information and proper utilization of the objective laws of socialism. At the present stage the importance of the scientific approach and of unity of theory and practice in party activities become even more important. All party documents related to the solution of domestic problems and which set the



foreign political conditions for the building of communism are distinguished by their strictly scientific nature. The main feature in CPSU activities is to define the general long-term development of society, the formulation of a proper political line and the organization of the working people for its implementation. This is inconceivable without the scientific management of society and without mastering the social and economic laws of social life and of the management of social processes. Each specific problem is considered and resolved by the party not separately but on a comprehensive and complex basis, in accordance with the possibilities and requirements of further progress.

The author proves that a scientific approach to the work is incompatible with subjectivism and drifting, decisions and actions which are unplanned, hasty and unsupported by knowledge of factual reality, neglect of practical experience and unwillingness soberly to assess successes and take into consideration difficulties and shortcomings.

A policy elaborated in accordance with the requirements of social development enabled the party to delve into the profound processes of economic, political and cultural life, promptly to formulate ripe problems, to detect and surmount arising contradictions and to define possibilities for progress.

The steady improvement of the style of the party and state apparatus is required also because the scale of public production has increased tremendously. This demands further improvements in the organization and management of the national economy on a planned basis and the strengthening of state and production discipline. The author particularly notes that the increasingly topical nature of problems of production discipline is caused by a number of factors. First of all, the intensive progress of science and technology has increased and continues to increase the complexity of production relations in each enterprise and sector and within the entire international economic system. Secondly, the party's requirement of making more skillful use of economic incentives and levers raised with particular urgency the problem of the responsibility of every working person not only for his own work but for the project and success of his collective and the entire enterprise where he works. Thirdly, the strengthening of labor discipline means not only the upgrading of the effectiveness with which our economic system functions but the further development and advancement of socialist social relations and the development of high conscientiousness among the people (see p 215).

The further democratization of all social life takes place of the developed socialist stage and the party particularly relies on the strengthening of conscientious discipline. It always sees to it that the party organizations and committees display high exactingness and educate every working person in a spirit of a statesmanlike attitude toward his work.

The author particularly emphasizes the importance of the labor collective and of its responsible and active educational role. It is precisely the labor collective that must become a school for labor and moral upbringing for every working person and, in the case of young people, a school for professional training and civic growth. This requires the fuller and more skillful use of the entire arsenal of educational means, the dissemination of progressive experience and



comradely mutual aid combined with high reciprocal exactingness. This is a common concern shared by the party and state apparatus, economic managers and public organizations.

The entire content of the book directs the reader to the further search for ways and means of improving the work of the party and state apparatus.

The 25th CPSU Congress formulated a broad program for its further advancement. The Central Committee accountability report to the congress pointed out the need for making the entire system of state management and the economic mechanism consistent with the new requirements and tasks facing the country. The party considers as one of its primary tasks the raising of the level of management to a qualitatively new stage and upgrading its effectiveness.

The measures earmarked by the congress cover all aspects of the party's comprehensive work and the complex governmental and economic mechanism.

The party attentively studies the quantitative and qualitative shifts occurring in the economy and defines the ways for the further development of the national economy and its individual sectors in accordance with the requirements of the time, the growing demands of society and available resources and material possibilities. Currently the party lists among the most topical problems improvements of the economic mechanism, upgrading the effectiveness of economic management, and concretizing the activities of the administrative apparatus.

L. I. Brezhnev's report and the congress materials became the base for the further creative development of all ways and means for managing the country's national economy. The report contains scientific conclusions and indicates effective means for the development of the Soviet economy based on a profound study of the work of the leading units of the economic mechanism and the extensive summarizing of practical experience.

As he points out the important and ever growing role of the management area, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev states that victory on the fronts of the building of a communist economy means, essentially, the application of management science. The party directs all management activities toward reaching the highest possible national economic end results based on available resources. It calls for the fuller utilization of economical and moral incentives and levers and for paying greater attention to cadre selection and education and their training and retraining, and for improving the economic education of the working people.

The cadres are the main effective strength of the apparatus. The individual qualities of the workers, the level of their training and the attention paid to it determine the success of their work. The most important qualities of the worker are his boundless loyalty to the party's cause and the interests of the state, knowledge of his assignment and combination of theoretical knowledge with the ability to work with people. The guarantee for success lies in imbuing the work of the personnel with a spirit of true party- and high idea-mindedness, and basing the organization of the work on the support of the masses and the utilization of their experience.

Yet another mandatory quality of the worker, determined by the fact that the contemporary world is characterized by an aggravation of the class struggle, must be borne in mind as well. Imperialism and reaction are mobilizing all their forces in the fight against Marxism-Leninism whose prestige and influence are growing steadily. They are resorting to ideological diversions and the dissemination of anti-Soviet and anticommunist fabrications. For this reason the apparatus has a responsible role in exposing the subversive intrigues of bourgeois ideologues and their stooges.

High level political vigilance and intolerance of bourgeois views and mores are the inseparable qualities of administrative workers.

What should today's party worker be? What are the qualities he must possess in all sectors of party work? As he shares with the readers his views on such matters, the author emphasizes that, "In fact, if we look carefully at the party worker we can notice immediately that his thoughts are always drawn to unresolved matters or to further improvements. This is a person who is always searching and always aspiring toward the better. Healthy dissatisfaction is his natural, his normal condition. The true party worker displays an equally serious concern for all matters, large and small, and works with total dedication...." (p 290).

The author deals extensively with problems of improving control and execution of assignments in accordance with current requirements. He notes, in particular, that, "Under contemporary conditions, when the functions of the party and state apparatus are broadening, and as the volume of managerial work expands, the nature of the very concept of control changes: priority is given to providing practical aid, to organizing implementation, to summarizing and applying progressive experience and to using effective labor methods. In other words, control becomes connected with direct organizational work for the implementation of one or another directive. Meanwhile, properly organized control insures high executive discipline and the personal responsibility of the worker for his assigned sector" (p 349).

The author's statement about trust as one of the important categories in party work with cadres is noteworthy. Trust of cadres does not exclude control and strict exactingness. "That is why the CPSU Central Committee acts strictly whenever such trust becomes misunderstood. In a word, a good, proper and trusting atmosphere can coexist with the high responsibility of cadres for assignments. In itself, it requires high maturity and the ability of cadres properly to assess and understand such trust" (p 286).

The daily practical activities of our highest party organs for the implementation of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the 10th Five-Year Plan provide an example of the systematic observance of Leninist norms and requirements and of the enrichment of the party's work style. Their work organization, operativeness and rhythmical pace are contributing to the planned and systematic solution of all important problems facing the country's economic and political life.

The activities of the CPSU Central Committee and of its Politburo and secretariat confirm the fact that the party has increased its efforts to strengthen and to develop the soviets at all levels, and to improve Soviet legislation and the entire social management system. The tasks formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev became the base for the familiar documents subsequently drafted and adopted by the CC CPSU and Soviet government pertaining to improving management and the activities of the economic mechanism.

The management workers face major tasks in the final year of the 10th Five-Year Plan, when all Soviet people are preparing to welcome the 26th party congress with new labor accomplishments. "Let us emphasize the need for maximum energy for the successful fulfillment and overfulfillment of the plans for the final year of the 10th Five-Year Plan, for the prompt completion of target projects and for insuring the stable work of the national economy in 1981, the first year of the 11th Five-Year Plan," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the June 1980 CC CPSU Plenum.

Today, when millions of people are competing throughout the country and dedicating their inspired labor to the 26th CPSU Congress, the party calls for the even fuller utilization of the effective influence of the apparatus in all realms of life. This is a major force in the struggle for new accomplishments in the final year of the 10th Five-Year Plan and for the successful implementation of the party's tasks.

The book by K. U. Chernenko is a valuable study of the establishment and development of the party and state apparatus in our country. It is noteworthy for its comprehensive contents, clarity of presentation, and profound study of factual data. Unquestionably, the monograph will help the party and soviet personnel and the aktiv to master important concepts of the Leninist theory of the socialist society and will equip them with new knowledge and experience in the building of communism.

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

5003

CSO: 1802

- END -

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

Feb. 11 1981



