

JPRS 78698

6 August 1981

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 6, April 1981



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 August 1981

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST
 No. 6, April 1981

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

CONTENTS

With Faith in the Power of Labor, the Country, the People and the Party.....	1
Decree on the All-Union Socialist Competition for the Successful Fulfillment and Overfulfillment of the 11th Five-Year Plan.....	23
Decree on Measures for Further Improving the Work with Letters and Suggestions by the Working People in the Light of the Decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress.....	29
L. I. Brezhnev Speech at the 1 April 1981 Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.....	32
Interview Granted by L. I. Brezhnev.....	35
L. I. Brezhnev Speech in Czechoslovakia.....	36
Start of Soviet Power Engineering (V. Steklov).....	43
Theoretical Foundations of Socialist Culture (Yu. Zhdanov).....	52
Toward New Positions (V. Shul'deshov).....	60
Tremendous Results of Reconstruction (N. Valitov).....	63
For the Good of the People (V. Gridneva).....	69
Components of a Good Mood (A. Lazunen).....	73

Great Responsibility of the Artist (I. Arkhipova).....	78
For the Sake of the Working People Themselves (E. Abakirov).....	82
On the Road Indicated by Lenin (V. Bilyak).....	84
Source of Pride and Hope (Nguyen Tkohn Le).....	87
In the Interest of All Mankind (Pen Sovan).....	90
Our Primary Tasks and Soviet Communist Forum (Babrak Karmal).....	92
Arsenal of Rich Experience (Carlos Nunez Tellez).....	97
Interview with Kommunist Contributor.....	100
Mankind's Strides in Space (G. Titov).....	106
The Strategy of Nuclear Madness (A. Arbatov).....	117
Certain Aspects of Chinese Policy (O. Borisov).....	128
For the Successful Building of Socialism (V. Fomichev).....	141

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 6
Apr 81

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : Apr 81

Signed to press : 10 Apr 1981

Copies : 908,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," "Kommunist,"
1981

WITH FAITH IN THE POWER OF LABOR, THE COUNTRY, THE PEOPLE AND THE PARTY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 3-22

[Text] The 26th Leninist party congress added a new outstanding chapter to the theory of scientific communism and of the building of socialism and communism.

It proved convincingly the humanistic nature of communist ideology and politics and the attainability of the ideals and interests of the working class.

Clearly and on the basis of reality, it proved the objective foundations and realistic nature of the goal of building a classless society and the establishment of durable peace among the nations.

The key and style themselves used in the consideration of topical domestic and international problems by the representatives of the Soviet communists were established long before the congress, in the course of the preparations for it, in which dozens of millions of working people participated, by the entire atmosphere of the pre-congress accountability and election campaign in party organizations and the nationwide discussion of the draft CC CPSU guidelines for the "Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990."

Before he formulated a number of general problems directly related to 1981 economic activities and to the development of the economy in the 11th Five-Year Plan, L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, stated the following at the October 1980 Central Committee Plenum: "I would like to open the discussion of such problems not with the topic of metal, transportation or even fuel and energy, their tremendous importance notwithstanding, but with problems whose solution affects most directly the living conditions of the Soviet people. We believe that concern for the good of the people is the most party-minded approach. From the strictly economic viewpoint as well, it is better to shift from the final objective to that which will insure its implementation."

This was the guiding idea which imbued all the speeches delivered at the 26th CPSU Congress and all its documents, ranging from the Central Committee accountability report and the delegates' speeches to the final resolutions and directive stipulations for the new five-year plan and for the entire period of the 1980s.

The 26th CPSU Congress gave the world a model for Marxist-Leninist unity between domestic and foreign policy. "We intend to concentrate all our efforts along two interrelated directions," L. I. Brezhnev emphasized in his concluding speech. "One

of them is the building of communism and the other is the strengthening of peace. Strictly speaking, this was precisely the instruction which the party members, the entire people, gave to the delegates to the party conferences. This instruction has now been translated into the language of party decisions."

I

As he pitted the historically confident revolutionary-proletarian world concept against the timid petit bourgeois premonition of hopelessness and future doom, V. I. Lenin wrote as early as 1913 that "the working class is not dying but growing, strengthening, maturing, uniting and educating and tempering itself in the struggle. We are pessimists as far as serfdom, capitalism and petty production are concerned, but we are great optimists regarding the workers movement and its objectives. We are already laying the foundations of the new building which will be erected by our children" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 23, p 257). These Leninist words are noticeably consonant with the materials of the 26th CPSU Congress.

The congress delegates and guests unanimously noted its efficient and realistic nature and its optimistic, life-asserting and upbeat mood. The profound, the basic reason for this is the broad and firm attitude shown by the communist party and the socialist system toward the working man as its "capital asset" (K. Marx) and as the "main and priceless resource of our society" (L. I. Brezhnev).

In his time Marx undertook the study of capitalist production relations with the study of the individual commodity, which he defined as the basic form of wealth of the bourgeois society. "Our reciprocal value," Marx wrote in describing the relationship among people under capitalism, "is to us the value of the objects we possess. Consequently, man himself, in our view, is something of no value to another man" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 42, p 35).

Clearly, a commodity cannot be the starting point for the study of production relations under socialism, for the basic form of social wealth in this society is something entirely different. What is it precisely? Economists have considered this problem for quite some time. The answers they have suggested, based on an analogy with the capitalist economy, have proved to be unconvincing on every occasion. One thing always stood out at the beginning of the study: the impossibility to bypass the "human factor," or to consider, even on the basis of a strictly economic approach, the existing totality of human capabilities and their manifestation in the overall specific labor which creates consumer values. Are these historically developed capabilities the basic form of wealth of the socialist society we are looking for? This is the direction toward which theory is turning under the influence of the ideas of the 26th congress.

It is easy to see the internal harmony between this statement and the USSR constitutional provision that "the supreme objective of social production under socialism is the fullest possible satisfaction of the growing material and spiritual needs of the people." The full concentration of the socialist social system on the subject of man and on the development of his capabilities and the satisfaction of his needs was brought out in the congress materials with impressive fullness. "The starting point of a party, a political approach to the

economy," L. I. Brezhnev stated, "remains the invariable programmatic requirement that everything must take place for the sake of man and for the good of man." He also stated that "specific concern for the specific person and his needs and requirements is the beginning and the end of the party's economic policy."

The following is an eloquent example of the conditions of universal-historical change under which we and our contemporaries have the fortune to live and act: nearly 2,500 years ago Protagoras, the ancient Greek philosopher and associate of Pericleus, a fighter against the gods, created an aphorism the meaning of which has not been entirely unraveled to this day: "Man is the measure of all things." For many generations, students of the history of philosophy have heard their professors accuse Protagoras of subjectivism. The professors were right, with the reservation that they gave a traditional religious-idealistic interpretation of man to whom they ascribed a spiritual nature exclusively. What if man is conceived as the "totality of all social relations," i.e., as dialectical materialism and Marx teach us? Does Marx' definition of communism as real humanism not represent the finally developed thesis that "Man is the measure of all things," providing a second, this time real rather than imaginary, meaning to this statement, under circumstances governed by the establishment of a communist system? It is precisely man who is the measure of all things in a social environment, rather than objects being the measure of man, his qualities, values and dignity... Such is today the clear line which separates the communists from the bourgeois-individualist perception of social reality. Such was the position expressed at the 26th congress repeatedly. On the basis of acquired experience and of all previous accomplishments, the congress provided a continuity and specificity for the 1980s for the line adopted at the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses calling for a more drastic turn of the national economy toward the variety of tasks related to improving the well-being of the people. It confirmed the orientation of the party's long-term economic policy: a decisive transition to primarily intensive factors of economic growth and increased effectiveness and quality of all work. "National economic management," the CC CPSU accountability states, "is the core of all party and governmental activities. It is precisely in the field of economics that the foundations are laid for the solution of social problems, the strengthening of the country's defense capability and the pursuit of an active foreign policy. It is precisely here that the necessary prerequisites for the successful progress of Soviet society toward communism are created."

Among the achievements and changes of the previous decade the congress noted the rise by a factor of 1.5 of labor productivity--the most concentrated indicator of economic effectiveness; the further development or creation of modern sectors such as nuclear machine building, space technology, electronic, microelectronic and microbiological industries, laser technology, and the production of artificial diamonds and other synthetic materials; the industrial development of new areas and the establishment of territorial-production complexes in the European part of the RSFSR, the Urals, Siberia, the Far East, Kazakhstan and Tadzhikistan; the stable growth of heavy industry, including the production of capital goods, the expansion and strengthening of our energy base, the strengthening of metallurgy and the development of machine building and substantial quantitative and qualitative changes in the chemical and petrochemical industries; intensified chemization, comprehensive mechanization and industrialization of crop growing and animal husbandry, extensive land reclamation and agricultural intensification, which made

it possible, on the one hand, to increase the volume of output per hectare by a 1.3 factor and, on the other, to secure greater production stability. In other words, it was a question of the material factors for the implementation of a broad program for the upsurge of the people's well-being in the 1970s.

Let us mention the fact alone that compared with 1970, average wages in 1980 were almost 40 percent higher; wages of kolkhoz members rose even faster, while payments and benefits from social consumption funds almost doubled; consumer goods production doubled; the amount of housing built in the 1970s exceeded the entire available urban housing stock of the beginning of the 1960s. Economic progress came ever closer to and was organically combined with social development. The entire system of social relations, our socialist way of life, continued to improve on the basis of steady economic progress.

The principled approach described by L. I. Brezhnev at the October 1980 CC CPSU Plenum was refracted differently when the congress considered the reasons for difficulties, shortcomings and omissions in the national economy. In addition to objective circumstances, which were independent of our will, shortcomings in planning and management, insufficient exigency on the part of many party organs and economic managers, violations of discipline and manifestations of negligence were pointed out. "The main reason, however, is the fact that the power of inertia, traditions and customs, which developed at a time when priority was given less to the qualitative than the quantitative aspect of the work, remains the main reason" (L. I. Brezhnev).

Thus, for a long period of time particular attention was being paid to the fulfillment of planned assignments according to nomenclature and the variety of goods, i.e., from the viewpoint of supplying the consumer with the consumer values he needed. Unfortunately, the effect of "gross output," which has been long condemned, is still being felt in a more or less concealed manner. Meanwhile, planning the production of machine tools, for example, in terms of tonnage, which in itself is a striking anachronism, and hiding behind monetary equivalencies sporadically arising shortages of sometimes most basic goods for daily use, obviously conflict with the purpose of socialist production. Naturally, this is not to say that we must no longer use tons and rubles as measuring units in our economic practices. For example, tons and other measures of weight are the only possible means for determining the quantity of extracted coal or crude oil or of the grain crop, i.e., the raw materials whose consumer qualities remain permanent regardless of their volume. However, the moment we bake the bread or refine a ton of petroleum we can be accurate only by taking into consideration the variety of bakery goods, the type of petroleum products obtained and the mandatory determination of their quality. In this case, concern for the Soviet person means concern for the products he is offered to meet his industrial and personal needs, concern for the good quality and reliability of the goods. This presumes giving serious consideration to the place and role of consumer value and to the natural production indicators related to it within the economic system of developed socialism.

It is possible to say that as an economic category consumer value has been noticeably "unlucky." Marx' remark in "Das Kapital" to the effect that the consumer value of goods must be the subject of a separate discipline--the study of

commodities--has been misinterpreted by some economists as an assertion that it was unnecessary, in general, to consider it. Actually, Marx' statement applied to the specific stipulation of consumer value within the capitalist production system, in bourgeois economic practice, where the self-growth of value, profit, is the immediate objective. A great deal has been written and said about the fact that the entire picture is changed by the fact that under socialism the satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of the working people becomes the immediate target of the production process. Nevertheless, the "consumer value" category has remained actually outside the political-economic thinking process. This ignored Marx' position that "consumer value itself plays the role of an economic category. The place where it plays this role is based on the analysis of the relations under consideration" ("Ekonomicheskiye Rukopisi 1857-1861 Gg." [Economic Manuscripts of 1857-1861], Part II, Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, p 151). Today, when the question of the qualitative aspect of production activities has assumed tremendous sociopolitical and even moral significance, the scientists must fill the developed gap. "The tasks formulated by life," L. I. Brezhnev pointed out, "demand the development of theory, of the science of economics, and the need to bring it closer to the needs of economic practice."

A discussion on the possibility of eliminating the major shortcomings of applied value indicators by combining them with physical indicators, by the "aggregation" of the two, has been under way for quite some time. There is also the viewpoint according to which the elaboration of physical indicators is impossible in general, bearing in mind the tremendous amount of types and varieties of goods produced and the physical impossibility, for this reason, to submit them to statistical processing. This kind of skepticism enables some economists to avoid any preliminary studies in this direction. However, both nomenclature and variety could be considered entirely as related indicators of the effectiveness of production activities since, to begin with, they are computable and, secondly, they characterize economic activities precisely from their qualitative side. Why not energize the respective methodological developments, making use simultaneously of the essentially unlimited capacity of computers? This and many other related problems have been awaiting a solution for quite a while. In turn, this solution will help to implement the party's instructions of switching from the final objective to that which will insure the achievement of it.

This position is supported strongly by the important formulation of the problem of the level of requirements regarding production quality, stipulated at the 26th congress. "I believe," L. I. Brezhnev pointed out, "that quality must be the highest possible. We neither can nor should agree to anything less than the best global and domestic standards. We must train ourselves to demand this. This must be achieved by rejecting everything obsolete, everything depreciated by life itself decisively." Such is the interpretation given to one of the most important components in resolving the main task of the 11th Five-Year plan today.

What does this task consist of?

It consists of insuring the further growth of the well-being of the Soviet people on the following basis:

Stable national economic progress;

Accelerated scientific and technical progress and conversion of the economy to intensive development;

More efficient utilization of the country's production potential; and

Comprehensive conservation of all resources and improved work quality.

The solution of the main problem and of its components will have to be obtained under difficult circumstances. For example, the development of the production process in the 1980s will be tangibly affected by the reduced expansion of labor resources, higher outlays necessitated by the development of the eastern part of the country and Siberia, and environmental protection expenditures; the need for the radical reorganization of many old enterprises, and the upgrading of roads, transportation and communications in accordance with rising economic requirements.

In particular, the congress called for increasing the national income by 18-20 percent, industrial output by 26-28 percent and agricultural production by 12-14 percent under the 11th Five-Year Plan. It emphasized that, naturally, the development of heavy industry, its basic sectors in particular, the fuel and energy areas primarily, is an unconditional prerequisite for the solution of all national economic problems. Along with the variety of measures aimed at improving the fuel and energy balance, the task was formulated of continuing the search for essentially new sources of energy, including laying the foundations of a thermonuclear power industry.

In addition to the commissioning of new production capacities, ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy must follow yet another path--that of the more skillful and complete utilization of metallurgical output.

The comprehensive concentration of forces for the fastest possible completion and commissioning of enterprises which can insure the highest growth of output and eliminate bottlenecks is a characteristic feature of the new five-year plan facing construction workers.

As to transportation, the problems which have piled up in that area will be resolved on the basis of a specially drafted comprehensive long-term program.

"Each sector has its own topical tasks and specific problems," the CC CPSU accountability report noted. "There are problems, however, which cover all economic areas. The main among them is completing the transition to a primarily intensive way of development." N. A. Tikhonov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman, who submitted to the congress the report on "Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990," compared this transition, in terms of historical scales, significance and consequences, to other most profound changes such as socialist industrialization which changed the face of the country radically.

The Soviet state has a truly gigantic production potential at its disposal. It holds a leading position in the world in the production of petroleum, steel, cement, chemical fertilizers, wheat, cotton and mainline electric and diesel powered locomotive engines. It has the biggest machine tool fleet and the biggest number of engineers. However, compared with the highest global indicators, we use a greater amount of raw materials and energy per unit of national income. The congress considered the successful solution of this contradiction a mandatory prerequisite for our progress. "Comrades, we are able now to resolve the biggest and most complex problems," L. I. Brezhnev emphasized. "However, a matter which might seem simple and rather ordinary--an economical attitude toward the public good, the ability to make full and expedient use of everything at our disposal, is becoming the linchpin of economic policy. This must become the focal point of the initiative of labor collective and of mass party work. It must become the focal point of our technical and capital investment policies and of our system of planning and accountability indicators...

"The economy must be economical. Such is the demand of the times."

The party deems it increasingly urgent to raise all economic sectors to the level of the leading positions of science and technology and of the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. No one needs to be convinced of the great importance which we ascribe to science. The party proceeds from the fact that the new society is simply inconceivable without science. Along with the study of theoretical problems, "big science" must concentrate increasing efforts on the solution of key national economic problems, discoveries and developments which could lead to truly revolutionary changes in production. We must continue to enhance the role and responsibility of the USSR Academy of Sciences. We must improve the organization of the entire system of scientific research, making it more flexible and adaptable and intolerant of unproductive laboratories and institutes. As it implements the practical assignments formulated by the planning and economic organs, science itself must become a constant "troublemaker," noting conservative trends the moment they appear, indicating means for their elimination and pointing out the most promising growth areas.

The congress acknowledged that the application of scientific discoveries and inventions is the most urgent sector. It analyzed the positive experience acquired by the country in the area of the close linkage between organizational, scientific research and design work, on the one hand, and the production process, on the other. At the same time, great attention was paid to the inadmissible slowness in the utilization of promising developments. "We must find out the reasons for which we occasionally lose our advance," L. I. Brezhnev stated, "wasting a great deal of money in purchasing abroad the type of equipment and technology which we could perfectly well produce ourselves and, frequently, on a higher quality level." We must no longer tolerate the lagging of the scientific and design base of many sectors such as the light, food and medical industries, and agricultural and some other areas of machine building. It is machine building most of all that can open wide the doors to new developments, converting into metal the ideas of scientists and designers. "Today, as we look at the next 5 or 10 years," L. I. Brezhnev concluded, "we must not forget that it is precisely then that we shall lay the foundations and create the national economic structure with which the

country will enter the 21st century. This structure must embody the main features and ideals of the new society. It must be in the vanguard of progress and embody the integration of science with production and the indivisible alliance between creative thinking and creative labor."

Putting the country's entire scientific and technical and production potential on the service of man, the party developed an extensive set of measures which cover improvements of all aspects of Soviet life--consumption, housing, culture, recreation and working and living conditions. The minimum wage is expected to reach 80 rubles per month under the 11th Five-Year Plan. Average monthly wages will be raised by 13-16 percent and reach 190-195 rubles; the kolkhoz members' income from the public farms will be raised by 20-22 percent. Other means are planned for upgrading the living standard of the working people by increasing their monetary income. However, the CC CPSU gives priority to the full physical and actual satisfaction of rising solvent population demand.

These tasks may be divided essentially into two groups of general state programs.

The first is the special food program which is being formulated. Its purpose is to insure the uninterrupted supply of the population with products as soon as possible. It will be based on the further upsurge of agriculture, the main directions for which were outlined at the July 1978 CC CPSU Plenum. In the agrarian policy of the 1980s the center of gravity will be moved to returns from the substantial governmental capital investments made in this sector, the growth of its productivity and the intensification and improvement of its ties with all sectors of the agroindustrial complex.

The second program calls for increasing the production and improving the quality of consumer goods and the development of consumer services. The pace of development of group B will be accelerated somewhat and will be somewhat faster than the growth rates of group A. The role of trade will be increased in determining the variety and quality of goods. Better technical facilities will be supplied to communal-consumer enterprises. They will be distributed around the country more evenly and skilled cadres will be trained for them. The task is to create a truly modern system for the production of consumer goods and population services consistent with the requirements of the people. The congress pointed out that this is a prime party assignment and should be treated as such.

The planned social measures are not limited to the consumer area. The party has always invested a great deal of effort to make human labor more productive, more meaningful, more interesting and more creative. In this case the elimination of manual, unskilled and heavy physical labor must play a most important part. This will eliminate the major obstacle which stands in the way of the conversion of labor into everyone's prime vital need.

The development of the creative initiative of the masses and of socialist competition will be helped by the congress' stipulation that socialist pledges and counterplans are formulated strictly "from the ground upwards" as follows: working person-brigade-enterprise-sector, after which obligations and counterplans will be coordinated with the state plan.

Man spends in his enterprise or establishment one-third of his life. The congress expressed its weighty opinion on the subject of making the socialist production process a suitable base for daily life, so that a person can feel equally well at work and at home. It approved L. I. Brezhnev's suggestion of reporting on the completion of new national economic projects only after the implementation of the planned assignments for a given project regarding housing and cultural construction.

The congress defined ways to improve the situation in public education and health care, and in developing physical culture and sports on a mass scale, and in advancing the esthetic education of the working people.

One statement by Lenin which was most frequently cited is an excerpt from his speech at the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets of the National Economy of 26 May 1918. He said: "Only socialism offers the possibility of extensively disseminating and truly subordinating public production and the distribution of products to scientific considerations, to making the life of the working people as comfortable as possible and to offering them the opportunity to become prosperous." However, Lenin's thought does not end there, though the words that follow are quoted far less frequently. "Socialism alone can accomplish this. We know that it must accomplish this," Lenin emphasized. The realization of this truth constitutes the entire difficulty and strength of Marxism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 381).

The entire difficulty and the entire strength of Marxism.... This striking combination must be considered closely. One must be a brilliant dialectical revolutionary to be able to combine in a masterly fashion these two seemingly disparate features of the proletarian doctrine which is transforming the world as it is specifically put to social practical use. The 26th CPSU Congress has proved that the party which Lenin created--the mind, honor and conscience of our epoch--inherited this skill. Fearing no obstacles and drawing its energy from the people, it is promoting the growth of the material and spiritual standards of the working man adamantly and consistently. It is developing the required technical-economic, sociopolitical and cultural prerequisites purposefully.

II

The 26th CPSU Congress reflected the increased interest of the party and the scientific public, the party members and all Soviet people in the contemporary social evolution of the country. In the developed socialist period the reorganization of all social relations on the basis of collectivistic principles internally inherent in the new system is drawing to a close," L. I. Brezhnev has pointed out. "This reorganization covers the material and spiritual areas and our entire way of life." The party's Central Committee is paying constant attention to problems of the development of the socioclass structure of Soviet society and to development, which is an objective rather than an uncontrolled process.

Such interest and attention have substantive practical grounds.

First, it is urgently necessary to determine periodically the extent to which the people who are building communism have come closer to the most important

programmatic task--the creation of a classless society--and, in this connection, to determine their next tasks.

Second, the study of changes in the social structure of the population and in social relations is a necessary prerequisite for the scientific management of social development, for it arms the ruling communist party and the socialist state with a detailed knowledge of the areas they administer.

Finally, third, the nature of social changes is one of the most important initial parameters in the formulation of current and long-term plans for the country's economic and cultural progress. "The social structure of the society and the system," Lenin wrote, "is characterized by changes without the clarification of which no single step can be taken in any area of social activity. The clarification of such changes determines the question of future development. Naturally, this does not mean the making of meaningless guesses but the determination of the basic trends of economic and political development, trends whose resultant force will determine the immediate future of the country, trends which determine the tasks, directions and nature of activities of any conscientious social leader" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 20, p 186).

The interest which communists show in the social breakdown of the population is of a profoundly principled nature. It is due to the efforts to find a revolutionary and a scientific solution to the age-old problem of social equality. The Marxist-Leninists base this idea on the only real foundation for the elimination of the old division of labor, which involves the existence of exploitation relations and their consequences--the contraposition between mental and physical, creative and routine, organizational and executive, and town and country labor--and to insuring the equal position of women and of citizens of all nationalities. The main obstacle in this case is the most drastic social division--the division of society into antagonistic classes--which is both the product and the guardian of the old division of labor. The First International, in declaring itself against liberal sermons of "class equalization," formulated its position as follows: "Not equalization of classes, which is an unachievable stupidity, but, conversely, the elimination of classes is the real secret of the proletarian movement and the great objective of the International Association of Workers" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 18, p 12). The example set by the land of the soviets proves that this "secret" was unraveled by the working class in the course of its revolutionary practical experience and successful progress toward this great objective.

In the USSR today, after more than 40 years since the elimination of exploiting classes, the characteristics of the development of a classless social system are becoming increasingly apparent. However, this historical problem cannot be resolved in one fell swoop. Nor could it be simplified in any way.

The question of the applicability under our circumstances of the "class" concept, as defined in Marxist literature, is frequently raised in connection with the elimination of class-social antagonisms and the long existence of a society consisting of exclusively socialist toiling classes and social groups. We consider correct the viewpoint of those scientists who believe that in the developed socialist stage as well this concept retains its entire significance and that we must continue to apply it in the characterization of the Soviet working class and kolkhoz peasantry and in defining their place and role in the global revolutionary process.

The use of this concept in the characterization not of classes per se but of their interrelationship within Soviet society, under the circumstances of the rapid elimination of class differences, is a different matter. It is generally accepted that in terms of this function the "class" concept no longer defines social reality so accurately as in the consideration of the class-antagonistic structure, for at this point it is applied to an essentially new subject whose social nature and trend of development are qualitatively different. The study of the manner in which class characteristics, as brought out by Lenin, are manifested in contemporary Soviet reality indicates that developed socialism is a social system without antagonisms, without class barriers, with great mobility of social boundaries and with the active and free mobility of the citizens who move from one social working stratum to another.

"In order to destroy the classes," Lenin wrote in 1919, "we must, first of all, overthrow the land owners and the capitalists. We have resolved this part of the problem. However, this is only part, and not the most difficult part at that. In order to eliminate the classes we must, secondly, eliminate the disparity between workers and peasants and make everyone a worker. This cannot be accomplished overnight. It is an incomparably more difficult problem and, by necessity, a lengthy one. It is a problem which cannot be resolved by the overthrow of any given class. It can be resolved only as a result of the organized restructuring of the entire public economy and the conversion from single separate petty enterprises to public large-scale enterprises" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 39, p 276-277). This type of reorganization and transition ends under developed socialist conditions. It is thus that the second part of the problem of the elimination of classes, as formulated by Lenin, is resolved. This is one of the most important conclusions of the 26th CPSU Congress. Disparities based on essential class or, in sociological terminology, "class-forming" characteristics between the working class and the kolkhoz peasantry are increasingly vanishing today. This means that both classes have objectively reached the stage of consolidation of their alliance which borders their organic blending within a single entity, within a cohesive classless labor association, the creation of which was anticipated by the founders of scientific communism.

Literary publications frequently use the concepts of "classless society" and "socially homogeneous society" interchangeably. Naturally, once achieved, the social homogeneity of the population will mean the total absence of class conflicts and differences. However, the elimination of differences among classes, although it may mean a qualitative change leading to the establishment of social homogeneity, will not resolve the problem by itself. Briefly stated, whereas a classless social structure may be created by equalizing the basic "class-forming" characteristics in a nonantagonistic society, its socially homogeneous structure can be the result of the total elimination of the old division of labor only. The building of a classless society and, subsequently, the achievement of its social homogeneity are structural elements in the systematic solution of the same problems, but are different in content and can be achieved over different lengths of time.

Today Soviet society is characterized, on the one hand, by the simplification of its macrostructure and the intensive elimination of major and obvious social disparities and, on the other, by the increased complexity of its microstructure

regarding the increased role which nonclass differences, previously considered of secondary or tertiary significance, play in daily life. "The elimination of interclass disparities," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said, "naturally, poses new problems of social policy, which is increasingly concentrating on surmounting disparities which exceed the boundaries of individual classes and on resolving problems which require the most attentive examination of the characteristics and interests of each individual group in our society."

While we take these objective characteristics of the shaping of a classless and socially homogeneous society into consideration, it is important not to ignore the social force which is in the center of such changes and which leaves its determining mark on them. Otherwise, should we become carried away by sociological exercises involving the increasingly detailed social, professional, age, and other differentiations within society, we may lose sight of the overall perspective and understanding of events and become entrapped by imaginary concepts according to which the process of elimination of class disparities may be interpreted as a seemingly disorderly "Brownian motion."

The working class is the force discussed here, "the social mind and social heart" (Marx) of the developing classless society, as it is of all other revolutionary processes. Engels' thesis to the effect that "The position of the working class becomes the actual foundation and starting point of all contemporary social movements..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 2, p 238), retains its entire significance and acquires a richer meaning. It is precisely the working class that guarantees the building of a socially homogeneous society thanks to the following basic qualities which Lenin noted:

The working class has been trained, unified, raised and tempered as a result of decades of economic, political and ideological struggle against capitalism; it has reached the urban big industry standard; it has the necessary resolve and ability to defend it, to protect and develop its gains further, and to make them accessible to all working people; it can endure all burdens, trials, misfortunes and great sacrifices which history invariably imposes on frontranking fighters, on those who make a break with the past and daringly make for themselves a way to the future; the best segment of the working class is full of hatred and scorn for anything that is petit bourgeois and philistine, for the philistine features and customs so typical of a petit bourgeois environment; what makes the working class particularly strong is the fact that it has attended the school of labor and that it can make every working person, every honest person respectful of its industriousness (see V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 38, p 387-388). These features of the working class are embodied in the Marxist-Leninist party which it has created and which expresses its basic interests. Thanks to all of this, the working class is particularly receptive to socialist ideology. It is the carrier of social relations of cooperation and mutual aid among people free from exploitation and is the most consistent fighter for the implementation of communist objectives and ideals.

In the socialist society the working class holds in its hands a powerful modern industry, which is the decisive base for the development of production forces and, therefore, for the prosperity of society at large. It creates the greatest share of the social product related to progressive technology. It works in sectors which

determine scientific and technical progress, which subsequently spreads to the other economic sectors. It is united within a large-scale industrial organization of production with a corresponding level of discipline and modern technological processes which require highly concentrated efforts and labor activities. The role of the working class in the revolutionary movement and in building the new society and its political aspect and interests, views and morality become a kind of social standard for all social groups under socialism. It is natural that in the circumstances of our country the rapprochement between it and the peasantry and the intelligentsia is intensified.

The leading position of the working class under socialism is explained mainly by virtue of its place and role in the social production system. It is strengthened also by virtue of the fact that it accounts for the majority of the working people. Today, three-quarters of all Soviet workers have a higher or secondary (8 or 10-year) education. The very nature of the job of the contemporary worker is changing and is acquiring an increasingly intellectual content. Together with the other groups of the builders of communism, the Soviet worker is justifiably considered the bearer of the creative and cultural potential of the developed socialist society.

Allied with and under the guidance of the working class, the peasantry has undergone a tremendous qualitative evolution. From a petty ownership class with a clearly expressed private capitalist tendency it has become a class the objective developments of which contribute to the establishment of habits of collective labor and to the adoption of a collectivistic mentality with every passing day. As agricultural labor comes closer to industrial labor in terms of technical facilities and of equalized conditions and living standards between the urban and rural population, the kolkhoz peasantry is increasingly acquiring features resembling those of the working class.

In this connection let us mention the view according to which the shaping of a homogeneous society is interpreted as a process in which each class or stratum acquires the best socially significant qualities of the other rather than the development of a single progressive class, although this might apply to the working class. Unquestionably, a comprehensive reciprocal enrichment takes place among socialist classes and groups in Soviet society. However, we must not fail to see also that this process has its own basic and dominating trend. If we look at the reciprocal influence between the working class and the peasantry, this trend becomes quite visible: industrial and sovkhoz workers do not become "peasants;" conversely, it is the kolkhoz members who assume the characteristics of workers, i.e., they reach the highest sociopolitical, cultural-technological and moral standards of the period.

When we speak of the resemblance of the peasantry to the working class we invest this concept with a sociohistorical rather than vulgar-empirical meaning. The working class as, in fact, any existing social stratum, has its progressive and its backward segments. Marx, Engels and Lenin never deified the proletariat and firmly opposed "taillism," or the veneration of accidental moods in the workers environment, brought in from the outside, some of them of a petit bourgeois nature. At the same time, they put an end to all attempts to depict the working class merely as a passive victim, ignorant and unable to stop being the victim of capital. This does not fit the image of the proletariat in the least. In Lenin's

words, the proletariat "dominates the center and the nerves of the entire capitalist economic system... It represents the true economic and political interests of the overwhelming majority of the working people under capitalism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 40, p 23), not to mention the leading position the working class holds in the socialist countries.

The universal-historical mission of the working class does not mean in the least the need for those who practice other professions to engage mandatorily in unskilled physical labor. It is right-wing and left-wing revisionism that ascribes to the working class such a vulgar mission, which is profoundly alien to Marxism. It is a question of something entirely different: of the hegemony of the proletariat as the most revolutionary class of our epoch in the liberation movement, the support and assistance of which are among the most important criteria of affiliation with the forces of progress. The working class, as represented by its skilled and conscientious segment, naturally, is the most developed mass stratum of working people engaged in modern scientifically organized industrial output, consistent with its growing requirements: workers against whom no one can compete in terms of social-labor initiative, general training and socioprofessional operativeness under the conditions of faster scientific and technical progress and of revolutionary changes in social relations.

These considerations are particularly important in the study of relations between workers engaged in physical and mental work or, if we use the accepted sociological term, between the working class and the kolkhoz peasantry, on the one hand, and the people's intelligentsia, on the other. We use here the word "accepted," for the rule of basic classification--the reciprocal exclusion of elements--is not strictly observed in the "working class--kolkhoz peasantry--people's intelligentsia" "three-term" formula. This rule is applicable to both classes but not to the intelligentsia which cannot be a class, for it can be singled out among the toiling population not on the basis of "class forming" characteristics but of professional involvement with the area of essentially mental work.

We know that under capitalist conditions, not to mention the conditions of a feudal society, initially the intelligentsia was almost exclusively involved in serving the interests of the ruling class and that it gravitates toward it in terms of its status and way of life. However, as intellectual professions develop into mass professions in the course of the scientific and technical revolution, the structure of the intelligentsia changes. This equally applies to its origin. In the capitalist countries a growing part of the intelligentsia finds itself in the position of hired labor and takes the side of the oppressed classes. At the same time, the dependent socioeconomic status of the intelligentsia naturally leads it to fluctuate between the two opposing sides.

The distinguishing feature of the intelligentsia of developed socialism is found mainly in the fact that most of it is "recruited" from among the workers and peasants. Together with them it forms the single labor collective of the whole people. Its social origin reflects quite accurately the characteristic features of the social structure.

Thus, the overwhelming majority of the Soviet intelligentsia, which today is larger than the class of the kolkhoz peasantry, is employed in the state sphere of the national economy and culture and in the service industry. Another one of its

groups is engaged in cooperated production. These are not intermediary strata at all. They have become equal to the remaining categories of working people in the respective sectors in terms of productive capital and are distinguished only by historically transient characteristics, mainly the work they perform in a specific area of the social division of labor. Depending on their affiliation with the workers in the national or the cooperative-kolkhoz sector of the socialist economy, the respective detachments of the intelligentsia acquire in varying degrees the "class-forming" characteristics of either the working class or the kolkhoz peasantry, and gravitate toward them. This makes even clearer the vital meaning of the statement made by G. K. Ordzhonikidze in 1935: "In our country the engineer is the great creator who works for his worker, being a worker himself, and for his kolkhoz member, being a kolkhoz member himself" ("Stati i Rech'i" [Articles and Speeches], Vol 2, Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1957, p 659).

The changed aspect of the social strata of the socialist society and the rapprochement between them take place under conditions governed by a general rise in the level of well-being and standards of the people, and the inordinately rapid change in the way of life and its reorganization on an urban modern industrial basis. The level reached by the population in its social homogeneity is manifested in the unified Soviet-wide features of the way of life of workers, peasants and intellectuals, which are established and strengthened also thanks to the fact that in Soviet society there is an ever diminishing number of "purely worker," "purely peasant" or "purely intellectual" families. The interpenetration among the different toiling strata and their merging with each other is a specific phenomenon inherent in the Soviet people as a new historical social and international community whose appearance we can justifiably consider as a type of summarized result of the political, economic and cultural changes which took place in our country after the great October Socialist Revolution.

Naturally, it is not a question of any kind of chaotic "mixing" of all social strata but of a natural, a purposeful trend which was specifically described in L. I. Brezhnev's broad summation as follows: "In assessing the experience gained in the development of our society in recent decades, it is possible, in my view, to assume that the establishment of a classless social structure will take place essentially within the historical framework of mature socialism." This confirms what some sociologists have tried to depict in the concept of the creation of a "one-class" social structure, but which was more accurately described by Engels in reference to the working class as follows: "...The time will come when it will no longer be a class, when it will encompass the entire society" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 19, p 296).

In developing the foundations of CPSU social and national policy further, the congress emphasized the need for equalizing social disparities on the territorial level and of cultural living conditions in the various areas of our huge country. Obviously, we must involve the relatively less mobile population, such as that of Central Asia and of a number of areas in the Caucasus, in the development of the new territories and to increase in them the percentage of skilled workers among the native population, mainly the rural youth. Population problems, which have become aggravated of late, have drawn serious attention to the formulation and implementation of an effective demographic policy and to its main direction—increased concern for the family and for young married couples, mainly for the

women. Along with systematic improvements in the material security of the retired, it has become more necessary to involve them in the type of work they can do, the service industry in particular. In accordance with these congress stipulations the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers have already passed the decrees "On Measures to Increase State Aid to Families With Children" and "On Measures for Further Improving the Social Insurance of the Population."

There are no backward national outlying areas in our country today. The close cooperation among all nations and nationalities within the USSR and, most of all, the selfless aid of the Russian people played a decisive role in raising them to the level of development reached by the central part of the country. This, however, does not exclude in the least the fact that some areas may find themselves temporarily in a less favorable situation compared with some others. That is what happened in the case of the Nonchernozem zone of the RSFSR for a number of reasons. The task of developing the Nonchernozem is so complex and urgent that it must be resolved with the joint efforts of all republics and in the shortest possible time.

The growth of the multinational characteristic of the population of the Soviet republics has brought to life the problem of insuring the proper representation of the working people of different nationalities in local party and state organs and the consideration of the specific requirements of citizens of non-native nationalities in terms of language, culture and way of life. "We oppose trends of artificial elimination of national characteristics. However, we consider equally inadmissible their artificial exaggeration," L. I. Brezhnev emphasized at the congress. "The party has the sacred duty to educate the working people in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism and in the proud feeling of belonging to the one great Soviet homeland." The intensive economic and social development of all Soviet republics and their comprehensive rapprochement, blossoming and reciprocal enrichment of national cultures and the shaping of the culture of the one Soviet people are the progressive processes which make this new social and international community the cradle of the first classless society on earth.

III

The collective mind of the CPSU, its single will and its unity around its Central Committee, whose work rests on the granite foundation of Marxism-Leninism, its high exigency toward the party members and its live ties with the masses are components of the party's ability to head the Soviet society and to lead the people to communism with confidence. All of these are factors inseparable from its combat ideological activities.

"It has been known for some time that truth is mastered durably when it has been experienced rather than simply taught," L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress in discussing the tasks of the Komsomol. This does not apply to educational work with young people only.

In the course of shaping a Marxist-Leninist and communist conviction, the acquired theoretical and political knowledge must organically blend with the emotional-moral-esthetic aspects of the personality, with its inner spiritual world,

becoming part of the moral-psychological atmosphere in which it conducts its work and lives its life. What makes this task harder is the fact that the class awareness of the Soviet people is hammered out in the absence of a class struggle and, therefore, of its stern practical and psychological training within the country, but with the adamant attempts on the part of the class enemy on the outside to impose even if on no more than a certain segment of the population, bourgeois and petit bourgeois mores and criteria for the assessment of social phenomena, to implant consumerism and to promote a kind of nonspiritual "economism."

To combine scientific communism with the mass movement of the working people remains a topical task for the party. It cannot be implemented once and for all but is repeated again and again in different ways and with each new generation of revolutionary fighters and requires the systematic renovation of the ways and means for its resolution.

The education of the new man can be successful only if it is based on the firm foundations of socioeconomic policy. It is precisely on such foundations, most directly related to the solution of the various vital problems of improving developed socialism and of building communism, rather than within the closed circle of purely educational and methodical problems and not always effective measures, that we must carry out the reorganization of many sectors and areas of ideological work is demanded by the congress.

The innovative approach which the congress took to educational problems was manifested in the fact that it considered them as part of the living fabric of conflicting social reality, without separating them from the pulse beat of social relations or isolating them from the development of the socialist way of life and the intensive class struggle in the international arena. Virtually all sections of the CC CPSU accountability report dealt with various aspects of these problems.

Another characteristic of the ideological problems dealt with at the congress was the even greater consideration of the contemporary Soviet person, such as he is, of his interests and requirements, and of the specific consideration related to his greater knowledgeability, increased erudition, considerably higher spiritual demands, and vast amount of information possessed. In L. I. Brezhnev's words, "The Soviet person is a conscientious worker, a person with high political culture, a patriot and an internationalist. He was educated by the party, by the heroic history of the country, and by our entire system. He lives the rich life of the builders of the new world." Is it admissible to address such a person as though he does not read his morning newspaper, as though there is no dense network of radio and television communications, as though the age of the silent movies is still on? We are familiar with a propaganda style which is rated positively on the basis of the exclusive condition that it must be "faultless," but which consists most frequently of hackneyed simplistic views, and anticipated boring cliches in which depth and emotionalism are replaced by high-falutin turgidity. Today this style is totally unsuitable. The delegates to the congress mentioned the need to update the content of ideological work, to modernize its forms, to extend it to sensitive topics and difficult problems, and to prevent the enemies of our country from using them for the purpose of slandering socialism.

Naturally, the lecturer, propagandist, agitator, political informant, social scientist-instructor, teacher, or party worker has no right to err. However, this does not mean that he must always follow the beaten path for the sake of insurance. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine, in its initial aspect, the party's documents, and the brilliant examples set by Marx, Engels, Lenin and the Leninists in their outstanding propaganda and publicistic activities represent a vast and valuable arsenal which, properly used, enables and demands of us to carry out ideological work with Bolshevik passion and conviction, in a spirit of communist party-mindedness, sincerity and principle-mindedness, and on a contemporary scientific level. We must not avoid frank discussions with people about problems which affect them, or hide behind ready-made formulas when an original fresh analysis is required. Ability to engage in analytical thinking is vitally needed by our propaganda cadres and must be developed steadily. "Who if not the ideological workers should have a highly developed feeling for the new?" A great obligation stems from this statement made by the CC CPSU general secretary.

As was pointed out at the congress, in some people education and level of information coexist side by side with political naivete, while professional skill coexists with an insufficiently responsible attitude toward work. This means that we must boost labor, moral and ideological-political upbringing jointly, bearing in mind the lofty truths of the Marxist-Leninist outlook and the principles and norms of the socialist way of life, which must be recalled literally along every step of the way despite our familiarity with them. Thus, we must prove with the help of all the information, propaganda and mass-political work media, tirelessly yet in a varied but non-persistent manner, that our socialist society is, first of all, a work society in which the satisfaction of personal material and spiritual needs is closely and permanently dependent on one's own contribution to joint labor; that our society is strong because of its collectivistic foundations and that the true blossoming of creative individualities is possible only on the basis of the development of communist collectivism; and that the rights and freedoms granted to the Soviet citizens by the USSR Constitution, unmatched in any other country, can be exercised fully only if combined with the strict implementation of civic duties, within the one and only circle of communist morality and socialist discipline.

What makes this particularly pertinent to recall is the concern expressed by the congress regarding negative phenomena whose spontaneous effect obstructs the functioning and development of socialist social relations. This includes cases of equalization, the earning of wages merely for showing up for work rather than for actual work results, the earning of undeserved bonuses, parasitism, bribery, speculations, deals involving scarce goods, mercenary-minded violations of housing allocation rules, unearned income and encroachments on socialist property. "Conscientious workers must be thoroughly encouraged, while idlers and waste makers should have no loopholes for living the good life without work," L. I. Brezhnev said at the congress. "Whoever wants to live better must work more and better. This, I believe, should be clear to all." All the chinks and cracks through which recurrences of petit bourgeois feelings and the weeds of egotism and philistinism, acquisitiveness, drunkenness, and indifference toward the concerns and accomplishments of the people penetrate must be sealed tightly in order to ensure the strict

observance of this and other norms of collectivistic-labor socialist community life. All means at our disposal--ideological, organizational, financial and legal--and all public forces, including that of workers' control, must be enlisted and utilized.

The congress authoritatively asserted the principle of unity of party ideological-theoretical, political-educational, organizational and economic work. It rated highly the difficult work of the thousands of Soviet journalists and expressed its gratitude to the tremendous army of party and nonparty members and enthusiastic volunteers engaged in agitation and propaganda work. It was deemed expedient, without becoming carried away by an excessive increase in the number of students, to undertake resolutely to improve the quality of training, above all that of party members, within the party education system. This requires a most thorough approach to the selection, training and timely information of propaganda cadres.

The formulation of this problem is coupled with the manner in which the congress considered the question of further improvements in the qualitative structure and deployment of leading personnel and of raising their qualifications. It approved the practice of promoting to party work national economic specialists, as was stipulated by the 25th party congress. It was also acknowledged that some of those promoted lack sufficient political experience and occasionally introduce administrative-economic methods in the work of party organs. The political training of such comrades must be improved, the CC CPSU accountability report indicated. "They must be helped to acquire the necessary skills for party work. Furthermore, it takes more than taking a party course to become a true party leader. Comrades promoted to leading party work must gain experience in the thick of the toiling masses so that they could learn how workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia of our country live, not from documents but from personal experience, and be familiar with their lives, demands and interests." This type of Leninist control for the training of management cadres and of the ideological aktiv is a mandatory prerequisite for blending party policy with the activities of the masses.

It is worth pointing out that occasionally Lenin used the concept of "ideologue" as a synonym for "conscientious manager" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 5, p 363). This becomes particularly topical now, when the ideological and educational functions of any managerial work, including economic management, become visible under developed socialist conditions. Lenin wrote that an "ideologue" can be considered as such only when he is ahead of the spontaneous movement, when he gives it its way, when he is able to resolve all theoretical, political, tactical and organizational problems spontaneously encountered by the "material elements" of the movement faster than others. In order to take "the material elements of the movement" truly into consideration, a critical attitude towards them must be adopted. We must be able to indicate the dangers and shortcomings of uncontrolled trends. We must be able to raise the nature of an element to the conscious level. To say, Lenin went on, bearing in mind his argument with the "economists," that ideologues (i.e., conscientious managers) are unable to lead the movement away from the path determined by the interaction between the environment and the elements means to forget the basic truth that conscientiousness is part of this interaction and this determination" (Ibid.).

Such participation is manifested most convincingly in the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory, which is the scientific base of the party's policy. The 26th congress noted that after the 25th congress its theoretical arsenal was expanded by a number of important summations and conclusions. "Among everything accomplished in the field of theory," L. I. Brezhnev pointed out, "let us mention, first of all, the elaboration of the concept of developed socialism. On the basis of this concept the party refined and specified the means and deadlines for the implementation of our programmatic objectives. It defined strategy and tactics covering a long historical period.... Our advance toward communism passes through the stage of the developed socialist society. This.... is a necessary, legitimate and historically long period in the establishment of the communist system." Today the Soviet social scientists have already developed a unanimous view of developed socialism as a stage in the first phase of communism, in which a high degree of socialization of labor and production has been reached and in which the new social system represents a mature social entity organically based on the principles of collectivism.

Among the positive theoretical results achieved in recent years the CC CPSU accountability report singled out studies of the experience of world socialism, the laws of the revolutionary process, the history of the international workers movement, the contemporary stage of the general crisis of capitalism and of its state-monopoly stage and of contemporary international relations. Social science areas whose condition remains unsatisfactory were also noted.

L. I. Brezhnev pointed out that the inclination which some social scientists show for scholastic theorizing, which was criticized at the preceding party congress, has not been surmounted. "Quite frequently philosophers prefer to prove what has been proved," he said, "instead of engaging in the interpretation of the new phenomena in life." Endless discussions are taking place on problems which Marxism has long resolved but which are presented as "controversial" by specialists who lack thorough methodological and historical-philosophical training. Totally inadmissible cases may be found in which, under the influence of a purely external and clearly uncritical perception of contemporary trends in foreign science, theoretical conclusions are suggested and are labeled as "innovations," but which are a step backwards compared with the works of the founders of scientific communism.

A great deal more remains to be done in the field of socialist political economy, as we apply to its fullest extent Marx' methodology in the study of economic phenomena and processes. The social consequences of the scientific and technical revolution and phenomena in the political life of society and in public opinion are still not being studied adequately.

The party's theoretical forces are being entrusted with tremendous responsibility in connection with the major problems of partywide significance which were discussed at the 26th congress, such as preparations for a new draft of the CPSU program. As the congress decree on this matter indicates, the current party program accurately reflects as a whole the laws governing global social developments and the targets and main tasks of the struggle for communism waged by the party and the Soviet people. However, 20 years have passed since the adoption of the program. Within that time extensive experience has been gained in the building of socialism and communism and new changes and processes have taken place in the

international arena. The program must take properly into consideration the party's conclusion on the precise stage reached by developed socialism along the way to communism. It must clearly show the changes which have taken place in the structure of our economy and refine long-term tasks. We must be guided by Lenin's instruction that the program formulates basic principles only and that it is both impossible and inappropriate to foretell the particulars.

We must also sum up the collective experience of the world socialist comity, the rapprochement among fraternal countries, and the development of socialist economic integration. The congress particularly discussed the fact that the CPSU and the other fraternal countries are charting a course as a result of which the 1980s will be a period of intensive output and scientific and technical cooperation among socialist countries. A greater need arises to expand the coordination of plans through the coordination of economic policy as a whole. We must also draw lessons from the difficulties which the socialist countries are encountering along the way.

The program must also consider basically important phenomena such as the elimination of the imperialist colonial system and the increased role which the young countries, some of which have set for themselves socialist objectives, play in global politics. An interpretation is needed of some new phenomena in the capitalist world and of the tremendous experience acquired in the struggle waged by the CPSU for peace and detente. This too should be borne in mind in making the necessary amendments and supplements to the party program.

In a word, a great deal of work lies ahead. Naturally, it will be based on the topical scientific studies and substantiated theoretical summations by Soviet social scientists.

Lenin described the Bolsheviks as great optimists when it came to the workers movement and its objectives when it was still difficult to predict the time when the victorious revolution of the proletariat would take place. Time itself--the entire sociohistorical practice of the 20th century--proved the extent of the strength and firmness of the optimism based on Marxist-Leninist ideology and proper proletarian class self-awareness. Today its real support rests in the developed socialist society in the Soviet Union, in the family of fraternal socialist countries, in the group of countries with a socialist orientation, in the growing awareness and level of organization of the working class in the citadels of imperialism and in the collapse of traditional colonialism.

As it resolves in its own countries problems of a higher social order, and as it creates conditions for the all-round harmonious development of the personality of the working man, the world socialist comity is helping other nations to gain their national independence and social freedom, and to rescue themselves from oppression and exploitation. It strives to provide guarantees for basic human rights, starting with the basic right to life which is being aggressively violated by imperialism, which is promoting a spiraling arms race. It considers the strengthening of the peace a guiding star toward the future, as was convincingly proved by the 26th CPSU Congress, which called upon the world's community to extend the Soviet peace program to the burning problems of international life.

"Yes, the Soviet people are looking at the future with confidence," L. I. Brezhnev said in winding up the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress. "However, their optimism is not the self-confidence of the darlings of fortune. Our people know that everything they have was created with their own toil and defended with their own blood. We are optimists because we believe in the power of labor, because we believe in our country and our people. We are optimists because we have faith in our party and we know that the road it shows us is the only true one!"

All those who have stood under the red Leninist banner of revolutionary optimism have shared a difficult and restless fate. However, this fate was also the happiest. For nothing on earth could be higher, more inspired and nobler than the calling of the communists, the calling of the leading fighter for a life worthy of man and for the salvation and liberation of all mankind.

5003
CSO: 1802/13

DECREE ON THE ALL-UNION SOCIALIST COMPETITION FOR THE SUCCESSFUL FULFILLMENT AND OVERFULFILLMENT OF THE 11TH FIVE-YEAR PLAN

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 23-27

[CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee decree]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee note that the report by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, to the 26th party congress, the congress' decisions, and the "Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990," were welcomed by party members, workers, kolkhoz members, the intelligentsia, by the entire Soviet people, with tremendous enthusiasm and patriotic uplift.

In answer to the party's call to mark the new five-year plan with shock and initiative-minded work for the good of the homeland, the labor collectives are launching an extensive socialist competition for upgrading work effectiveness and quality, accelerating scientific and technical progress, and successfully fulfilling and overfulfilling the 11th Five-Year Plan. The initiatives of the working people of Moscow and Leningrad regarding the completion of their individual and brigade assignments for the first year of the five-year plan by 7 November, of Yaroslavskaia Oblast on increasing industrial output in the 11th Five-Year Plan without increasing the number of workers; of Rostovskaya Oblast on reaching planned equipment capacity ahead of schedule; of the kolkhozes and sovkhoses of Krasnodarskiy Krai and Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast on improving the quality of agricultural output; and the application of the practical experience of the labor collectives in the Urals and the Kuzbass on the conservation of metal, fuel and energy resources are supported and spreading throughout the country.

Socialist competition is the live creativity of the masses. It is a patriotic movement based on the high conscientiousness and initiative of the Soviet people and a powerful means for mobilizing the working people for the implementation of the plans for the building of communism. It helps us to bring out and utilize production reserves and to upgrade work effectiveness and quality. It is an effective means for involving the working people in production management and for developing a communist attitude toward labor. At the same time, however, the great opportunities which socialist competition offers are not as yet used fully in many cases.

Ascribing prime significance to the further development of the socialist competition and to the enhancement of its role in resolving the problems related to the country's economic and social development, the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee decree:

1. In order to make good use of the high labor and political upsurge of the masses, the central committees of communist parties of union republics, the party kraykoms and obkoms, ministries and departments, councils of ministers of union republics, and party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol and economic organs must direct the socialist competition toward the implementation of the tasks formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress and its decisions, the successful fulfillment and overfulfillment of the five-year plan and to insuring the further growth of the well-being of the Soviet people.

The entire organization of the socialist competition must be raised to a higher standard. It must be developed in close connection with measures aimed at improving the economic mechanism. The great traditions of the competition must be expanded. An atmosphere of truly creative search, labor competitiveness, comradely mutual aid, high responsibility for assignments, and intolerance of shortcomings and labor discipline violations must be established in each labor collective.

The active participation of all workers, kolkhoz members, engineering and technical workers, specialists, employees, collectives of brigades, sectors, teams, departments, livestock farms, enterprises, associations, sovkhoses, kolkhoses, organizations and establishments, and working people of cities, rayons, oblasts, krays and republics in the all-union socialist competition must be insured.

2. The CC CPSU, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee emphasize that the competition slogan must be the following: "Work Effectively and Qualitatively!" This means to adopt a thrifty attitude toward the public good, the skillful and effective utilization of all available resources and of the entire production potential and the achievement of high results with the lowest possible outlays. The competitors' efforts must be concentrated on accelerating the growth of labor productivity, improving production quality, conserving raw materials, materials, fuel and electric power and insuring the better utilization of productive capital and the strict implementation of commodity procurement plans in accordance with stipulated deadlines and varieties.

The following must be insured on this basis:

The fuller satisfaction of the needs of the national economy for productive capital and of the population for consumer goods; reduction in the time needed for the creation and utilization of new equipment and technologies, improvements in capital returns and reduced material intensiveness; further growth of output and quality improvements in crop growing and animal husbandry, the successful solution of the food program and coordinated work among agricultural, transportation and industrial enterprises with a view to increasing the output of final products per hectare of farmland;

The complete and prompt satisfaction of the needs of the national economy and of the population for transportation; efficient interaction and coordination of activities among all transport systems, reduced time for the delivery of freight, its proper preservation, and improvement of passenger service standards; reduced construction time, insuring the scheduled and the ahead of schedule completion of production capacities, cultural projects and residential buildings, reduced volume of unfinished construction, and accelerated reconstruction and technical retooling of operating enterprises;

Increasing the amount and variety of services, and applying progressive forms and upgrading the quality and standards of population services.

3. Party, trade union and Komsomol organizations and economic managers must pay particular attention to the development of the competition in brigades, sectors, sections and livestock farms. The role of such collectives in the struggle for higher production effectiveness and work quality and in strengthening labor discipline, reducing cadre turnover and developing a communist attitude toward labor must be increased. The initiatives of workers and kolkhoz members in the formulation of counterplans, the application of technically substantiated labor norms, brigade cost effectiveness and individual thrift and quality accounts, and the production of the stipulated amount of work with lesser personnel must be supported and disseminated.

Production frontrankers, shock workers and communist labor collectives must set the example at work, in public life and at home.

4. Ministries, departments, party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organs and economic managers must comprehensively support the initiatives of labor collectives in the formulation of counterplans for improving quality indicators primarily in raising labor productivity, lowering production costs, increasing profits, producing superior quality goods, insuring the more effective utilization of production capacities and increasing volumes of output through the conservation of resources. They must make available the necessary material, organizational-technical and economic conditions for the successful implementation of counterplans.

5. The competition among collectives of related enterprises and organizations, aimed at creating favorable conditions for rhythmical work, achieving best final results and insuring the successful implementation of comprehensive target programs for the solution of most important scientific and technical and socio-economic problems must be developed comprehensively. To this effect broader use must be made of the experience in cooperation among enterprises in the extracting and processing industrial sectors and of labor collectives participating in the building of the Sayan-Shushenskoye and Nurek hydroelectric power plants, the KamAZ and the Atomash Plant, based on the "Workers' Relay Race" principle; of the workers at the Leningrad Transportation Junction in efficient interaction and coordination of activities of all types of transport; and of the agricultural, light industry, textile and other industrial branches, based on the "One Thousand Contract."

Ministries, departments, councils of ministers of union and autonomous republics, and kray and oblast executive committees will insure the coordinated activities

among related enterprises, associations, scientific research, planning-design and other organizations which have concluded competition contracts, and will provide the necessary assistance to the intersectorial coordination councils and voluntary staffs for the development of the competition among related skills.

6. Ministries, departments, and central committees of trade unions will assess the work of collectives of associations, enterprises and organizations in accordance with the stress of state plans, growth rates, end results of production activities, comprehensive completion of capacities and of housing and cultural consumer projects, the condition of educational work and the implementation of the socialist obligations on a cumulative basis, starting with the beginning of the year and of the five-year plan.

The system for material and moral incentives to participants in the competition must be improved. Fuller use must be made of the material incentive and wage funds in awarding bonuses to workers, based on the results of the socialist competition. Competition results must be summed up operatively.

7. The winners of the socialist competition will receive the following awards:

Workers, kolkhoz members, engineering and technical workers, specialists and employees: honor diplomas of ministries (departments) and trade union central committees, and gifts or cash bonuses;

Collectives of brigades, sectors, teams, livestock farms and sections: honor pennants of ministries (departments) and trade union central committees, and gifts or cash bonuses;

Komsomol-youth brigades: red challenge banners bearing the inscription "From Heroes of the Five-Year Plans to the Best Komsomol-Youth Collective," with diplomas and cash bonuses;

Collectives of industrial, production, scientific-production, interfarm, agroindustrial and other associations, their production units, enterprises, construction projects, kolkhozes, sovkhoses, scientific-research, design, engineering, and other organizations and establishments and higher educational institutions: red challenge banners of the CC CPSU, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU, and Komsomol Central Committee, with diplomas and cash bonuses. Collectives awarded the red challenge banners of the CC CPSU, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee on the basis of annual results and which have achieved the highest and stablest indicators in the implementation of counterplans and of greater socialist obligations will be listed in the All-Union Honor Board of the USSR Exhibit of Achievements of the National Economy;

Cities, autonomous okrugs, and city and rural rayons: red challenge banners of the CC CPSU, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee, with diplomas and cash bonuses;

Union and autonomous republics, krays and oblasts: red challenge banners of the CC CPSU, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee, with diplomas.

The results of the all-union socialist competition will be totaled up for each individual year of the five-year plan and for the five-year plan as a whole. The red challenge banners of the CC CPSU, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee shall be granted in perpetuity to enterprises, rayons, cities, autonomous okrugs, oblasts, krays and republics which have earned such awards each consecutive year during the five-year plan.

8. The honor badge of the CC CPSU, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee "For High Effectiveness and Work Quality in the 11th Five-Year Plan" shall be instituted as an award to collectives of enterprises, associations, construction projects, kolkhozes, sovkhoses, scientific research and other organizations and establishments and higher educational institutions. This commemorative badge shall be awarded to collectives which have achieved high work quality and reached best indicators in the implementation of the 11th Five-Year Plan and have been repeatedly awarded on the basis of annual results of the all-union socialist competition the red challenge banners of the CC CPSU, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee.

The standard all-union badge "Shock Worker of the 11th Five-Year Plan" shall be instituted as an award to workers, kolkhoz members, engineering and technical workers, specialists and employees, together with the presentation of a commemorative gift for high indicators reached in upgrading work effectiveness and quality and ahead-of-schedule implementation of assignments and socialist obligations.

9. The number of USSR state prizes awarded for outstanding achievements in labor and in scientific and technical creativity to frontrankers in the socialist competition--workers, kolkhoz members, engineering and technical workers and specialists--shall be raised to 25.

The following suggestions have been approved:

AUCCTU: Institute the awarding of a bonus by the Soviet trade unions, named after outstanding labor veterans in different economic sectors, to be presented to leading production workers who have achieved high results in the socialist competition; assign 120,000 tourist cards at reduced prices for travel in the Soviet Union and abroad as a prize to the winners in the all-union socialist competition.

Komsomol Central Committee: award Lenin Komsomol bonuses to Komsomol-youth collectives and young production workers who have achieved high results in the socialist competition; award production frontrankers the badge "Young Guard of the 11th Five-Year Plan," and assign annually for the winners of the socialist competition 30,000 tourist cards at reduced prices for trips to areas of revolutionary, combat and labor glory of the Soviet people and to the fraternal socialist countries.

10. The party, soviet, trade union, Komsomol and economic organs will steadily implement the Leninist principles of the organization of the socialist competition: publicity, comparability of results and possibility for the practical duplication of leading experience.

The experience of the winners in the competition must be disseminated extensively and depicted better in the sectorial stands of the USSR Exhibition of Achievements

of the National Economy and studied in progressive experience schools, within the economic training system, the communist labor schools and the people's universities.

The experience of the collectives, the winners of red challenge banners, must be the basis for seminars for managers of enterprises and organizations and for party, trade union and Komsomol workers.

The role of ideological-educational work and of propaganda and agitation in insuring the effectiveness of the socialist competition and in upgrading the production and social activeness of its participants must be intensified. Fuller use must be made of the opportunities offered by the mass information and propaganda media for the extensive dissemination and application of valuable initiatives and for the comprehensive description of the ways and means by which the competition winners have achieved their high results.

The USSR Goskormizdat, Politizdat and Profizdat, the Plakat and Molodaya Gvardiya publishing houses and USSR Goskino must include in their plans the production of books, posters, documentaries and feature films which describe extensively the experience of frontrankers, topical problems related to the development of the competition and the movement for a communist attitude toward labor. The central and local press must dedicate special sections on the socialist competition, while television and radio broadcasts must set aside a special time slot for showing the "Socialist Competition Diary" program.

11. In coordination with the central committees of the trade unions, ministries and departments must formulate and, with the agreement of the USSR State Committee for Labor and the AUCCTU, approve the conditions for the all-union socialist competition in the various sectors for the 11th Five-Year Plan.

The CC CPSU, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee express their firm conviction that workers, kolkhoz members, engineering-technical and scientific workers, and all working people in industry, agriculture, construction, transportation and in the other economic sectors will expand the nationwide socialist competition for the successful fulfillment and overfulfillment of the 11th Five-Year Plan even further and will insure the implementation of the historical decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

DECREE ON MEASURES FOR FURTHER IMPROVING THE WORK WITH LETTERS AND SUGGESTIONS BY THE WORKING PEOPLE IN THE LIGHT OF THE DECISIONS OF THE 26TH CPSU CONGRESS

Moscow **KOMMUNIST** in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 28-30

[CPSU Central Committee decree]

[Text] Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's report to the 26th party congress discusses the tremendous importance of the letters and suggestions of the working people as a most important channel for live contacts between the party and the masses. The sensitive and attentive attitude toward the letters, requests and complaints of the citizens must be considered by every party worker and manager as his duty to the people and the party.

In the period between the 25th and 26th party congresses the CC CPSU received more than three million letters and almost 100,000 visitors. Within the same period the local party organs considered 15 million written and verbal statements by citizens. The 26th CPSU Congress received more than 270,000 letters, greetings and labor reports. They reflect the profound interest shown by the working people in the solution of the socioeconomic problems of the development of the country and their concern for governmental and social affairs. Many of the suggestions and remarks formulated by the working people were used in drafting the congress' document.

The letters and suggestions of the working people help the party organizations to understand the circumstances better, assess the work of party, soviet and economic organs and public organizations more objectively, see more clearly shortcomings and the means to eliminate them and formulate proper political decisions consistent with the Leninist course of the CPSU. This is one of the most reliable and valuable sources of information concerning the demands and expectations of the working people of town and country and the situation in the various areas of the socioeconomic, political and spiritual life of our society and one of the means for the exercise of the constitutional rights of the Soviet citizens.

Party and soviet organs and economic and public organizations have substantially improved their work with the citizens' letters and suggestions in recent years. This has greatly contributed to the creation of better working and living conditions and of a healthy moral-psychological climate in labor collectives, establishments and organizations, and to the successful implementation of production plans.

However, the CC CPSU also notes that major omissions exist in the handling of the written and verbal addresses of the citizens by some central governmental, economic and public organs or local party, soviet and other organizations. There have been cases of callous and bureaucratic attitudes toward legitimate requests and substantiated petitions and of nonfulfillment of promises. This has forced the citizens to address themselves to superior organizations and establishments and to make long trips in order to insure the satisfaction of their requests.

Occasionally, some party and soviet organs do not display the necessary principled-mindedness and exigency in assessing the activities of officials who adopt a bureaucratic attitude and use red tape in their approach to the letters of the working people and who do not react with sufficient sharpness to facts of eyewashing, persecution for criticism or reports concerning work shortcomings described in the letters. There have also been violations of the stipulated procedures for the reception of citizens.

The CPSU Central Committee decrees:

1. In their work with the letters and suggestions of the working people the CC CPSU departments, the Party Control Committee of the CC CPSU, the central committees of communist parties of union republics, the kray, oblast, okrug, city and rayon party committees, the primary party organizations, the soviet, trade union and Komsomol organs, ministries, departments and economic organizations must strictly observe the stipulations formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress that a responsive and attentive attitude toward the letters, requests and complaints of the citizens must be considered by every party worker and manager as his duty to the people and the party.

2. The party, soviet, trade union and economic organs must formulate and implement specific measures pertaining to the further improvement of the ways and means of work with letters and the reception of citizens. They must strengthen the acquired positive experience and eliminate shortcomings and reasons for complaints.

The state of work with letters and with the reception of working people at enterprises, establishments and organizations must be controlled systematically. Reports must be submitted by managers and such problems must be regularly discussed at plenums and bureau meetings of party organs, sessions and meetings of executive committees of soviets of people's deputies and ministry and department collegiums.

The personal responsibility of managers and officials for the proper organization of work with letters, suggestions and verbal addresses by working people, the operative taking of pertinent measures and the substantiated and prompt answers supplied to petitioners must be upgraded. Attempts to suppress criticism or to persecute the authors of letters, cases of bureaucracy and red tape and lack of principles in assessing delinquencies and misuse of position by officials must be firmly prevented. Reasons which lead to repeated or collective complaints by citizens must be identified and eliminated.

3. The thorough study of the letters, suggestions and complaints of the working people and the practical use of the information contained in the letters must be extensively applied in the practical work of party and soviet organs, ministries, departments, establishments and organizations. Active use must be made of the useful experience of sponsoring open letter days, of reports submitted by managers to labor collectives on work with letters and of trips by senior officials to local sites for a study of specific statements and for receiving citizens directly at enterprises, construction sites, kolkhozes, sovkhoses and places of residence.

4. Party, soviet, trade union and economic organs must insure extensive publicity in the study of suggestions, petitions and complaints by the working people. They must insure a more active participation on the part of members of party committees, deputies, frontranking workers, kolkhoz members and members of the intelligentsia in this work. Suggestions, critical remarks and petitions whose resolution calls for a consideration of the collective viewpoint must be submitted for discussion at workers meetings and citizens' rallies.

Problems related to improving work with letters and with organizing the reception of working people must always be kept in sight by the primary party organizations of enterprises and establishments, ministries and departments. The party organizations must formulate and implement measures for training the cadres in the spirit of a responsive attitude toward the people and a feeling of high responsibility for the prompt and accurate resolution of the request, wishes and suggestions submitted by the working people.

A healthy moral and psychological climate and an atmosphere which contributes to the development of open comradely criticism and self-criticism and which excludes anonymous slanders must be created in the labor collectives.

5. Party, soviet and administrative organs and primary party organizations must increase their legal propaganda. They must inform the population on a broad range of problems mentioned in letters and personal receptions systematically and operatively. They must insure the knowledgeable explanation of the constitutional rights and obligations of the citizens and of the legislative stipulations regarding the consideration of suggestions, petitions and complaints and the rights of state and public organs, enterprises, establishments, organizations and officials in resolving requests submitted by the working people and of procedures for appealing decisions handed down on petitions and complaints.

6. The editors of the central and local press and journals and in the radio and television must improve their work with letters. They must publish them more frequently and systematically report on the results of their consideration. They must submit surveys of letters to the corresponding organizations so that the proper measures may be taken. Party, soviet and economic managers must be recruited more actively for the purpose of answering the questions raised in the letters. Positive experience in work with letters and in organizing the reception of citizens must be given extensive coverage. Officials who apply bureaucratic procedures or red tape in the consideration of petitions and complaints and who violate procedures governing the reception of citizens or ignore critical remarks must be criticized.

**L. I. BREZHNEV SPEECHES AT THE 1 APRIL 1981 SESSION OF THE USSR SUPREME SOVIET PRE-
SIDIUM**

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 31-33

[Text] On the Tasks of the Soviets of People's Deputies Stemming From the Decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress

We may confidently state that even the short time which separates us from the congress has confirmed the tremendous mobilizing effect of its decisions. The congress armed the party and all the links within our political system with a clear and efficient program. The main thing now is to support this program with real accomplishments and to organize, as Lenin taught us, the resolute and united work of millions of people.

By this time, the party organizations of republics, krays, and oblasts, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee plenums and thousands of labor collectives have formulated at the meetings of their aktivs specific assignments on the implementation of the congress' decisions.

It is equally important for the soviets of people's deputies to involve themselves most actively in this truly nationwide project. This applies to more than 50,000 elected organs and to more than two million deputies and dozens of millions of activists. These figures by themselves prove the powerful creative charge carried by the soviets.

It would be proper for each soviet to undertake the comprehensive discussion of and earmark its program for action for the implementation of the decisions of the congress. Such work is already underway. We are quite pleased by the fact that in many areas it was undertaken from below, starting with the soviets which are in direct contact with the people, with the labor collectives. By this I mean the rayon, city, settlement or rural soviets. It is precisely here that popular initiative is manifested in the first place, that the implementation of plans is organized and that the socialist competition gathers strength.

It is also important for the oblast and kray soviets and, subsequently, the supreme soviets of the republics to consider most carefully all the valuable suggestions which may be formulated by the primary soviet organs, so that not one such suggestion may be wasted and so that the people's initiatives may bring maximum return.

Naturally, each soviet will act within its own framework in its participation in the implementation of the decisions of the party congress. In the case of the local power organs, this means mainly improving services to the people, implementing the food program, increasing the production of consumer goods, and fulfilling the plans for the construction of housing, schools, hospitals, and kindergartens. The soviets and their executive committees must act in these areas not as petitioners but as strict and exigent masters. They must make better use of their coordinating and control rights. The recently passed Central Committee, Supreme Soviet Presidium and government decree on upgrading the role of soviets in economic construction provides a good incentive for such actions.

Speaking of the supreme soviets, allow me to reemphasize how important it is today to combine even more closely legislative with management and control work. Without paying any lesser attention to legislation, which is developing in our country actively and systematically, we must intensify our live organizational work and insure the precise and strict observance of laws and plans. Our party policy and socialist law proceed from identical principles and pursue the same objective--the good of the working people. The laws must be made most operative in order to ensure the implementation of this noble objective.

In this area, the USSR Supreme Soviet faces special tasks. Metaphorically speaking, it is the top of the pyramid of our power organs and it has the broadest possible rights. This, precisely, is the basis of the plan for the work of the Supreme Soviet this year, submitted for your discussion. It has been drafted in such a way that the supreme power organ may focus on the central problems formulated at the 26th congress, the practical experience of the soviets of many republics and the development of relations with foreign parliaments for the sake of the peace and cooperation among nations.

In conclusion, allow me to emphasize that it is a question today of energizing the entire system of soviets in order to resolve the problems set by the party. Unquestionably these problems will be resolved. The strength of the Soviet system lies in its closest possible ties with the people's masses. While it feeds on their initiative and activeness, it organizes and directs the efforts of the people into a single channel. This is the guarantee for our successes and for the strengthening and development of the socialist governmental system.

On the Results of the Consideration of the Suggestions and Remarks of the Permanent Commissions of the Chambers and of the Deputies, Submitted at the Fourth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet during the Discussion of the 1981 Plan and Budget:

In recent years we have been regularly informed about the measures taken by the USSR Council of Ministers on the implementation of the decrees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and about the suggestions made by the commissions of the chambers and by individual deputies. This is an important new development. Thanks to it the mechanism of socialist democracy has begun to operate more accurately and effectively.

The conclusion which may be drawn from the communication made by Comrade N. I. Tikhonov is that once again, the USSR Council of Ministers has approached the recommendations and remarks of the deputies with great attention. What makes this even more pleasing is that it is a question of the materials of the last session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which took place in an atmosphere imbued with pre-congress feelings. In addressing the session the deputies were thinking not only about the current year but about the good rhythm of the entire five-year plan and the suggestions they submitted were of great national economic importance.

We note with satisfaction that the plan is being studied by the commissions more thoroughly. The recommendations formulated here are better substantiated. This is an indicator of the improved level of control exercised by the supreme power organ. This control enables the USSR Supreme Soviet to guide the work of subordinate organs better and to organize the economic mechanism. As was pointed out at the congress, this greatly contributes to the improvement of the general tone of state life. This means that our constitutional formulas are being successfully tested and that they are acquiring a live and real content.

Unfortunately, as the commissions of the chambers reported, many materials received from ministries and departments contain only general pledges to improve the situation. Naturally, we cannot be satisfied with this. It is very important for the suggestions of the deputies to meet not only with understanding in words but to be backed by specific actions.

I hope that the USSR Council of Ministers will take this remark into consideration. It should continue to be concerned with the implementation of measures formulated by ministries, departments and republic governments, and suggestions submitted by representative authorities. In turn, the permanent commissions of the chambers must not lower their control.

The very promising significance of this work is obvious. It will help us, most of all, maximally to enrich the draft 11th Five-Year Plan and to improve this document in accordance with the requirements of the society and of our Soviet people.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

INTERVIEW GRANTED BY L. I. BREZHNEV

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 p 33

[L. I. Brezhnev's answer to a question by the Greek newspaper TA NEA]

[Text] Question: In your address to the 26th CPSU Congress, Mr President, you paid particular attention to the struggle for detente. You stated in particular, that the USSR will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear powers which have not allowed the deployment of such weapons on their territory. Can this statement of yours be taken as a specific guarantee in the case of countries such as Greece?

Answer: The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated that it will never use nuclear weapons against countries which refuse to produce or acquire nuclear weapons and which do not have nuclear weapons on their territory. This in itself is a sufficiently firm guarantee. However, we are ready to go even further and to sign at any time a special agreement with any non-nuclear power including naturally Greece, providing that, in turn, it pledges not to have nuclear weapons on its territory.

I take this opportunity to wish the Greek people peace and prosperity on behalf of the Soviet people.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

L. I. BREZHNEV SPEECH IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 34-39

[Speech by L. I. Brezhnev at the 16th congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia on 7 April 1981]

[Text] Dear Comrade Husak!

Dear comrades!

Allow me to express to the delegates attending the 16th congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and to all party members and working people of the country the friendship and fraternity felt by your comrades in the struggle--the Soviet communists--and by our entire people (lengthy applause).

I would like to say, on my behalf, that every visit to Czechoslovakia is a great pleasure (applause). I have become attached to your beautiful country. The first time I stepped on its soil was almost 40 years ago, with our army, side by side with the troops of the corps commanded by Ludvig Svoboda. This is the fourth CPCZ congress that I attend as head of the CPSU delegation. I cherish this opportunity to be with you, dear friends, on this noteworthy day (lengthy applause).

The CPSU delegation heard with great interest the accountability report of the CPCZ Central Committee, presented by Comrade Husak. The clear and realistic analysis of the results of the past period and the formulation of major yet entirely realistic tasks in domestic and foreign policy, and the efficient course charted for the further development of socialist democracy and the people's initiative prove that the CPCZ stands firmly on the positions of Marxism-Leninism (lengthy applause). This is the most reliable guarantee for the confident progress of your homeland toward new social and economic heights.

Comrades! This year you are also celebrating the 60th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Your party is approaching its anniversary as a mature combat social force which has acquired extensive and valuable experience in the political struggle and in social management. This experience is a prerequisite for the successful building of socialism in Czechoslovakia. It is also of great importance to the other parties and to the international communist movement as a whole. This experience includes the active political efforts to organize the frontranking part of the working class under the conditions of a bourgeois republic, the clandestine struggle against the Hitlerite occupation, the fight against the occupation forces in the front lines and the organization of people's uprisings in the name of the freedom and independence of the homeland and of its social renovation.

The victory of the 1948 socialist revolution was of truly historical significance. The CPCZ, then headed by the outstanding revolutionary Klement Gottwald, was able to lead the millions of working people of town and country and to insure a peaceful transition to the building of socialism (applause).

The victory over the counterrevolutionary forces in 1968 and the ability to draw from those events profound and long-term political conclusions is another major contribution which the Czechoslovak communists have made to the development of the global revolutionary process and their great contribution to all fraternal countries (applause).

In a word, the CPCZ honorably dealt with major difficulties and trials, holding its Marxist-Leninist banner high. We, your Soviet comrades and fellow workers, warmly say: "Glory to the party of the Czechoslovak communists!" (tempestuous and lengthy applause).

We present our special respects to the outstanding leader of the CPCZ and president of the republic and noted leader of the communist and workers movement Comrade Gustav Husak (lengthy applause). As a party veteran he has played an important role in many decisive stages in its activities.

Today the CPCZ is confidently leading the Czechoslovak people on the road to building a mature socialist society. You are resolving like socialists the basic problems of the country's social and economic development. You are fully entitled to be proud of the level of material well-being of the people's masses reached in Czechoslovakia. Carefully protecting the very rich cultural heritage of your peoples, you are striving for the tireless upsurge of science, art, public education, health care and sports--of everything which serves the main objective of socialism: the ever fuller satisfaction of the steadily rising material and spiritual needs of the members of society and the all-round development of the individual.

All of this is to the lasting credit of the CPCZ and a confirmation of the accuracy and farsightedness of its political course (applause).

While properly assessing your achievements, you also clearly keep in sight arising difficulties, criticize existing shortcomings sharply and actively seek the best means for their elimination. This is confirmed both by the accountability report of the CPCZ Central Committee and the discussion of it at the congress.

Obviously, comrades, you know that the same exigent and responsible approach to activities was shown by our party's recent 26th congress. There is no other possible way. V. I. Lenin taught us how to assess our work soberly and critically. As long as the communists follow his behest they can accomplish anything! (applause).

Allow me to report to you, comrades, with a feeling of deep satisfaction, that the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress met with a lively response in our country and were welcomed with warm approval by the party members and the entire Soviet people. Having adopted the party's cause as their own, the Soviet people have undertaken the practical implementation of the vast plans for the building of communism as earmarked by the congress.

The members of the socialist comity are resolving a variety of ever deeper and complex problems on the road to the further development of the mature socialist society. We must do this under the circumstances of a growing counteraction and, sometimes, openly hostile actions on the part of the most aggressive imperialist forces.

Under such circumstances, more than ever before, the key to success for all of us may be found in the following: first, we must work ever better, more effectively and more organizedly in developing our economy, culture and socialist democracy. Secondly, we must tirelessly strengthen the unity among fraternal countries and their all-round and ever increasing cooperation in all areas. We must join forces and resources in the interest of each one of our countries and of the entire comity in a most rational manner.

A great deal is already being accomplished on this level and even more remains to be done as you, comrades, well know. Let me emphasize in particular, that our comprehensive and profound cooperation is developing on a consistently socialist basis--on the basis of equality, mutual respect, consideration of reciprocal interests, and true revolutionary cohesion (applause). It is precisely because of this that our "socialist cooperative," to use Lenin's words, not only does not infringe in the least the sovereign rights of its members but, conversely, acts as their reliable support.

Let us consider perhaps the single fact that it is precisely thanks to interaction within CEMA that the fraternal countries are able to meet many of their most vital economic needs today.

As you know, extensive development of cooperation in the extraction of natural gas and iron ore is contemplated. Like the USSR, Czechoslovakia is already doing a great deal to develop its nuclear power industry. The energy of the atom has made it possible to meet a considerable share of the requirements of our and of other fraternal countries. Clearly, it would have been far more difficult to resolve such extensive problems alone.

Comrades, we can confidently state that the steady improvement of CEMA and Warsaw Pact activities is consistent with the vital interests of each one of the members of the socialist comity (applause).

However, our successes irk our class adversaries. They are doing everything possible to hinder the progress of socialism and to erode it from within. All possible means are used to this effect: economic pressure, blackmail, false propaganda, flattery and demagoguery, support and encouragement of counterrevolutionary forces, wherever they still exist, together with other kinds of subversive actions.

Comrades, you remember all of this from your own experience which prove convincingly that the reactionary plans have no future.

Similar attempts are being made today in the case of the People's Republic of Poland. However, with the support of all true Polish patriots, the Polish communists, we must assume, will be able to provide the necessary rebuff to the plans

of the enemies of the socialist system who are also the enemies of Polish independence. They will be able to defend the cause of socialism, the true interests of their people and the honor and security of their homeland (lengthy applause).

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it has been and remains the loyal friend and ally of socialist Poland. I am confident that Czechoslovakia, like the other members of the socialist comity, shares our position (applause).

The great Republic of Cuba--an inseparable part of the socialist comity--is resolving the problems of its development under difficult foreign circumstances. The Soviet Union is supporting and will continue to support the fraternal Cuban people firmly and steadfastly (lengthy applause). We wish it most warmly further successes in the building of socialism, peace and prosperity (applause).

Comrades! In protecting our socialist comity we are defending the most priceless gain of the peoples: peace and security. This is because the socialist countries are making a decisive contribution to the prevention of war today and because they are the flag bearers of the policy of detente and disarmament.

We, in the Soviet Union, recently formulated at the 26th party congress a number of very specific suggestions aimed at the settlement of the most acute and urgent international problems in the interest of the peace and security of all nations. These suggestions were heard throughout the world and met with a good response in all continents. We value the energetic and active support given these proposals by our friends and allies including, naturally, socialist Czechoslovakia (applause).

Here, in the center of Europe, I would like to mention specifically one of the new Soviet proposals.

The unrestrained nuclear arms race in Europe is becoming a mortal threat to all European nations. In order to undertake the practical solution of this problem we suggest, as a beginning, perhaps to draw the line under what already exists, i.e., to put an end to the further deployment of new or the replacement of nuclear medium range missiles deployed in Europe by the USSR and the NATO countries. Naturally, this includes the American theater weapons in this area. This moratorium could remain effective until the conclusion of a permanent limitation treaty or, even better, a treaty on reducing said nuclear arms by both sides in Europe.

Actually, the moratorium we suggest is not a self-seeking aim. Its purpose is to create a more favorable atmosphere for talks. In our view, the purpose in this matter, as I have said before and repeat now, is, precisely, a reduction by both sides of the nuclear arms stockpiled in Europe. This can be accomplished quite well without endangering Eastern or Western safety.

Our suggestion, as we know, met with a very positive response among the broad political circles and the public of Western Europe. However, those who clearly dislike it let their feelings be known quite soon.

They claim that the purpose of the new Soviet suggestion is to consolidate the allegedly already existing superiority of forces on the side of the Warsaw Pact.

Naturally, this is not so. We have already had the opportunity to discuss this in detail at the 26th CPSU Congress. Looking at the overall nuclear potential of both sides in Europe today, we see an approximate balance of forces. Incidentally, this has been repeatedly acknowledged by the West as well. FRG Chancellor Schmidt, for example, openly rejected in one of his public statements, last February, the view that the balance of power between East and West in Europe had been disturbed. However, the chancellor expressed his fear that "the Russians are just about ready to disturb it." U. S. Secretary of State Haig also mentioned recently the existence of a "relative balance and equivalency." True, he expressed his concern that this balance could change in favor of the USSR by the mid-1980s.

Logically, with such an assessment of the current situation and of its future development, the leaders of the Western countries should jump at our proposal. The fact that instead of doing so some of them are trying to belittle its significance, naturally, is due not to the fact that the ratio of the forces in Europe may change in a matter of days. Their reason is motivated by their desire to change it in favor of the West, for which reason they are unwilling to tie themselves down with a moratorium.

It must be clearly understood, however, that such efforts will merely force the other side to adopt countermeasures. Here again we have a vicious circle in the course of which the situation in Europe will become even more dangerous to all. Do the leaders of the Western countries find this so difficult to understand?

As a whole, comrades, our suggestions are aimed at settling the most topical, the most important international problems for the sake of the consolidation of the peace. We suggest to the interested parties businesslike and constructive talks on such matters at any level and without preliminary conditions. Should anyone bring forth other sensible suggestions we would be willing to consider them as well. However, frankly speaking, we have not noticed so far any particular readiness on the part of the governments of the Western countries to engage in talks. We are told sometimes that all this is very interesting but that it requires long studies and that it should not be hurried. We are also led to understand that the definition of positions depends not on a specific government but on other authorities. Meanwhile, therefore, let the arms race go on and let the international situation become aggravated even further.

In other cases, demands are made upon us and preliminary stipulations are formulated. While claiming for themselves some kind of "right" to control just about every corner of the planet, they are asking of us as the "price" for the agreement of the West to engage in talks, to abandon even a basic consideration of the interests dictated by our own security or the helping of our friends if they become the victims of aggression or are threatened by an attack.

To say the least, this is a strange position.

Imagine for a single minute that the Soviet Union would say: Before initiating talks on the settlement of ripe international problems, let the Western countries change their policy in areas which we, like many others, definitely dislike. For example, let the United States begin by withdrawing its forces from one country or another or from military bases abroad. Let it stop its support and rearming of this and such a dictatorial terroristic regime.

Would anyone seriously consider such an approach to talks? Hardly. Rather, we would be treated as simpletons, ignorant in politics, or else as people who erect artificial obstacles and hindrances and who avoid talks for entirely different reasons, not peaceful in the least.

Historical experience, including that of recent decades, proves convincingly that success in talks between countries is achieved only when attempts to dictate one's conditions on the other party are set aside, and when there is real desire for peace and reciprocal respect for the interests of one's partners. It is precisely on such a basis that the most important international agreements which helped to strengthen the peace and security of the peoples were reached. Let me cite as an example the state treaty on the restoration of an independent and democratic Austria, the 1971 West Berlin agreement, the treaties concluded between the USSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the GDR with the FRG, the Soviet-American agreements on the limitation of strategic armaments and, finally, the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

We expect on the part of these governments the same type of approach to the constructive suggestions formulated by the Soviet Union at the 26th CPSU Congress and of which the governments of the respective countries were informed. Our proposals were formulated not for the sake of propaganda but of achieving mutually acceptable agreements for the sake of peace--peace in Europe, Asia, America, and the Near, Middle and Far East, for the sake of universal peace (lengthy applause).

Dear comrades!

In conclusion, allow me to express my confidence that the communists, the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia of Czechoslovakia will be able to resolve successfully the responsible problems facing the party and the government in the building of mature socialism. Guided by the stipulations of this CPCZ congress, unquestionably, you will make your homeland even richer and more beautiful and the life of its people even better and will make yet another contribution to our common cause, that of securing peace and security in Europe and throughout the world. We wish you total success in all of these great accomplishments (tempestuous and lengthy applause)!

Long live the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia! (tempestuous and lengthy applause).

Long live the fraternal Czechoslovak people! (tempestuous and lengthy applause).

Long live the eternal Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship! (tempestuous and lengthy applause).

May the great comity of socialist countries live and strengthen (tempestuous and lengthy applause)!

Let there be durable peace on earth and a reliable security for the peoples! (tempestuous and lengthy applause).

Always forward, comrades, toward our just and noble objective--the building of communism! (tempestuous and lengthy applause). All rise. The participants in the congress chant: "Friendship! Friendship!" "Brezhnev! Friendship!"

5003

CBO: 1802/13

START OF SOVIET POWER ENGINEERING

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 40-47

[Article by V. Steklov, USSR honored power worker and RSFSR deserving builder]

[Text] The recently held historical 26th CPSU Congress defined the grand scale of constructive activities of the party and the people, aimed at reaching new levels in laying the material and technical foundations for communism. Shortly before the congress, our country celebrated the 60th anniversary of the famous GOELRO Plan, the unified nationwide plan for the development of the national economy on the basis of electrification and the first of its kind in the history of mankind. The closeness of these two noteworthy dates is symbolic. The CC CPSU greetings on the occasion of the anniversary, signed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, read: "Formulated under the guidance of the great Lenin, the GOELRO Plan marked the beginning of the use of qualitatively new principles of economic management, based on scientific nationwide planning. It laid the path to our future heroic five-year plans."

The importance of Lenin's GOELRO Plan is truly endless. Formulated by a large group of scientists, with Vladimir Il'ich's direct participation, it defined the basic ways for the economic reorganization of the country and, in particular, for the creation of progressive production forces. These forces set a reliable foundation for the new production relations, which were the result of the victory of the Great October Revolution. The GOELRO Plan closely linked problems of interaction among industry, transportation and agriculture, which turned it into a unified comprehensive national economic plan. The long-term planning methodology, which was developed in the course of its formulation, involved a process of expanded socialist reproduction. It was no accident that, on V. I. Lenin's suggestion, the State Planning Commission (Gosplan) was organized in February 1921 "for the purpose of formulating a unified nationwide economic plan based on the electrification plan adopted by the Eighth Congress of Soviets, and for overall supervision over the implementation of this plan."

In discussing Lenin's approach to the formulation of long-term plans, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that "Lenin personally set a classical example of such an approach with his work on the GOELRO Plan in which all computations and technical substantiations were subordinated to a single objective: the creation of a progressive power industry and a technical base for the economic renaissance and socialist reorganization of the country."

The international importance of the GOELRO Plan was tremendous. From its very first steps the young Soviet state was already setting for the world an example of

scientific planning aimed at insuring the upsurge of the economy and at improving the well-being of the working people. To this day, the electrification plan is a model of long-term economic planning for socialist and developing countries.

In becoming part of history as the Leninist plan for electrification, the GOELRO Plan linked forever the first long-term statewide program for the development of the national economy with the name of the founder of the communist party and the creator of the Soviet state. In continuing the work of K. Marx and F. Engels, Lenin formulated the essential stipulation regarding the ways for the development of production forces in the state of the victorious proletariat, based on a single scientific statewide plan, and developed an integral theory of electrification as the material-technical and power base of socialism and communism.

Long before the October Revolution, in his careful study of the development of the then existing production forces, and observing the initial attempts to use electric power in the national economy and for domestic purposes, Vladimir Il'ich developed the firm conviction that the extensive use of electric power, which offered a number of advantages compared with other types of power (universal application, easy conversion to any kind of energy, fragmentation and possibility of transmission over long distances), was the foundation for technical progress. He wrote about a technical revolution based on electrification. Lenin developed these scientific ideas and theoretical views, which were implemented subsequently, after the victory of the October Revolution, when he had to define the means for economic construction.

Created as a result of the victory of the October Revolution, the first state of workers and peasants in the world was the most progressive in terms of its political system, having set for itself the goal of establishing a classless society. In terms of economic development, however, the young Soviet republic was still far behind the leading capitalist countries. Furthermore, Russia's economy had been wrecked by the imperialist and civil wars. In order to undertake the building of socialism a material and technical base had to be laid, resting on the latest equipment. The industrialization of the country and the socialist reconstruction of agriculture had to be carried out. Communism presumes a Soviet system as a political organ which allows the oppressed masses to accomplish everything. Without this, communism is inconceivable," Lenin pointed out. "...This provides for the political side. The economic aspect, however, can be secured only when the Russian proletarian state will control the entire big industrial machinery based on modern technology, i.e., on electrification...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 42, pp 30-31).

V. I. Lenin not only pointed out the decisive role of electrification in the country's economic life and in laying the material and technical foundations for a classless society, but repeatedly emphasized that electrification is the most important prerequisite for making radical sociopolitical changes in town and country, for the growth of the material well-being of the working people and for insuring the comprehensive and harmonious development of all members of society. The positions of the working class strengthened as labor productivity grew and industrial production increased. The use of electric power in agriculture became the base for the reorganization of the Soviet countryside and of the peasants' way of

life. Electric light, lovingly described by the people as "Il'ich's bulb," gave the multimillion-strong rural masses exposure to contemporary culture and education. Gradually, the contradictions between town and country and between people engaged in mental and physical work began to disappear in the course of the building of socialism based on electrification.

As Lenin pointed out, the transition to socialism through electrification could be accomplished within a historically short time. If dozens of big electric power plants could be built "the transitional stages and intermediary links between the patriarchal system and socialism become totally or virtually unnecessary" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 43, p 228).

In April of 1918, one and a half years after the victory of the October Revolution, in the familiar "Outline of a Plan for Scientific and Technical Work," Vladimir Il'ich called for the formulation of a draft statewide national economic plan and asked the Sovnarkhoz to instruct the Academy of Sciences "to set up several commissions of specialists, for the fastest possible formulation of a plan for the reorganization of industry and for the economic upsurge of Russia" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 228). Lenin suggested that particular attention be paid to "the electrification of industry and transportation and the use of electric power in farming. He called for the use of second-rate fuels (peat and the lowest grade coal) for the generation of electric power, with the lowest possible outlays for the extraction and transportation of the fuel. Hydraulic and wind-powered engines should be used in agriculture as well" (ibid., pp 228, 231).

However, at that time the implementation of Lenin's assignment on the formulation of a unified plan was not possible. The internal counterrevolution and international imperialism took up arms against the young Soviet republic. All the forces of the party and the people were concentrated on defending the revolution.

The Red Army defeated the main forces of the White Guards and the interventionists between the end of 1919 and the beginning of 1920. A temporary breathing spell followed and Lenin was able to deal extensively with problems of economic construction and to take up again the idea of the formulation of a unified economic plan. On 26 December 1919, in a talk with his old friend and fellow worker G. M. Krzhizhanovskiy, the noted power engineer, Vladimir Il'ich discussed the use of local fuels such as peat and soft coal for electric power station requirements. He considered this as one of the solutions to the fuel crisis and to easing the load of the transportation system.

After a while Gleb Maksimilianovich sent to Lenin his article "The Task of Industrial Electrification," in which Vladimir Il'ich was interested. In his answer, dated 23 January 1920, Lenin gave Krzhizhanovskiy a specific assignment on the formulation of a unified state plan for electrification. In this historical letter he stated that "...Should we not add that this is not a technical plan (which, naturally, would be a project involving many people and would not be a hasty one), but a political or a state plan, i.e., a task for the proletariat?"

"For example: in 10 (5?) years to build 20-30 (30-50 ?) power plants so that the entire country may be covered by plants with a 400 (or 200, if we make them

weaker) verst radius; we could use peat, water, shale, coal or oil (roughly speaking, we could cover all of Russia). Let us start now by purchasing the necessary machines and models. Let us make Russia "electric" in 10 (20?) years.

"I believe that you could give us a draft for such a "plan" which, I repeat, would be not technical but governmental.

"Such a plan must be formulated now, making it clear and popular, so that the masses may be inspired by a clear (basically totally scientific) prospect: with work, in 10 to 20 years we could convert to electric power everything in Russia, both industry and agriculture. Let us produce a certain amount (in terms of thousand or million horsepower or kilowatts?? The devil only knows!) of machine tools, etc.

"Should we draw up a projected map of Russia with centers and perimeters, or is this still too early?

"I repeat, we must entice the mass of workers and politically conscious peasants with a great 10- to 20-year program," (Poln. Sobr. Soch., Vol 40, pp 62-63).

Several decades have passed since, but we are still impressed by the depth of thinking found in this document and by the infinite faith in the strength of the working people and the Soviet system which imbued these lines written in the most difficult period of establishment of the proletarian state. A few lines in a letter, presented as theses, outline the basic ideas of the plan for electrification. Lenin most categorically emphasized that the plan must be addressed at the broadest possible mass of people--the workers and the politically conscious peasants -- as their great program.

Having reached the conclusion that the period the country had entered made the undertaking of economic construction possible, Lenin decided to submit to the first session of the first All-Russian Central Executive Committee, Seventh Convocation, which was to open on 2 February, a resolution on drafting a plan for electrification, so that the project may assume governmental importance. Only numbered days remained before the session. As instructed by Vladimir Il'ich, Krzhizhanovskiy drafted the pamphlet "Basic Tasks for the Electrification of Russia," to which he added a map on which the planned electric power stations were marked. Lenin approved the pamphlet and ordered its urgent printing.

On Lenin's motion, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee Session passed the resolution "On the Electrification of Russia." The resolution stated, in particular, that "for the first time Soviet Russia has the opportunity to undertake a more planned economic construction and the scientific formulation and systematic implementation of a governmental plan for the entire national economy."

Throughout 1920 Lenin did a tremendous amount of work on the formulation of the plan for the electrification of the country. He repeatedly met with Krzhizhanovskiy, who was assigned to head the GOELRO commission. Gleb Makzimilianovich combined his old Bolshevik revolutionary training and his status of close fellow worker of Vladimir Il'ich's, dating back to the days of the "Association for the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class," exile to Siberia and long years

of joint party work, with extensive knowledge of engineering and a profound familiarity with problems of power engineering. In the course of his work with electric power in Petrograd and Moscow he had acquired extensive experience and had become one of the biggest specialists in this area. Furthermore, he had established personal contacts with many Russian engineers and scientists.

V. I. Lenin ascribed tremendous importance to involving the old specialists in the constructive activities of the Soviet system, electrification in particular. Even before the GOELRO commission was formed he had talked to prominent scientists and power engineers such as professors M. A. Shatelen and G. O. Graftio, engineer A. V. Vinter, and others. Vladimir Il'ich believed, with complete justification, that Krzhizhanovskiy will not only guide the efforts of the GOELRO commission into the necessary channel, but will be able to rally around himself a large group of outstanding scientists and technicians and inspire them to undertake the difficult project of formulating a plan for the electrification of the entire country, something unprecedented in world practice. "...The Soviet scientists," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said, "justified the trust and hopes of the communist party, the Soviet state and the Soviet people! They participated most actively in the formulation of the GOELRO Plan--the first truly scientific long-term plan for the development of the national economy."

Lenin's speeches, in which he tirelessly promoted the plan for the electrification of Russia, gave the GOELRO commission tremendous support. Starting with the Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets of the National Economy, which was held in January 1920, and to the very end of his life, Vladimir Il'ich seized every opportunity to explain to the party and the people the importance of the electrification plan and of preparing the entire country for the new stage in the building of socialism.

Lenin addressed not only party and soviet workers but peasants as well. He described to them the importance of the electrification of the country. On 14 November, accompanied by Nadezhda Konstantinovna, Lenin traveled to Kashino Village to attend the opening of the local electric power plant. He delivered a speech on the electrification plan. Again he discussed the topic with the peasants of Modenovo Village on 15 December 1920. The GOELRO commission continued its intensive work throughout 1920. It held 67 sessions all of which were chaired by Krzhizhanovskiy. Dozens of reports on the electrification of the individual economic sectors and draft plans for the electrification of many rayons were discussed.

The "Plan for the Electrification of the RSFSR" was a result of the commission's activities. It consisted of two basic sections: an introduction with an explanatory note to the chart for the electrification of Russia and plans for the electrification of eight rayons (Central-Industrial, Northern, Southern, Volga, Urals, Caucasus, West Siberian and Turkestan). Radical changes were earmarked concerning the fuel balance as a result of increased coal extraction in the Donbass and of insuring the more extensive use of local grades of coal, peat and shale.

In the field of transportation, in addition to comprehensive reconstruction, the plan called for the electrification of the most important mainlines, totaling about 3,500 kilometers in length, and the parallel laying of new tracks totaling 25,000 to 30,000 kilometers.

Extensive work was planned in agricultural mechanization. The production of farm machinery was to be doubled. Electrification was to contribute to the growth of labor productivity and to the improvement of cultural standards in the countryside.

The development of a power base called for the implementation of programs A and B of the GOELRO Plan. The A program included the restoration and reconstruction of the country's power industry and the implementation of a number of measures for the reconstruction of the old electric power plants, which were to be linked with the high tension grids, as well as the improvement of their work quality indicators. The overall power generated by these plants was to total 250,000 kilowatts. Program B was the basis of the GOELRO Plan. It called for the construction of 30 regional electric power plants generating a total of 1,750,000 kilowatts, including 20 thermoelectric power plants generating 1,110,000 kilowatts and 10 hydroelectric power plants generating 640,000 kilowatts. The individual generating power of these plants ranged from 30,000 to 200,000 kilowatts. The plan called for the creation of an energy base in the new industrial areas in the eastern part of the country and, in particular, the building of four electric power plants in the Urals and of the Kuznetsk Regional Electric Power Plant in Western Siberia. The economic development of the individual national areas called for the construction of the Altay GES in Kazakhstan, hydroelectric power plants in Turkestan and the Sviyazhsкая Thermoelectric Power Plant in Tatarsiya. Hydraulic power plants were to be built in the Northern Caucasus as well.

The map of the electrification of Russia indicated the location of the regional stations and the area to be covered by centralized electric power supplies. Some of the circles overlapped, thus creating a unified power ring covering the main parts of the country. In his 6 November 1920 letter to the members of the RKP(b) Central Committee, Lenin suggested that the report of the GOELRO commission chairman be included in the daily agenda of the Eighth Congress of Soviets.

The Eighth All-Russian Congress of Soviets opened on 22 December. A long-term plan for the economic reorganization of the country, based on electrification, was being discussed for the first time in the history of the supreme state power organ. In his report, Vladimir Il'ich described in detail the content of the GOELRO Plan, which he rated highly and which he described as the "second party program," a program for our economic construction. "Without the electrification plan," he said, "we cannot undertake real construction" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 42, p 157). Lenin developed his views on electrification as the basis for the reorganization of a country inhabited by small peasants and for converting the economy to the technical foundations of modern large-scale production. "It is only when the country has been supplied with electricity," he said, "and when industry, agriculture and transportation are based on the technical foundations of modern large-scale industry that we can win a definitive victory" (Ibid., p 159). After formulating the famous slogan that "Communism means Soviet power plus electrification of the entire country," Vladimir Il'ich concluded his address as follows: "...If Russia becomes covered with a thick network of electric power plants and powerful technical systems our communist economic construction will become the model for a future socialist Europe and Asia" (Ibid., p 161). At the congress he submitted a draft resolution on electrification, which ended as follows: "The

Congress expresses its inflexible conviction that all Soviet institutions, departments, workers and toiling peasants will apply all their efforts and will stop at no sacrifice for the implementation of the plan for the electrification of Russia at all cost and regardless of any obstacle" (Ibid., p 197).

After the approval of the GOELRO Plan by the Congress of Soviets, Lenin continued to work on its further improvement. On 8 February 1921 he signed a Sovnarkom decree on the holding of an all-Russian electrical engineering congress to discuss technical and economic problems related to the implementation of the GOELRO Plan and the active involvement of a broad range of specialists in the electrification of the national economy. In the period of preparations for the congress the press published a number of rather confused articles by some economists, who tried to substitute scholastic views for the specific electrification plan. After reviewing the history of the formulation and the content of the GOELRO Plan and after emphasizing its scientific and specific nature, in a brilliant article entitled "On the Unified Economic Plan," Vladimir Il'ich asserted that "the 'Plan for the Electrification of the RSFSR' is the only serious work done on the unified economic plan..." (Ibid., p 339).

It would be entirely justifiable to claim that Vladimir Il'ich was the real inspirer and initiator of the GOELRO Plan if we consider the tremendous work accomplished by Lenin in this connection. He defined the main stipulations of the plan and gave daily support to the commission members; he was a passionate and consistent propagandist of the idea of electrification and waged an irreconcilable struggle against its various opponents.

V. I. Lenin was not only the creator of the GOELRO Plan but the tireless fighter for its implementation. No more than two months after its approval by the congress, on 2 March 1921, he signed a Labor and Defense Council decree which emphasized that, because of the special tasks related to the electrification of the country and the decisions of the Eighth Congress of Soviets, it was necessary "to consider all work related to electrification, in the areas of the electric power industry, electric power supplies and new electric power systems and the electrification of various economic sectors in the country as being of primary governmental importance."

Vladimir Il'ich himself ascribed primary importance to electrification. A broad range of electrification problems were considered at Sovnarkom and Labor and Defense Council sessions, held under his chairmanship: securing the national economy and the household needs of the working people with regular electric power supplies; developing domestic power machine building and the electrical engineering industry; problems of fuel industry, particularly peat extraction, as fuel for the electric power plants; production of electric power cultivation tools, and so on. Lenin paid particular attention to the building of the first enterprises in the area of socialist electrification. He helped to procure the necessary equipment, construction materials, workers and specialists, funds, and many others for such projects. He believed that even the most insignificant matter was of great importance to the success of the construction project and helped to resolve food supply problems.

The implementation of the GOELRO Plan was pursued at the cost of incredible efforts on the part of the Soviet people, under circumstances dominated by economic dislocation, a fuel crisis and scarcity of construction materials and equipment. Despite tremendous efforts, between 1920 and 1921 power generating capacities for only 12,000 kilowatts were commissioned. "Twelve thousand kilowatts," Lenin said, "is a very modest beginning. A foreigner familiar with American, German or Swedish electrification may laugh at it. However, he who laughs last, laughs best" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 51).

Lenin's words were prophetic. Thanks to Vladimir Il'ich's personal support, the Kashir GRES, near Moscow, which used local low grade coal, and the Utkina Zavod' GRES in Petrograd, which used peat, were commissioned as early as 1922. The construction of the Kizel GRES, the first of its kind in the Urals, and of the Nizhegorodskaya and Shatura Electric Power Plants was completed. Lenin closely followed the pace of construction of the powerful Volkhov Hydroelectric Power Plant, the first of its kind in the country. In Georgia, the building of the Avchal'skaya GES, near Tbilisi, and of the Yerevan GES, in Armenia, was progressing with the active assistance of the head of the Soviet government. The Boz-Suyskaya GES was under construction not far from Tashkent. Lenin was also involved with the building of the Dneprovskaya GES, which was the most powerful electric power plant of the GOELRO Plan. Despite his tremendous work load Vladimir Il'ich found the time to receive the author of the Dneproges plan, Prof I. G. Aleksandrov, and to study his proposal.

After the death of the great leader, the Soviet people continued to follow Lenin's course for the building of socialism steadfastly, under the leadership of the communist party. The principles of electrification, formulated by Lenin and made into the foundations of the GOELRO Plan, defined the main directions followed in the development of our national economy. Thanks to the efforts of the party and the people by 1935--the planned year of completion--the Leninist GOELRO Plan was considerably overfulfilled in terms of all basic indicators. Let us consider the specific figures in the following table.

Implementation of the GOELRO Plan

Indicator	1913	GOELRO Plan	1935
Gross industrial output (1913=1)	1	1.8-2	5.6*
Power of regional electric power plants (in kw)	0.2	1.75	4.1**
Electric power production (in kw/h)	2.0	8.8	26.3

* Large-scale industry

** Furthermore, the generating power of industrial electric power plants of regional importance rose by half a million kilowatts.

In the course of the implementation of the GOELRO Plan, 40 regional electric power plants instead of 30, as stipulated in the plan, were commissioned.

In his report to the Eighth All-Russian Congress of Soviets Lenin said: "We have a plan for electrification which will take many years to fulfill. We must implement this plan at all costs and shorten the time of its implementation" ("Poin. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 42, p 160). This instruction was implemented with the heroic toil of the Soviet people.

More than 60 years have passed since the formulation and ratification of the plan for the electrification of the country--Lenin's GOELRO Plan. Systematically implementing "the second party program," the Soviet people achieved tremendous successes in the development of the socialist economy and built mature socialism. Today the Soviet Union has a powerful fuel-energy complex and modern power machine building and electrical engineering industries. The Soviet Union is successfully operating the biggest electric power plants and the longest high tension power transmission cables of up to 750 kilovolts. The Integrated Power System of the USSR, the biggest in the world, covers the centralized electric power supply of the entire European part of the country, Siberia and Kazakhstan. Lenin's dream of an electric Russia has become reality.

Time is the best judge of historical predictions. It confirmed in full the accuracy of Lenin's policy of electrification. Although in the past 60 years the GOELRO Plan has been outstripped severalfold in terms of its quantitative indicators, and although today no comparison is possible between the GOELRO Plan and the size of our economic construction, the Leninist principles of electrification on which it was based have retained their topical significance in laying the material and technical foundations for communism.

Today electrification, which is the linchpin of the economic building of a communist society, plays a leading role in the development of all economic sectors and in the achievement of technical progress.

Electrification plays a most important role in the further upsurge of the economy and in improving social production effectiveness on the basis of the steady growth of labor productivity.

The tasks formulated by the 26th CPSU Congress on the development of power engineering in the 11th Five-Year Plan and beyond it are based on the Leninist principles, enriched by the experience of contemporary science and technology. Comprehensive automation, electronics and computers, based on electrification, are the most important prerequisites for the new stage of the scientific and technical revolution. "Electrification, as the great Lenin predicted, was a powerful lever in laying the material and technical foundations for developed socialism. It was one of the essential factors in improving the working and living conditions of the Soviet people," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out. "As in the past, today it plays a leading role in the solution of the most important economic and sociopolitical problems." Loyal to the behests of the leader and led by the communist party, the Soviet people are confidently implementing Lenin's brilliant formula: communism means Soviet power plus electrification of the entire country.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIALIST CULTURE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 48-54

[Article by Yu. Zhdanov, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member]

[Text] The publication of anthologies on a particular topic, which include the basic views of the great leader on individual key problems of revolutionary theory and practice, is one of the popular methods for the dissemination of Lenin's theoretical and ideological legacy. The problem of the nature, development and fate of world culture is precisely one such key problem of Marxist-Leninist theory and party practical work. That is why the publication of an anthology on this topic (V. I. Lenin, "O Kul'ture" [On Culture], Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 336 pp) is a useful and important contribution to our Leniniana.

The compilers of the anthology were faced with an extremely complex task: to select from the entire tremendous Leninist legacy the kind of works and statements which would show Lenin's theoretical views and practical approach to cultural problems. It would be no great exaggeration to say that these matters are covered, to one extent or another, in most of Lenin's works. Do we not gain an understanding of the standard of intraparty comradeship and, as a whole, of interpersonality relations from Lenin's works and publications on the work of the ISKRA collective? Are works like "Materialism and Empiriocriticism" or "Philosophical Notebooks" not crowded with problems of culture and attitude toward cultural legacy? The spiritual culture of socialism is the basis of Lenin's entire literary legacy.

The attention which Lenin paid to problems of culture is unquestionably related to the deep current of a progressive cultural tradition, both domestic and global, which Lenin inherited from previous generations of philosophers, fighters, scientists and artists. Leninism encompassed within itself everything progressive, the best creations of the genius of the Russian people, linked to the names of Radishchev, Pushkin, Chernishevskiy, Shchedrin, Turgenev and Plekhanov. At the same time, Leninism rests on the achievements of the entire previous age-old world culture.

Lenin's attention to problems of culture is an extension of the lofty tradition of the progressive Russian intelligentsia but does not end there. Lenin brought out the profound laws governing the development of culture, defined its place in social life and established its importance to the socialist revolution. The solution of basic problems of culture became possible only on the basis of Lenin's creative application of the dialectical method and of the theory of development in its deepest sense.

The compilers of the anthology have limited themselves to citing Lenin's statements which characterize the nature of culture as a social phenomenon, the class aspect of culture, the ratio between the international and the national, the building of a new, socialist culture and the struggle against bourgeois ideology and left-wing deviationism in culture.

In the preface to the anthology the compilers justifiably write that "according to Lenin's concept of culture, the latter must be considered not only as a combination between material and spiritual achievements of the social man but as a process of his self-development and of the multiplication and advancement of his essential forces and capabilities."

The materials in the collection and the entire system of theoretical concepts they offer confirm that unlike many other popularizers of Marxism, Lenin considered culture not as an individual phenomenon or aspect of social life or else a form of organization of recreation or of esthetic upbringing. We read in the work Lenin's statements not only concerning spiritual standards, but economic, industrial, technical, management and political standards, and the standards of customs and needs.

In his works Lenin implements the conclusion expressed in the "Philosophical Notebooks:" "Categories must be derived (rather than arbitrarily or automatically borrowed)" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 29, p 86). Step by step, in encompassing the full data of historically varied human practice, and in summing up the course of development of theoretical thinking, Lenin precisely "derives" the culture category, bringing up its universal significance and universality in social development.

To say that culture is merely one of the areas or aspects of human activities is insufficient. Culture is a most general, an all-embracing concept which reflects the specifics of social life such as production, trade, consumption, knowledge and creativity. In this respect, it would be pertinent to recall Lenin's thought that "the category of thinking is not a human tool but a manifestation of laws, nature and man" (Ibid., p 83).

As a category of historical materialism, culture characterizes a given society at all the stages of its establishment and development, regardless of social or local differences, in the same way that the categories of historical materialism consist of production and consumption, exchange and distribution, and base and superstructure. Let us note, incidentally, that such a categorical scope is not found in a number of important but nevertheless historically transient social institutions, which are reflected, for example, in the concepts of nation, family, value, science and so on.

On the other hand, the categories of historical materialism are less general than are, for example, the concepts of matter, causality and contradictions, which are part of the system of dialectical materialism as a whole. Whereas the categories of the way of life and consciousness are subjects of dialectical materialism, historical materialism concretizes them in the categories of social life and social consciousness.

The category of culture, as Lenin proved, does not encompass all essential definitions of social life, nor does it cover all of its specific dialectics. Society is a complex social system within which alone the social nature of man can be realized. The structure of this system is historically varied in terms of forms and manifestations. It is in a state of indivisible dialectical unity with culture. The two sides interpenetrate and one is inconceivable without the other. They influence each other steadily. Such an indivisible unity makes it possible to describe the sociocultural nature of man. However, the cultural and social aspects are not identical to each other. History shows their differences and their occasionally contradictory natures. Such an intertwining between the cultural and the social frequently leads to the concept of their interchangeability. Theoretically, however, this is erroneous and it is the Marxist-Leninist approach alone that enables us to establish the true nature of their interrelationship.

Lenin noted the difference between the cultural and social aspects of societal life. Thus, in criticizing the anarchic phraseology of French socialist Gustave Herve, who rejected the existence of national defensive wars in the imperialist epoch, he wrote: "The fatherland, i.e., the specific political, cultural and social environment, is the most powerful factor in the class struggle of the proletariat... The proletariat cannot be indifferent to the political, social and cultural conditions of its struggle and, consequently, to the fate of its country" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 17, p 190).

The specific dialectics of the cultural and social aspects operates in the crucible of the political struggle and the political actions of the masses, classes and parties. Culture has always been the arena of class battles and a weapon of the belligerent parties.

After the victory of the Great October Revolution the danger of the restoration of the bourgeois social order because of the retention of the entire cultural arsenal in the hands of the remnants of the exploiting classes, bourgeois specialists, managers, scientists, engineers, officials and members of cooperative societies, at the beginning of the Soviet system, frightened some unstable members of the semiproletarian strata and triggered in them the feverish desire to put an end, to reject all previous culture in general. Lenin was great in that he called upon the working people to master the entire powerful arsenal of past culture and to restructure it in such a way that the new, socialist culture may become a weapon for the social reorganization of the world on a communist basis. That is why the requirement was "to take over the culture created by the old social relations and which had been left as the material base for socialism" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 263). This means that the role of culture is not limited to industrial, educational or artistic functions. It is a role which assumes a socially reorganizing significance. That is why the ideologues of the modern bourgeoisie fear socialist culture and, along with exporting bourgeois culture, are attempting to lay the grounds for the erosion of and change in the social structure of the socialist countries, as was the case during the familiar events in Czechoslovakia.

Lenin's theory of culture contains yet another important aspect which brings up the dialectics of the cultural and the social. Despite the unquestionable organic

link between the two, many disparities may be noted between the cultural levels and the social structure of a society. Shortly after the revolution Lenin criticized Bukharin for his failure to understand the specific characteristic of the moment when the victorious Russian proletariat proved to be "ahead of England or Germany in terms of our political system" while remaining "behind even the most backward of the Western European states in terms of the proper organization of state capitalism, the level of culture and the extent of preparedness for the material-industrial 'introduction' of socialism" (Ibid., p 306). A long historical period were to pass before this disparity, which was a real historical contradiction, could be eliminated from our country and before not only a progressive social system but a progressive culture could be created.

Lenin's theory of the two cultures within a class-antagonistic society is of essential importance in the study of the reciprocal influence between cultural and social processes: the democratic culture of the toiling masses and the antihuman culture of the ruling exploiting classes.

On this matter Lenin held a strictly scientific position. The most important aspect of the Leninist theory of culture is the doctrine of the continuity of the cultural development of mankind. In his address to the Seventh Emergency Congress of the RKP(b) in 1918, V. I. Lenin may have seemed to discuss the extreme case in which culture appears to perish entirely. However, even in such a case it remains protected to a certain extent. "For however severe the destructions of a culture may be, it is impossible to eradicate it from historical life. It may be more difficult to restore it but no destruction will ever lead to the vanishing of this culture entirely. This culture is ineradicable in one or another of its parts or physical vestiges. The entire difficulty lies in its restoration," Lenin said (Ibid., p 46).

History offers examples of a seemingly total disappearance of a culture. Such was the case of the peoples of Mesopotamia, ancient Egypt and Central America. In these cases as well, however, many of their cultural achievements were preserved for the good of their descendants.

The deep ties within Russian culture, ranging from "Tale of the Igorev Regiment" to contemporary poetry and from ancient Russian paintings to the works of contemporary masters have remained unbroken. The wonderful Scythian engravings are creatively refracted in the contemporary art of the Caucasus.

V. I. Lenin faced the party and the people with a task of inordinate historical significance and complexity: "We must take the entire culture left by capitalism and build socialism from it" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 38, p 55). In his speech to the young builders of the socialist society, the representatives of the Youth League, he presented a developed program for building a proletarian culture: "Without a clear understanding of the fact that a proletarian culture can be built only on the basis of an accurate knowledge of the culture created as a result of the entire development of mankind and exclusively through the processing of this culture, we cannot resolve this problem. Proletarian culture is not something which has sprung out of the unknown. It is not an invention of people who consider themselves specialists in proletarian culture" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 41, p 304). Lenin returned to the same idea in his "Outline of a Resolution on

Proletarian Culture!" "This is not an invention of a new proletarian culture but the development of the best examples, traditions and results of existing culture from the viewpoint of the Marxist outlook and the conditions governing the life and struggle of the proletariat in the epoch of its dictatorship" (Ibid., p 462).

Lenin's statements give us a concept of the overall picture of the proletarian cultural revolution and bring up its most important features, such as the preservation of historical continuity in the development of human culture, the totality of the mastering of its material ("take the entire culture") and many others.

All of this, however, does not mean the adoption of an uncritical attitude toward the culture of the past. At this stage in the analysis we must apply the class approach which eliminates cultural phenomena alien to the proletarian class. We must not allow elements of bourgeois, landowning or feudal culture, born of relations of exploitation, suppression of the individual, racial oppression and national discrimination, or relations of the alienation of man from man and from nature to penetrate inside the socialist society.

As early as in his "Critical Notes on the National Problem," written in 1913, Lenin cautioned that "When we raise the slogan of the 'international culture of democracy and of the universal workers movement,' we take from each national culture its democratic and its socialist elements only. We take them exclusively and unquestionably as a counterweight to social culture - to the bourgeois nationalism of any given nation" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch," Vol 24, p 121).

Therefore, the next necessary prerequisite for the development of proletarian culture, as stipulated by Lenin, is the reworking of the entire past cultural material and its restructuring on the basis of Marxist theory and in the interest of building a socialist society.

In such a case, the naive person could ask, why do we need a revolution? Theoretically, the revolution is a leap in development, a break with the past. Are we not substituting a smooth evolution, traditionalism, for revolutionism in the theory of culture? This was the question raised in the first years of the revolution by some publicists and practical workers. Actually, they reflected the petit bourgeois viewpoint of the "left-wing" detractors of culture. Theoretically, they confused the social with the cultural, unable to understand their complex dialectics; practically, their actions led to the self-isolation of the proletariat and undermined the prospects and possibilities of the socialist reorganization of the country.

V. I. Lenin rejected the sectarian views of the Proletkul't, according to which the new culture could be built only by the proletariat, without involving the engineers, scientists or artists who had developed in the bourgeois epoch. After V. Pietnev, one of the Proletkul't's ideologues, had written that "The problem of building a proletarian culture can be resolved with the efforts of the proletariat alone....," Lenin underlined the word "alone" and wrote on the margin "totally false" (V. I. Lenin, "O Vospitanií i Obrazovaníi" [On Upbringing and Education], Prosveshcheniye, Moscow, 1973, p 567). Lenin took firm steps to involve in the

building of socialism all Russian cultural forces. He condemned the nihilistic, the Makhayevskiy-type attitude toward the intelligentsia and the attempts to administer cultural affairs bureaucratically.

Unable to understand the dialectics of the development of culture, the leaders of the Proletkul't pitted Lenin's idea of the uninterrupted and continuing development of culture against the metaphysical concept of breaks and interruptions in cultural development.

On Lenin's initiative, the party firmly blocked the unrestrained ravings of the defamers and destroyers of culture. Let us point out that the Proletkul't bawlers outstripped by far the organizers of the Maoist "cultural revolution." The pressure of small-scale production and petit bourgeois ideology triggered in China a sinister wave of persecution of culture. It was a question not only of breaking the ties with Chinese cultural traditions (the campaign against Confucius and against classical Chinese theater), and with progressive generally democratic European culture, but with the socialist culture of the Soviet Union as well. Leninism firmly insisted that the proletariat and the toiling masses it headed were the natural recipients of progressive cultural traditions, who took over the cultural baton. To repeat the question, what is, then, the nature of a truly proletarian cultural revolution?

According to Lenin, the cultural revolution is one of the manifestations of the advent of the new historical age, when the toiling masses which have been plundered materially and spiritually for thousands of years and who are deprived of the opportunity to make use of the results of the culture they have created, gain possession of all achievements of human culture. A gigantic process of combination of labor with culture and of the molding of the new, the comprehensively developed, the universal man, who has mastered the entire wealth of forms of human activities, begins with the socialist revolution. A culture which, for centuries, was at the disposal of a minority, of a chosen elite, now becomes accessible to the entire people. Is this not a revolution?

This historical turn is so important to the life of mankind and the fate of the revolution that even in the worst period of dislocation, when there were shortages of bread and metal, when there were no tractors or motor vehicles, Lenin defined concisely the entire objectives and tasks of the development of our society with a single thought: "Today this cultural revolution is sufficient for us to find ourselves in an entirely socialist country...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 45, p 377). Understood in the totality of its tremendous importance, the cultural revolution, as we clearly realize now, cannot be reduced in the least to the reorganization of education or of the arts. It affects the basic living conditions of the people, their material production, forms of communication and all aspects of their activities.

Lenin has given us examples of how to rework critically the cultural legacy of the past. In his studies of the works of Hegel and the great writings of Tolstoy, Plekhanov's philosophical writings and of the latest achievements in the natural sciences, he taught us how to develop a concerned attitude toward everything progressive, sensible and good found in the cultural legacy and how to surmount one or another erroneous view it may contain.

In this respect, the anthology offers a great deal of valuable information. It describes Lenin's attentive attitude toward cultural traditions and the thoroughness with which he rallied the cultural forces as he laid the foundations of the new socialist culture. The work describes the tremendous practical activities of Lenin and the party in the area of cultural construction. The fact that the compilers of the anthology have included in it not only original Leninist documents but recollections of Lenin's contemporaries and fellow workers and official decisions in which Lenin's thoughts are reflected deserves our approval.

The problems of the development of socialist culture and of the growth of the cultural standard of the Soviet people have always been the focal point of attention of the communist party, the Soviet state and our public. In the course of our socialist changes we have insured the tremendous upsurge of the material and spiritual culture of our society, crossing the distance from the wooden plow to spaceships. Today, as it defends the peace, our country is standing guard over the achievements of world culture and civilization.

Cultural problems create fierce clashes between socialist and bourgeois ideology, particularly in the efforts to influence the youth. The ideological servants of imperialism, the defenders of what is most sinister and reactionary, try to substitute the cheap surrogates of so-called "mass" culture, with its supportive anti-humanism, violence, philistinism, and parasitism, for true culture, and to impose upon the people the base ideals of consumerism, entertainment and sex. It is precisely they who encourage standardized thinking, narrow outlook and conformist views, and who promote distorted tastes. This is achieved with the help of stupefying and cacophonous music, horror, crime, and catastrophe movies, and dehumanized art and science. The fight for culture and for its lofty values goes on tirelessly.

The development of culture is as infinite as is the nature of man. Every new Soviet citizen who enters this world must master from scratch the entire wealth of preceding cultural developments, for culture cannot be inherited with parental genes.

The period of developed socialism represents a new stage in the history of socialist culture. It formulates qualitatively new requirements concerning the culture of the Soviet person. The "Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990" mention the need "of insuring the further growth of the people's well-being and the development of the socialist way of life and of the entire system of social relations on the basis of economic upsurge and higher social production effectiveness." They call for "raising the educational and cultural standard of the population, improving medical services and the recreation of the Soviet people and creating more favorable conditions for active work."

Other very timely CPSU stipulations include "The Creation of More Favorable Conditions for Highly Productive Work and for the Intensification of Its Creative Nature," "Raising the Structure of Consumption of Material Goods and Services, Improving Their Quality and Increasing Their Variety," and "Improving the Housing and Living Conditions of the Population...and Raising the Standards of all Consumer Services."

The "Further Development of Socialist Democracy" and "The Effective Utilization of the Social Factors for Economic Growth" will contribute to the all-round development of socialist culture as well.

Worrisome phenomena are still encountered in our society: a scornful attitude toward labor. This lowers the discipline and, in its extreme forms, lead to parasitism and vagrancy, a careless attitude toward social resources and public property, a philistine-consumerist taste, drunkenness, greed, unkind attitudes, religious views, and emulation of bourgeois culture. We cannot consider a scientific worker who limits himself strictly to his own field and is unfamiliar with the entire wealth of human culture as being truly cultured. Lenin's caution remains valid: those who rule are not always sufficiently cultured. In fact, the engineering or agronomical training of many managers does not give them a general culture automatically, or the skill of dealing with people or of resolving social problems knowledgeably and sensitively.

Naturally, the reasons for such shortcomings include some familiar economic and social factors. However, a great deal is determined by the cultural standard. Further progress in culture is a necessary prerequisite for progress in social relations, technical forecasts, and improvements in the ecological situation at the developed socialist stage.

It is only by raising the cultural standards that the complex problem of developing sensible needs may be resolved. It is a question of culture interpreted in the broadest meaning of the term as a culture of work, way of life and human relations, which Comrade L. I. Brezhnev mentioned at the July 1978 CC CPSU Plenum.

The documents of the 26th CPSU Congress have given us the directions to be followed in improving the developed socialist society, in the course of which the reorganization of all social relations on the basis of the collectivistic principles inherent in the new system is completed. This reorganization covers the material and spiritual areas and our entire social way of life. Our party remains loyal to Lenin's cultural policy whose main objective is the molding of the new man.

The light of Lenin's ideas, reflected in the anthology, will unquestionably contribute to the better definition and resolution of the practical problems of cultural development and construction in our country at the present stage of the struggle for the ideals of communism.

5003
CSO: 1802/13

TOWARD NEW POSITIONS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 55-56

[Article by V. Shul'deshov, party committee secretary at the Svetlana Electronic Instruments Manufacturing Association]

[Text] It is frequently said of the Svetlana collective that it is at the "spearhead of technical progress." One five-year plan after another we are developing and launching new progressive methods for labor, production organization and management in all areas and testing ever new methods of party work, which are yielding increasing results.

Svetlana is one of the leading production firms in the country. It was here that the first plan for the economic and social development of the collective was enacted in 1966, marking the beginning of the drafting of similar plan at hundreds and thousands of other enterprises, after which such planning spread to rayons, cities and oblasts.

For the past 12 years the Svetlana party committee has operated with an expanded membership, steadily improving its structure and clearly reflecting the changes which have taken place in the organization of the production process. Particularly big changes occurred after our association established the first scientific-production complex in Leningrad, which was consolidated in the Ninth Five-Year Plan and became a model for the reorganization of many industrial associations throughout the country. At that time a work method such as the council of secretaries of party organizations of subunits, members of the scientific-production complex, was tested. The establishment of a single party organization in the scientific-production complex enabled us to resolve a variety of problems of party life more operatively and efficiently. In the 10th Five-Year Plan the Svetlana party organization focused its efforts on resolving the problem set by the party of insuring effectiveness and quality in all areas of work. The idea of counterplans, which originated in the first five-year plan, was raised to a qualitatively new level. At the present stage, the search for production reserves and intensive development factors, which enable us to progress at a higher pace, has been organized on a scientific basis. The stressed counterplans were formulated in detail within each structural unit and party organization in the association. We are improving the system of moral and material incentives steadily in order to insure the implementation of the tasks.

In the course of implementing the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Improving Planning and Strengthening the Influence of the Economic Mechanism on Upgrading Production Effectiveness and Work Quality," beginning with 1980, the association converted to the new method for planning the volume of output based on the normative net output indicator. In the final year of the five-year plan we completed a structure for managing the association on the basis of scientific-production complexes. The trend toward the organic merger of science with production made it possible to reduce the "research-application" cycle substantially, and to produce dozens of new kinds of instruments ahead of schedule. Their quality is equal to or frequently superior to the best foreign products.

In the last five-year plan the Svetlana personnel achieved substantial successes: the volume of output and labor productivity doubled. Capital returns rose by a factor of 1.4, while production costs dropped by one-third. Social problems were successfully resolved: the new vocational-technical school was opened. It offers young men and women a secondary education degree. The nursery and kindergarten opened their doors and a cafeteria with one thousand seats became operational. Many Svetlana personnel families improved their housing, living and recreation conditions.

The successes of the collective reflect the efforts of every Svetlana member. Let me note in particular, however, the vanguard role of the party members in production and social life. They are the ones who lead the thousands of association workers. More than 80 percent of the party members employed at Svetlana are communist labor shockworkers. On the eve of the 26th CPSU Congress all party members worked on the basis of stressed socialist obligations, which were met honorably. This played a decisive role in the successful implementation of the patriotic initiative of "a shock finish for the five-year plan. A worthy welcome for the 26th CPSU Congress!" Starting with 1981 the Svetlana personnel have produced additional goods worth hundreds of thousands of rubles, with above-plan profits of 100,000 rubles.

On the basis of their achievements in the 10th Five-Year Plan, the Svetlana personnel earmarked the new positions to be reached over the next five years and defined their assignments through 1990. The program for the effective utilization of cadres provides one of the decisive directions to be followed in the future. It calls for the creation of conditions in which the potential of every worker will be maximally used. This will enable us not only to cope with the increasing volume of output with the same number of people but even to reduce the size of the personnel. In particular, we are planning to release no less than 150 people in the first year of the 11th Five-Year Plan.

In the next few years the Svetlana personnel must develop and master the production of dozens of new instruments serving the needs of a great variety of economic sectors. The association's party committee has earmarked measures for the organizational and ideological support of the tasks facing the collective over the next five years.

The 26th party congress opens to the Soviet people exciting prospects. The CC CPSU accountability report sets major tasks consistent with vital interests and indicates the specific means for their implementation. Many of them directly apply to the forthcoming projects of the Svetlana personnel, whose labor is following major

directions of technical progress. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev described the practical utilization of scientific discoveries and inventions as a decisive and most urgent sector. We are proud that he rated the achievements of Leningrad's associations in this matter highly.

Our delegates to the congress, who represent the detachment of party workers, read and reread with particular attention the section of the report which deals with the role of the CPSU under contemporary conditions. We accept as our manual for action the stipulation that successes in our work are insured above all as a result of energetic and competent party leadership and promise to apply all our efforts to insure its further advancement.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

TREMENDOUS RESULTS OF RECONSTRUCTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST No 6, in Russian Apr 81 pp 57-61

[Article by Doctor of Chemical Sciences N. Valitov, chief engineer at the Bashneftekhimzavody Territorial Association]

[Text] "The economy," Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, "must be economical. This is the demand of the times." This demand can be met in full only by completing the shifting of all of our economic sectors to the tracks of intensive development. In the 10th Five-Year Plan the Bashkir petrochemical workers have done a great deal in this direction. Our association which, incidentally, is the biggest in the sector, fulfilled its five-year assignments for petroleum refining and the production of high-octane gasoline, low-sulfur diesel fuels, bitumens and other goods ahead of schedule, on 11 October 1980. The five-year plan for the production of consumer goods was fulfilled even earlier, by 16 April. Under the five-year plan the volume of output of consumer goods rose by a factor of more than 1.7.

Progressive changes have occurred in the structure of our output as well. Thus, whereas the overall volume of petroleum refining rose by 5.8 percent under the five-year plan, the production of high-octane gasolines rose by 39 percent; of low-sulfur diesel fuels, by 17 percent; of polyethylene, by 16 percent; and of high-index lubricants, by a factor of 3. The production of goods bearing the state Emblem of Quality tripled. Today more than one-fourth of the overall volume of output coming out of our plants bears the honorific pentagonal mark. Over the past five years the association's collective used its production potential thriftily and with good returns. For example, nonrecoverable petroleum and petroleum product losses averaged 1.17 percent of the overall volume of refining by the sector. Meanwhile, the association's enterprises were able to reduce them to 0.69 percent. This indicator, the lowest of its kind in the sector, represents hundreds of thousands of tons of additional petroleum products for the country. Under the five-year plan the amount of fuel and energy resources we saved could have met the industrial and residential needs of a city in the Urals with a population of one million. In 5 years capital returns at the enterprises within the association rose by 2.4 kopecks per ruble of capital assets and outlays per ruble of commodity output dropped by 3.5 kopecks.

The reconstruction and technical retooling of existing production facilities played a tremendous role in upgrading work effectiveness and quality. Under the 10th Five-Year Plan they accounted for about one-half of the entire growth in the volume of output. This growth, which was reached with substantially lesser outlays

compared with new construction, is the equivalent of the commissioning of another large petrochemical enterprise with capital assets worth in excess of 130 million rubles.

All of these figures are backed by the constant concern shown by the party's central committee for the achievement of progress in the petrochemical and petroleum refining industry and the attention and support invariably given to us by the oblast party committee and the heads of sectors in resolving current and long-term problems of production development, including difficult ones related to reconstruction and technical retooling. The organizational and educational work of the association's party, trade union and Komsomol organizations and the efforts of the entire labor collective are focused on the successful implementation of the association's tasks.

I shall cite a few typical examples of the high returns of reconstruction. The extensive modernization of one of the systems at the Ufa Petroleum Refinery made it possible to organize the light cracking of tar, with savings totaling 3.4 million rubles. Following the reconstruction of the catalytic cracking system at the Ufa Refinery imeni XXII S'yezda KPSS, not only did its production capacity increase but the production of gasoline rose by 36 percent. Currently this is the highest indicator in the sector.

At the Ufa Synthetic Alcohol Plant imeni 40-Letiya VLKSM the problem of the supply of propylene, the raw material, arose following the completion of the largest complex for the production of phenol and acetone in the country. We know that propylene is formed in the course of petroleum refining. Until recently, however, it was not extracted in its pure substance from waste gases but was simply burned. The design institute suggested that a special system be constructed for the production of propylene by filtering and treating the burned propylene fraction. The cost of the project was 10 million rubles. Specialists from our two enterprises developed a system for the reconstruction of existing facilities involving the use of all available equipment. Overall outlays for the implementation of the plan totaled no more than about 500,000 rubles. The outcome is that every year we extract from petroleum refining gases 12,000 tons of propylene from which we obtain phenol and acetone worth 12 million rubles. That is what a reconstruction can yield!

The repair-construction trusts within the association are doing the reconstruction and technical retooling of operating production facilities themselves. Prior to the creation of the association, as everywhere else, our enterprises ran their traditional repair services whose purpose was to insure the normal run of operations. Naturally, these services were underpowered. In the course of the establishment of the association it was decided to consolidate them. It turned out that in addition to making capital and current repairs, the trusts we created could engage in reconstruction work as well. Their personnel are well familiar with the specifics of the production process and have studied the features of each of our systems most thoroughly. For this reason, as confirmed by practical experience, they can engage in the reconstruction and technical retooling of operating facilities far more skillfully than conventional construction and installation organizations working on a contractual basis. The association draws up its

reconstruction and technical retooling plans for the five-year period, annually and quarterly. The plans stipulate precisely the month in which one or other operation is to be initiated or completed. In order to stimulate such projects, the association was the first of its kind in the sector to formulate and apply a regulation on awarding bonuses to managers of enterprises and repair-construction trusts. The fulfillment and overfulfillment of technical retooling plans has become one of the basic indicators in determining the winners of the socialist competition among our enterprises and trusts. The nonfulfillment of reconstruction plans lowers bonuses (by as much as 50 percent). We could say confidently that the establishment of our construction and repair trusts has been justified from the organizational and economic viewpoints.

Under the new five-year plan as well we intend to pursue firmly our course of further reconstruction and technical retooling of existing production facilities, for this will enable us to increase and renovate productive capital rapidly, to reduce raw material losses and to improve the quality of output. We consider reconstruction a tried means for a considerable acceleration of the scientific and technical progress and of production intensification and, on this basis, of upgrading its effectiveness.

Bearing in mind the conditions under which the national economy must develop in the next decade, this task will become ever more urgent with every passing year. Therefore, when we think of the possibilities of the future development of the association, we find it painful to realize that regardless of the considerable renovation of production capacities, equipment and technological plans every year, many previously installed systems become hopelessly obsolete, resulting in excessive increases in their operational expenditures.

A system for the production of sulfuric acid has been in use at one of our enterprises for almost 30 years. To be specific, it was built in 1954. It cost 4.5 million rubles in capital investments. In the course of its operations, with an amortization norm of about 200,000 rubles per year, 3.4 million rubles were spent in current repairs and 6.7 million in capital repairs. Whereas in the initial operational period annual capital repair outlays did not exceed 200,000 rubles, of late they have reached 600,000 to 800,000.

In 1961 alone the cost of repairs of the four systems for the primary processing of petroleum, which were commissioned at the Novo-Ufimskiy Petroleum Refinery in 1952, totaled the amount required for the construction of four new and more productive systems. At that same Novo-Ufimskiy Plant the funds spent from 1967 to the present for all kinds of repairs of two catalytic cracking systems, built as early as 1952, have reached the initial cost of the installation. Meanwhile, both the computations of specialists and practical experience, both domestic and foreign, prove that repairs are economically justifiable only if their cost does not exceed 25 percent of the initial cost of the reconstructed equipment. What is happening? Why is it that at the cost of tremendous outlays the enterprises are maintaining in operational condition at all cost equipment which has become long obsolete, both morally and physically? It is my deep conviction that not the least reason for this is that the amortization norms do not set a term after which no withholdings are to be made for the total restoration of the equipment. Currently

such withholdings are made until the time that the equipment is dismantled and written off. The outcome is that our enterprises end up by paying a double or triple price for the full value of the equipment.

This leads to rather curious situations. At one point we installed 10 gas compressors. Such compressors have not been produced for quite some time now nor are spare parts for them manufactured. Today only two of the 10 compressors work, more or less, while the others have been cannibalized for spare parts. Meanwhile, we are continuing to make amortization withholdings for all ten.

On the surface, everything appears adequate: money goes into the budget and the productive capital at the enterprises seems to be increasing. However, actual goods produced with the help of hopelessly obsolete equipment bring to the state increasingly lesser profits, while the cost of reconstruction keeps rising. As the equipment becomes obsolete, amortisation withholdings are no longer sufficient for full reconstruction and our systems operate with increasingly reduced productivity.

The current amortization norms artificially slow down the pace of industrial retooling. In my view, amortization withholdings for the full restoration of the equipment must end the moment their overall amount has reached the initial cost of the equipment. Whatever the case, one thing is clear: we must write off hopelessly obsolete equipment and technologies more firmly and at an economically expedient time. It is only thus that the conversion of our national economy to intensification can be substantially accelerated.

"Anything which slows down and makes the process of the introduction of the new more painful must be eliminated," Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev pointed out at the congress, and this statement was welcomed with the delegates' applause. "The production process must be vitally interested in making faster and better use of the thinking and results of the efforts of scientists and designers. Naturally, the solution of this problem is no easy matter. It demands the rejection of obsolete habits and indicators. However, it is absolutely necessary for the country, the people and our future."

The petrochemical plants within our association are quite old and must be basically retooled. We have quite a number of ideas on this subject. However, the financial, material and manpower resources needed for their full implementation are twice the size of our possibilities. The simplest thing, taking into consideration the experience of carrying out reconstruction projects by our own repair-construction trusts, may seem to allocate them additional manpower ceilings, raise the level of their mechanization and increase equipment procurements for the technical updating of existing production facilities. However, the answer to such entirely sensible considerations is that the resources needed for the full satisfaction of our requirements are lacking.

Understandably, the amount of resources at the disposal of society is always limited. However, this makes it even more important to insure the correct and accurate definition of the priority of targets on which such resources are to be spent. The inertia of extensive economic management methods has led so far to a situation in which huge capital investments are directed essentially into new

construction, scattered among numerous projects, and remain frozen for long periods of time. Unquestionably, we cannot do without new capital construction. However, quite frequently, the increased production of goods needed by the country, the production of new goods, can be achieved more economically by the technical retooling of existing production facilities. In the case of our association and other enterprises reconstruction is quite a bothersome matter and is somehow considered less prestigious than engaging in new construction. Compared with new construction however, its economic results are higher by a factor of three.

Substantial capital investments for new construction are appropriated for our association as well. The contracting organizations are unable to use these funds on time and in full. Meanwhile, we cannot, we have no right to use such funds for reconstruction and technical retooling of existing facilities, for such funds are included in a different item of the state plan.

I am convinced that the resources available for each sector must be channeled more decisively and in greater amounts into the reconstruction of existing production facilities. This will enable us significantly to accelerate the installation of the equipment and the development of new technological processes.

Improving the practice of planning the growth of labor productivity, which is one of the most important work effectiveness indicators of industrial enterprises and production associations, will contribute to the solution of this key problem. This indicator which, as we know, characterizes gross output per worker could be improved and the volume of output could be raised without changing the number of workers and even by reducing this number without, however, changing the volume of output.

In the petrochemical industry wages account for no more than six percent of overall outlays per ton of petroleum products. That is why the means through which a petrochemical enterprise achieves the growth of labor productivity is not in the least a matter of indifference in terms of the national economy. It is obvious that with such a structure of outlays the end national economic results will be considerably greater if labor productivity is increased primarily by raising the volumes of output. That is why in sectors where, like in petrochemistry, the share of wages in production costs is low, in my view it would be inexpedient to plan for enterprises and associations a mandatory reduction in the number of workers. This would discourage the enterprises to renovate their equipment and production technology to a higher extent than is the case presently.

With this in mind I would like to suggest yet another new aspect: fluctuating wholesale prices of individual commodities. For example, if during a three-year period a given enterprise has not improved the quality or volume of output providing, naturally, that such increases are needed by society, and in which production costs are not reduced, the wholesale price of such goods should be lowered by 5 or even 10 percent. The approved plans for the volume of output, based on the old price, would remain the same. In that case the reduction of the wholesale price would hit the pocket of a collective working by inertia painfully. The volume of goods marketed and the amount of profits and, consequently, withholdings for the economic incentive fund would be reduced. The enterprise would be

considered as having failed to fulfill its plan. The plan, however, is the law. Its implementation, as the congress emphasized, must be demanded most strictly. The first to be taken to task will be the managers who because of inability or the desire for a peaceful life would be at the tail end of technical progress and would have failed to use properly the resources entrusted to them by the socialist society.

We have all the necessary facilities for production of goods which are absolutely competitive on the world market and for export of both crude oil and refined petroleum products. We can supply the domestic market 100 percent of the goods it needs, bearing the state Emblem of Quality. I believe that such work must become and will become the work standard of each enterprise or association, if not today then absolutely tomorrow. "We neither can nor should accept anything below the corresponding best worldwide and domestic standards," the CC CPSU accountability report to the congress emphasized. "We must train to demand this. We must strive toward it and firmly reject everything that is obsolete, backward and depreciated by life itself." This applies not only to equipment and technology but equally to the areas of planning and management. It is precisely here that we must abandon obsolete planning methods and indicators and surmount the inertia of economic thinking more firmly and daringly than in the past. It is precisely this that is stipulated in the work program for the improvement of the economic mechanism stipulated by the congress.

5001

CSO: 1802/13

FOR THE GOOD OF THE PEOPLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 62-64

[Article by V. Gridneva, weaver at the Oktyabr' Worsted Production Association]

[Text] Now, when the party has formulated an extensive program for the further growth of the living standard of the people, the drastic improvement in the quality of goods in mass demand becomes particularly important. For us, things do not take the place of people. In a socialist society we are producing material goods for the people, for the satisfaction of their needs, and for the creation of conditions which insure the all-round development of the individual. That is why the struggle for high quality of output is not merely a production task. It is a task of tremendous social importance and a true manifestation of concern for the people.

Our industry is producing an increasing amount of more varied consumer goods with every passing year. In the 10th Five-Year Plan many collectives increased the volume of goods bearing the honorific pentagonal sign. Rich experience has been acquired, and thousands of enterprises are applying comprehensive quality control systems. Nevertheless, there still remain enterprises whose items find no market and remain on the shelves of stores for long periods of time. Yet labor has been invested in them. The result is that the national economy suffers losses while the population is deprived of many necessary items. Such negative phenomena will recur as long as the managers of such enterprises focus on "gross output," rather than on the needs of the consumer, on end results.

In the course of their daily work all workers without exception in the industrial sectors producing consumer goods must be guided by the following simple rule: see to it that anyone who enters a store to make a purchase can purchase items according to his taste, needs and volume. Our work methods must change a great deal if this is to take place. Above all, we must organize the permanent study of demand. We must know what the customers think of our goods and we must replenish and renovate their variety promptly. The strengthening of relations between industrial and trade organizations and the enhancement of their reciprocal responsibility for end results must play a role in this respect. The same type relations must be developed between enterprises producing finished goods and related enterprises which supply them with raw materials, materials, and semi-finished products.

Under the 10th Five-Year Plan the Oktyabr' Worsted Production Association, where I work, increased its output of high quality fabrics. Thanks to technical retooling and improved organization of labor and production labor productivity rose and working conditions improved.

Socialist competition plays an important role in the life of our association. We are competing against the collectives of the Kalinin and Ivanovo Worsted and Tibilisi Cloth Combines. We have concluded labor cooperation contracts with 16 trade and clothing associations. The results of the labor competition are summed up regularly and the exchange of progressive experience is broadening. In standing on labor guard in honor of the 26th CPSU Congress, in a two-month period the association's collective produced above-plan goods worth 400,000 rubles and over-fulfilled its obligations considerably.

In the struggle for high production quality ever greater attention is being paid to the study of consumer demand. We have organized direct relations with 63 firm-owned stores and trade and clothing associations in various parts of the country. They sent us information which enables us to take consumer demand into consideration better and to expand and renovate the variety of fabrics produced. Last year the collective of our art workshop submitted 19 models of fabric for evaluation, 16 of which were assigned the "N" index (new item).

Demand for many types of fabrics we produce keeps rising. However, if we were to ask ourselves whether we have done everything possible for its satisfaction and whether we have used all of our opportunities, the only possible answer could be that we could produce a far greater number of good quality items needed by the people.

Currently I service 12 looms, which is double the norm. I work without defects. I could handle as many as 16. I believe that this is not the limit and that many workers could achieve similar results. However, it frequently happens that even with six looms the weavers must do very intensive work. Frequent breaks caused by the poor quality of individual batches of yarn sharply reduce productivity and increase equipment idling. The spinning workers are to be blamed but they too have their problem. Twenty-seven percent of the raw materials they receive go to waste with the initial treatment. If economists in our sector would estimate step by step the sum total of our losses, starting with the reduced rate of the wool due to the inadequate grazing of the sheep and ending with poorly made suits or overcoats which no one wants to purchase, the resulting amount would be substantial. In all likelihood, an assessment of losses in other production facilities would produce similar results. By improving the quality we could not only eliminate such losses but could also increase the production of good quality items in demand by the population considerably. That is precisely why the struggle for quality must be waged at all levels and in all stages of the production process, ranging from raw materials to finished products.

Unfortunately, not everyone understands as yet that the role of a person in the production process is determined less by the prestige of his profession than by the quality of his work. In the weaving industry paper cones and cylinders are used as bobbins. They cost a few kopecks each. They are manufactured by the thousands and, obviously, not all the workers engaged in their manufacturing ascribe the necessary significance to their work. This is wrong. With a different attitude toward their work they would save the weavers a great deal of unpleasantness: the frequent defects on the cone surfaces result in the losses of dozens of meters of expensive fabrics.

Today the role of the person in the production process has increased exceptionally. Individual responsibility for end results must be increased correspondingly. Collectives which have failed to realize this simple truth tolerate the low quality of labor and find all sorts of justifications for it. I believe that such justifications are unnecessary. Everyone can work well and carry out his obligations impeccably. Naturally, this requires the necessary professional training and experience. However, a conscientious attitude toward labor and true concern for the people who will benefit from this labor remains the main prerequisite for high work quality.

A poorly made object, whether a suit, a television set or a refrigerator, can only create a durable bad mood in the purchaser and cause unnecessary difficulties related to repairs or exchange. However, does anyone among us who manufactures raw materials, fabrics, parts or designs bear this in mind? When we see occasionally an experienced and highly skilled weaver who is "running after volume," ignoring the quality of the fabric, relying on the obliging nature of the controller in the quality control department, we realize yet one more time that in our collective we have accomplished far from everything possible to develop in every worker a proper attitude toward his work.

The labor and social activities of each collective and every working person must be imbued with concern for the people. The production of consumer goods and the development of services is a prime party assignment. We must see to it that the party organizations and their members, as they fight for the implementation of the party's economic policy, guide the organizational and educational work in the collectives toward the enhancement of the individual responsibility for the quality of the work of every participant in the production process.

The socialist competition for effectiveness and quality, which became extensively widespread under the 10th Five-Year Plan, yielded rich results. Labor competitiveness triggered the aspiration to improve one's skill and develop a feeling of worker's pride. Thousands of working people in many enterprises throughout the country earned the title of excellent quality workers and the right to supervise their own work. They became winners of labor skill competitions. Now, in connection with the assignments set by the congress, socialist competition rises to a new level. High work quality must become the moral duty, the demand of one's conscience and the norm of behavior of every working person. Such is the imperative of the time.

The materials of the 26th congress emphasize that "expanding the production process and improving the quality of consumer goods and developing consumer services assume prime significance in the party's efforts to upgrade the well-being of the people." A number of important measures must be implemented in this area, such as equipping light industry with modern facilities, improving raw and other material supplies for it, insuring higher growth rates for group "B," increasing the role of trade in determining the variety and quality of goods and many others. These measures, which are the foundation for the long-term comprehensive target program, are aimed at developing the production of consumer goods and services for the population on a truly modern basis, consistent with the people's needs.

The collective of tens of thousands of light and heavy industry, agricultural, trade and service enterprises will participate in the implementation of the comprehensive target program. Today they are united by the common task of mobilizing their efforts and using all existing reserves in order to produce more good quality goods and improve the quality of population services with the lowest possible outlays. The socialist competition among all working people and all collectives engaged in the production of consumer goods must be channeled precisely into the solution of this problem. By combining our efforts and establishing firm ties among related enterprises, based on labor cooperation contracts, we can achieve high quantitative and qualitative end results.

In the period of the congress our association decided to issue a challenge to a number of industrial and service enterprises for socialist competition for the development of the production of consumer goods and services. In order for the competition to be effective we must consider its organization. We must pay primary attention to bringing up the existing reserves, to formulating and coordinating counterplans among competing enterprises, and upgrading the quality of the work. We are confident that the competition will make it possible for all its participants to make a worthy contribution to the implementation of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress.

5003
CSO: 1802/13

COMPONENTS OF A GOOD MOOD

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 65-68

[Article by A. Lazunen, head of a turners' brigade, Avangard Shipyard, Petrozavodsk]

[Text] Everyone is familiar with the way the mood improves when one is working well and is facing a large and interesting project. Today, when we think of the results with which one's country, plant, and fellow brigade members came to the 26th CPSU Congress, and when we think of the opportunities which the congress' decisions opened to us, our mood becomes twice as good. How not to be pleased, for example, by the fact that under the past five-year plan the Petrozavodsk ship-builders increased their volume of output by nearly one-third, the production of consumer goods by a factor of more than 1.5, and their labor productivity by almost 30 percent. We are also proud of the fact that one of the diplomas earned by the Soviet Union at the Inrybprom-80 International Exhibit was gained by our plant's collective which is producing diesel powered freighters of the Kizhi class and Palanga-class fishing trawlers. As to our brigade, it fulfilled its assignment for the first two months of the first year of the 11th Five-Year Plan ahead of schedule, on the day of the opening of the congress. The quality of our entire output is high.

A good mood is always a driving force. It has many components. In my view, one of the most important among them is the brigade labor organization method which is used today by most machine tool piece rate workers at the plant. Piece rate work is a familiar system in which everyone works for himself. It creates arguments and exchange of insults if the foreman gives someone "profitable" items to machine while someone else is given "unprofitable" or more labor-intensive parts. That is why some people work tirelessly while their neighbors smoke their cigarettes or, in general, waste their time....The turners' brigade I head is small. It consists of no more than five members and was established slightly more than 6 months ago. However, even within such a short period of time we were able to realize the advantages of the brigade method of labor organization with wages based on end results.

The collective contracting method means that one works for all and all work for one. The foreman gives the brigade a general assignment such as the machining of a set of parts. The decision concerning the assignment of individual parts is made jointly, based on individual skills and experience. There are no longer arguments concerning "profitable" or "unprofitable" work in the brigade. Earnings are divided in accordance with the worker's grade. Should someone show an inclination

toward laziness we meet for a discussion and may even lower his labor participation coefficient, for if the brigade suffers he should earn less. So far, however, we have not had a case to lower anyone's coefficient, for all brigade members are doing conscientious work.

The brigade's earnings have gone up. However, there is more to it. The people have developed a common interest in how to carry out their assignments better, more quickly and more effectively. Reciprocal support has increased. Previously, if a piece rate worker would take sick leave the part he had begun to machine would wait for his return. One could not even finish it, for this would mean profiting from someone else's efforts. Meanwhile, the common project would suffer. Now one no longer hears as in the past the answer, "You must have your own!" when needing a tool. Everyone in the brigade will back up his comrade with tools and advice how to initiate the machining of the part and how better to carry out the operation stipulated in the blueprint. The saying that one mind is good but two minds are better is an old familiar one. For example, we use several thousand different fastenings. The shop has its nut threaders but they were unsuitable for cutting threads on short bolts, for which reason they had to be cut manually. The brigade considered the problem and invented the proper attachment. Separately, we may not have thought of it.

Both in the shop and at the plant we can feel the aggravation of the problem of industrial manpower in Karelia. Experienced cadre workers are retiring and it is becoming ever more difficult to fill their jobs. We have already taken everything we could out of the machine tools. However, a considerable growth of labor productivity can be achieved by improving its organization. By improving labor discipline in the brigade, developing mutual support and interchangeability and strengthening collective responsibility for labor results, the collective contracting method offers substantial reserves for upgrading labor productivity.

The new type brigades improve the general atmosphere in the collective. It is no secret that administrative penalties do not always have the proper impact on the violators of labor discipline. The influence of the workers' collective is a better educator than any kind of penalty. Amateurs taking a cigarette break during working time, who find themselves in a brigade of the new type, see that everyone around them is at work. If they fail to see this, one could discuss the matter with them as one does among workers. The people then realize that it would be shameful to be expelled from the brigade by one's comrades!

The collective contract method increases the strictness of requirements concerning the level of labor planning and organization in the shop and the enterprise at large. In our brigade today we want to know what we will be doing tomorrow or a week or two weeks later, in order to determine whether or not the warehouse has all the necessary materials and whether or not related services will be able to provide us with the necessary work. When the personnel of shop services fail to cope with the increased volume of plant operations naturally our mood worsens.

Something else that I must mention is the large number of boors we have at work. Apparently, some workers consider boorishness an irreplaceable tool of management. If such a manager comes to the shop and starts shouting at the foreman, whom we justifiably consider the master of the production process, he does not think of

the way he is eroding his own prestige and the prestige of his subordinates in the eyes of the workers. Meanwhile, rudeness frequently triggers a chain reaction. After being scolded, the foreman starts shouting at the workers. This spoils everyone's mood and affects the work. All of us must learn how to address one another without raising our voices or without insulting anyone's dignity. Far stricter party and administrative measures, compared with the present ones, should be applied in the case of those who are unwilling to learn this.

As I perform the troublesome yet very honorable and responsible duties of deputy at the Karel'skaya ASSR Supreme Soviet, and as member of its presidium, I have the opportunity to see and feel quite sharply the extent to which the mood of a plant's collective, the good mood of the individual, are affected by the work of the urban transportation system, the trade, public catering and service enterprises, and the cultural establishments.

In 30 years, literally under my own eyes, the big microrayon in which 140,000 people live today has expanded side by side with the plant. Essentially, this represents a new city. Modern urban construction is inconceivable without comprehensive development which takes into consideration the complex interaction among the various urban services. However, disproportions frequently arise in the course of intensive housing construction in the development of such services and enterprises. Naturally, this hinders the normal living and working conditions of the people. In our rayon as well the new highway, which will lighten the load of the existing one and insure normal transportation, remains unfinished. As a result of the small number of shops many people in the rayon are forced to make their purchases in the center of the city. There is a shortage of service enterprises as well, and landscaping is scarce.

Naturally, the comprehensive development of new rayons is based on the coordinated resolution of a substantial number of economic and organizational problems. I am convinced, however, that even today the joint efforts of urban organizations and industrial enterprises could accomplish a great deal in the development of the microrayon and the improvement of living conditions in it. Party persistence and approach to the work help us to find a solution to even a most complex problem, as practical experience has indicated.

For example, for many years the rayon population suffered from an inadequate water supply. The pressure maintained in the old water main, which was fed through the plant's pump, did not allow the water to reach the upper stories of buildings. What kind of mood could one speak of in such a case? However, in order to be linked to the urban water main grid, whose pressure reached seven atmospheres, the old and rusty pipes in the houses had to be replaced. The use of a conventional method would have required several years. Therefore, the plant set up several shock brigades, procured pipes and stand-pipes and one section and house after another were connected with the urban water supply system.

The problem of heat supplies was resolved as well when the project was taken up with real interest. The point was that most houses in the microrayon were supplied with heat from our plant boiler room and some from the small old boiler room which used coal. Its operation was quite inadequate. The plant's party committee and administration decided to link the "suffering" houses to the plant boiler room.

The problem was not easy to resolve. The plant's boiler room was to be converted from steam to superheated water. The plan calls also for the modernization of the small boiler system and for its conversion from the use of coal to liquid fuel. This will provide all residential buildings in the microrayon with proper heat.

We believe that had the construction workers shown the same persistence the highway would have long been completed and, therefore, the transportation service in the microrayon would have been secured. Now, however, people come to work late, or even if they are on time, they come in a bad mood. Trolley buses are the main transportation system in our microrayon. The moment a trolley bus falls behind schedule by a few minutes several hundred people pile up at the terminal. A second trolley bus line is urgently needed. This, however, requires the construction of a power substation. Unfortunately, its construction is dragging on. The bus situation is even worse. Quite frequently our slowness, formalistic attitude toward the matter or simple irresponsibility are the cause of all of this.

The building of the road, the end of which cannot be predicted, the completion of the substation, whose building is still empty, are part of the officially accepted voters' instructions. As a deputy, I cannot explain to the people why the decisions made and cleared with all interested organizations remain on paper only. Need we say that disparity between word and action strikes at the prestige of governmental and public organizations? The people no longer trust promises.

For example, the personnel of our enterprise remember perfectly well that 30 years ago a decision was made on building a plant house of culture. At that time the appropriated site was even fenced. However, matters did not progress beyond that point. Difficulties arose with the financing of the project. Between 1977 and 1980 the measures stipulated for the development of the Petrozavodsk urban economy stipulated, on an exceptional basis, the building of a plant house of culture for 600 seats out of funds allocated for industrial construction. However, even this decision was not carried out. Once again the construction of a plant house of culture became doubtful.

A rayon, which is inhabited by several tens of thousands of people, has neither a movie theater nor a small club. All we have is the assembly hall at the plant administration building, where we can show one movie per evening for the rayon population. No more than 150 people can see a movie properly in this unsuitable premise. The audience consists essentially of children who have nowhere else to go.

Today a great deal is being said about the education of the youth. However, there is virtually no facility in the rayon for working with young people. Under such circumstances street education begins actively to interfere in the upbringing of children and adolescents. As we know, however, the street teaches nothing good. Unquestionably, with the participation and support of the enterprises, the local soviets could set up in the rayon children's playgrounds and basic sports facilities.

With good will, forces and funds could be made available for the opening of squares, the building of fountains and the placing of benches along the streets for the people to sit down and rest. I repeat, a great deal more could be done if

we think of the people and their mood at all times, and if we always bear in mind the individual with his needs and requirements.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

GREAT RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ARTIST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 68-71

[Article by I. Arkhipova, people's actor of the USSR and Lenin Prize laureate]

[Text] We shall never forget the days of the 26th congress of our communist party... The principled and sincere conversation which took place at the party forum on the subjects of man, work and peace, the atmosphere of practical discussion of the results of the development of the land of the soviets, the scientific substantiation of the further growth of our economic power and the truly paternal concern for the good of the people will be long remembered by us, the envoys of the multimillion-strong army of Soviet communists.

In his presentation of the CC CPSU accountability report to the congress, Comrade I. S. Brezhnev said: "If we were to ask any Soviet person, party or nonparty member, what has distinguished the path of our party in recent years most of all, his answer would be the fact that, most of all, we were able to preserve the peace." These words met with the warm response of all Soviet people, including the men of culture. This is natural, for culture is indivisible from peace.

Time rushes on. However, it is unable to erase from our memories the war years with which we are familiar not only from motion pictures or books. I recall how as a child, with my mother, we rushed to the shelter in the basement of our Moscow home to save ourselves from fascist bombs, or we were barely able to reach the subway station. Those who had managed to find shelter in the station were sleeping on planks laid straight across the tracks. The first words spoken by my then very small brother were "air alarm." This must not happen again!

The appeal which the Leninist party addressed to the world from the rostrum of the congress was heard with new strength: "Our struggle for strengthening the peace and the intensification of detente is above all a struggle for insuring for the Soviet people the necessary external conditions for the solution of its constructive problems. We are thus resolving a problem of a truly universal nature as well, for today no nation faces a more essential, a more important problem than that of the preservation of the peace and of guaranteeing the most important right of every person, the right to life."

Humanism has always been a distinguishing feature of Soviet art. It was and remains the art of peace. We, its representatives, try to bring to the audiences these noble ideals which are close to their hearts. We are inspired by this not

only by our minds but by a feeling of tremendous responsibility, by the awareness of the fact that the future of the planet depends on us, on those who are alive today.

Every party forum in the land of the Soviets is a milestone in the chronicle of the people's accomplishments and a powerful ideological charge for the discovery of new horizons in our creative surges. This is the pulse beat of our entire life. That is precisely why during the congress, the Soviet people, whatever their profession, age or title, experienced once again the unparalleled force of the unity between the party and the masses, the force of the powerful cohesion of the entire Soviet people.

The most important task facing the workers in the socialist arts is the artistic representation of the principals and ideas with which our people live and the comprehensive depiction of the character of the person building communism. "The Soviet people gravitate toward art tremendously," the CC CPSU accountability report to the congress pointed out. "...however, this respect and love for art presumes a great responsibility to his people by the artist." These words are addressed to us, the thousands-strong detachment of the Soviet creative intelligentsia. They make us turn again and again to already created works in order to be able to assess our achievements in the various art types and genres, to study our omissions soberly and principle-mindedly, and to focus our efforts on the still unresolved problems existing in our country.

As an opera singer I am particularly sensitive to problems related to the development of Soviet musical and performing arts, most of all of singing.

In our country, a person whom nature has granted the rare and precious gift of a beautiful and strong voice has all the necessary opportunities for becoming a professional master. Today more than 30 VUZs are training opera performers. As is the case with all higher educational institutions in the Soviet state, training in such schools is free of charge, as legislatively codified in the constitution. The right to engage in professional art is determined in our country by two conditions only: a person's talent and industriousness. In the West, it is determined mainly by capital and, far less frequently than described in the bourgeois press, by luck.

The numerous amateur collectives and schools and conservatories help in the discovery of talent in our country. Reviews and competitions--on the city, republic or all-union level--are sponsored regularly. The most important creative competition is the All-Union Competition Among Vocalists (named M. I. Glinka, sponsored since every 2 years. Sometimes it is far more difficult to win this competition than any other international competition among singers. Furthermore, the competition auditions lead to the discovery of many outstanding talents and amazing voices!

The caring exploration of the youth becomes organically combined with the high aesthetic and vocal standards developed by the music schools. However, whereas in the past operatic theaters recruited competition winners for work on the opera stage without delay, which created a natural continuity of generations, unfortunately this has not been the case in recent competitions. Why have such very useful and promising ties between creative competition and operatic theaters been dis-

turned? Could it be that the theater groups are overcrowded with young talents? I do not think so. In my view, the traditional ties must be restored precisely now, when we are concerned with our future replacements. This will be a truly statesmanlike approach, as demanded by the party congress.

However, it could be wrong to believe that natural gifts alone insure a young talent a trouble-free existence in the field of art. The rapidly growing popularity of an actor--an artist in the broad meaning of the term--may prove to be inversely proportional to his creative longevity. The public may immediately acknowledge such a master but debunks its idol soon afterwards. The stage is merciless and just. The stage performance is a confirmation not only of the natural talent of the performer. It brings up his intellect, taste, and comprehensiveness of his culture. Therefore the actor, the young actor in particular, must not only perfect his professional skill steadily but enrich himself spiritually and develop within himself civic-mindedness and patriotism.

The public plays an infinite role in molding the talent of the opera singer. The unknowledgeable observer alone might assume that the actor feels the reaction of the audience only at the time of applause. Each note and movement are tested and checked against the reaction of the audience which, perhaps, may not even realize this. A silence dominating a crowded hall may contain dozens of emotional shades. This, precisely, is one of the "miracles" of the performing arts.

We, the actors at the Bol'shoy Theater of the USSR, are pleased and delighted by the nationwide love which surrounds our theater. As the years go by, it becomes ever more difficult to obtain a ticket for the Bol'shoy Theater. But why conceal it, it also frequently happens that the happy owner of a ticket is more proud of the fact that he has gone to the theater than of the outstanding opportunity to communicate with the masterpieces of the musical arts which require a certain level of preparation or, to say the least, the desire to understand them. Such a "fan," whether he wishes it or not, carries his own "shade" in the quiet of the audience, representing a dissonance to which we react painfully.

We are always thinking of expanding and improving the ties between the Bol'shoy Theater and the people. This idea guides us in the course of our sponsorship relations, which are getting stronger with every passing day, in our tours of stock construction and projects, and in promoting the musical arts, on the television and the radio. This is the reason for the plan, which is being extensively discussed today, of opening a branch of the Bol'shoy Theater which, in our view, would make it possible for the viewers to become better acquainted with our performances and would broaden opportunities for creative surges on the part of the artistic youth.

The fact that each line of the accountability report submitted by the CC CPSU to the 26th party congress, whatever its subject, can be accepted from the viewpoint of one's own project or profession is the reason, in my view, for the durable significance of this outstanding document.

Let us take as an example the question of the further improvement of the economic mechanism, of economic management. In the organization of theater work, in particular, the importance of economic factors is self-evident. A performance is

the completion of a tremendously labor-intensive and complex process which involves, along with the so-called creative staff, hundreds of specialists in a great variety of skills, dozens of intratheater services and many related enterprises which must carry out important assignments. I used the expression "the so-called creative staff" not for the sake of belittling the dignity of our musicians, singers, ballet dancers or painters, whose merits are universally known, but in order to point out that the work of hundreds and, under the summations of the Bol'shoy Theater, thousands of people who make the performance process possible yet who remain invisible to the audience are, without exception, tremendously creative.

Not only a new production but each one of its performances is a unique phenomenon offering opportunities for non-routine solutions while preserving the artistic integrity of the performance. As I say this, I also think of the stage workers who must rearrange the complex settings with extreme accuracy during the short intermissions; I also think of the clothing shop where a tremendous volume of one-of-a-kind projects related to designing and sewing costumes of all historical ages takes place on a tense schedule. I think of the decorations shop—a collage of real sculptors who create amazing plastic forms on the stage. It would suffice to find oneself even once behind the light control panel to realize that this work resembles that of a computer operator or controller at a big modern airport. The work of most of the masters of the theater is inseparable from intellectual labor and, in my view, is defined by two qualities, creativity and love for the theater which, incidentally, are closely interlinked.

However, the economic conditions governing the labor of this "auxiliary" personnel are still quite imperfect. Labor norms and rates, which clearly fail to take into consideration the specific nature of theater work, and the unjustifiable savings on petty matters which results in major losses and equalization, occasionally puts our specialists in a disadvantageous position compared with workers in the motion picture or television, constantly testing the strength of their love for the theater. The labor dynamics of stage workers, of which the Bol'shoy Theater has always been proud, have begun to break down imperceptively; the influx of young people has declined. Also, this process has afflicted even the famous chorus of the Bol'shoy Theater. It seems to me that the economic aspect of our work must not conflict with the enthusiasm of people dedicated to their art but must encourage it comprehensively.

In the days of the congress we thought of the extent to which we, workers in the arts, are fulfilling our civic duty to the people and the country. "To live with the interests of the people, to share with the people happiness and sadness, to accept the breath of life and our humanistic ideals, and to be an active participant in the building of communism, means true nationality and true party-mindedness in art." These words voiced by Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev at the congress described the main task facing Soviet art. The great responsibility of the artist to the country and to his time is to be worthy of the historical accomplishment of the party and the people who are building communism through his creative work.

5000
LIT: 1802/13

FOR THE SAKE OF THE WORKING PEOPLE THEMSELVES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 72-73

[Article by E. Abakirov, chairman of the Kirgiz Republic Council of Trade Unions]

[Text] Virtually all working people are members of the Soviet trade unions--the most widespread public organization in our country. This can be seen in the example of the Kirgiz trade unions which have a membership of 1,344,000. Today there is virtually no labor collective in the republic without a trade union organization. No single measure is implemented without the participation of the trade unions, which focus their main attention on the development of the economy, upgrading work effectiveness and quality and involving the working people in production management. In this area the main efforts are focused on the further improvement of the socialist competition in which more than one million people are involved. The competition developed particularly extensively in the period of preparations for the 26th CPSU Congress. Higher socialist obligations were assumed by more than 2,500 associations, enterprises and production subunits, and 830,000 working people. On the day the congress opened more than 68,000 production frontrankers had fulfilled their assignments for the first two months of the year, and over 30,000 had fulfilled their first quarterly assignments.

The extensive involvement of the working people in production management remains the target of particular attention on the part of the trade union organizations. Standing production conferences, attended by dozens of thousands of workers, are actively operating in economic subunits. Last year alone more than 60,000 suggestions, resulting in savings in excess of four million rubles, were adopted at the meetings of the standing production conferences whose unified agenda dealt with the item of "Search and Utilization of Reserves for Raising Labor Productivity."

The organizations of the VOIB [All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalizers] and the scientific and technical societies are making a major contribution to the development of the production process. In the 10th Five-Year Plan they applied more than 100,000 inventions and rationalization suggestions with an economic effect equaling 317 million rubles. The republic's trade unions are doing extensive work to insure the effective utilization of the working time and to strengthen socialist labor discipline. All this contributed to the successful implementation of the republic's 1980 plans and obligations and of the five-year plan as a whole.

Together with the economic organs the republic's trade unions carried out comprehensive plans on improving labor conditions and safety and on the implementation of sanitation measures. Slightly under 70 million rubles were spent on labor safety measures under the five-year plan. Within the same period more than one million people improved their health at trade union health establishments and pioneer camps.

The trade unions' successes in the resolution of social problems are based on the continuing aid provided by the party organizations. The working people in Kirgizia, as throughout our entire country, can feel every day the steadily increasing concern of the communist party, its central committee, the politburo and, personally, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary. The Central Committee decree "On the Work of the Karagandinskaya Oblast party committee on the implementation of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress on the party's guidance of trade union organizations and on improving their role in economic and cultural construction" offers clear proof of the increased role of the trade unions in the life of Soviet society. This decree, which became a document of partywide significance, continues to exert a tremendous influence on the level and content of the entire work done by the republic's trade union organizations.

The Communist Party of Kirgizia bureau and secretariat systematically analyze and direct the work of trade union organs. They point out existing shortcomings in a supportive yet exigent manner and support their initiatives comprehensively. The party organizations pay particular attention to the strengthening trade union organizations, assigning well trained specialists to help them. This has resulted in noticeable positive changes in the structure of trade union cadres and activists, which number 320,000 people, including 32,000 party members. The trade union committees of enterprises and kolkhozes alone have elected 13,000 CPSU members and candidate members as their members. It is precisely the party members who set the example of conscientious and selfless implementation of social assignments and who are leading the trade union activists.

The 26th CPSU Congress rated the work of the trade unions at the present stage highly and noted the exceptional extent of their tasks and rights and their great contribution to the building of communism. At the same time, however, they were the subject of important critical remarks. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted that they are not always sufficiently insistent in matters of fulfillment of collective contracts or labor safety; they are still inadequately reacting to violations of labor legislation, bureaucracy and red tape.

To a large extent the same shortcomings may be found in the trade union organizations of our republic, and we shall concentrate all our efforts on their elimination. A great deal remains to be done also in the implementation of the tasks formulated by the congress related to increasing the control of the trade unions and labor collectives over the solution of all problems effecting the work and living conditions of the people, the expansion of their participation in production planning and management, improving cadre selection and placement and insuring the more effective utilization of enterprise and organization funds.

The Kirgiz trade unions will do everything possible to stand on the front ranks of the struggle for the implementation of the historical decisions of the 26th congress of our beloved party.

ON THE ROAD INDICATED BY LENIN

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 74-75

[Article by Vasil Bilak, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee Presidium member and Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee secretary]

[Text] All of us are under the indelible impression of the proceedings of the 26th CPSU Congress. They could be briefly expressed as follows: greatness, creative approach, humanism, love of peace, clarity and intelligibility.

However, the congress is not merely a source of immediate impressions. The program contained in the report submitted by Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, requires profound study and interpretation. Each one of its words or suggestions reflects the tremendous political and organizational work of the CPSU and the great activeness, initiative and dedication of the Soviet people. The program expresses the inflexible resolve to follow the path indicated by the great Lenin. It defines the main directions for the progress of Soviet society in the years to come. It will have a great impact on international developments.

In the broad meaning of the term this is a true program of world socialism and of the progressive and peace-loving forces the world over, a program which opens prospects for revolutionary development and for the solution of the most urgent problems facing mankind.

Today, as confirmed by the reports filed by the biggest news agencies, the attention of the world is justifiably focused on Moscow from where, for more than 60 years, the voice of peace has been heard, appealing for friendship and for the development of equal and mutually advantageous cooperation. This appeal, addressed to the forces of peace and progress and to all realistically-thinking governmental and public leaders, was heard also at the recently held highest Soviet communist forum.

An entirely different voice comes from the camp of imperialism and reaction. Not so long ago the world was waiting to hear what the new U. S. administration in the White House would say. Today, in comparing what was said here in Moscow and what was said in Washington, we see a directly opposite approach to the needs of mankind.

On the one side we hear a constructive program for peace and reciprocal understanding, for developing everything positive which has been achieved over the past decade in the field of international relations, a program for better and more effective management for the benefit of the working person. We hear from the other

side an appeal for the arms race and for the spending of huge funds for the production of ever more destructive weapons to the detriment of the solution of social problems and for the sake of poisoning the international atmosphere. Such a "program" can bring nothing but fear and uncertainty and lead mankind to the edge of a global catastrophe. Fighters for the freedom and progress of the peoples are classified as terrorists, while terrorists are presented as democrats. Values are turned upside down. Lies become truths, black becomes white and slavery becomes freedom.

The Soviet people, the working people of the socialist countries, are well familiar with the true policy of imperialism and of individual capitalist countries and their military associations. However, the working people in the capitalist countries cannot find the truth of the policy pursued by the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries, for it is deliberately concealed or distorted by bourgeois propaganda. No single bourgeois newspaper, however strongly it may boast of the freedom of speech and objectivity, published the text of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's speech in full without distortions. At conferences and meetings bourgeois propaganda leaders loudly speak out in favor of broadest possible information. Meanwhile, they themselves do not allow the people to find the truth about the life of the Soviet people, their labor efforts and their great struggle and desire to live in peace and friendship.

The Soviet Union threatens no one. It has no territorial claims. It is not aspiring to take over other people's resources. On the contrary, it is making tremendous efforts for the preservation of the peace, for the sake of which it suffered so many casualties, for the good of all mankind. The single objective of the Soviet Union is to prevent imperialism from threatening the existence of our civilization.

The new and very clear and specific suggestions formulated by Comrade Leonid Brezhnev from the program of the 16th congress are the organic extension and development of the peaceful efforts of the Soviet Union: a moratorium on the deployment of new medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe by NATO and the USSR; a substantial increase in measures aimed at strengthening trust in military affairs; initiation of talks on the extension of measures of trust to other parts of the world; and rejection of the arms race and initiation of talks on all problems related to the limitation of strategic weapons, disarmament and security.

It is now the turn of the United States and the other capitalist countries to give a positive answer and not to decline the suggestions but to initiate talks on a platform of such great importance to mankind.

The peoples of the world are unwilling to live in an atmosphere of fear for the future or to participate in preparations for suicide. Albeit slowly, to a rising extent they are learning the truth about who is threatening their existence and who is systematically trying to throw them down the precipice. The forces of peace are growing and strengthening. We are deeply convinced that an ever increasing number of politicians will take the will of the people into consideration.

Our delegation which was headed by Comrade Gustav Husak, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee general secretary and president of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, expressed the true opinion of the Czechoslovak people by

stating that it fully supports the efforts of the USSR, including the new specific suggestions aimed at strengthening the peace and that, together with the Soviet Union, it will participate actively in this historical struggle.

Unquestionably, our own 16th Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Congress will support in full the peaceful initiatives of the Soviet Union and will formulate methods for their implementation in the specific activities of the party and the Czechoslovak state.

I am very happy to have had the opportunity to be a member of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia delegation to the 26th CPSU Congress and a witness to the formulation of a program for the all-round development of Soviet society on the road to the building of communism and of the new initiatives for strengthening the peace--the basic prerequisite for human life--the world over.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

SOURCE OF PRIDE AND HOPE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 76-78

[Article by Nguyen Tkohn Le, Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee member]

[Text] The 26th congress of the great CPSU is a political event of exceptional importance to the members of the socialist comity and international communist and workers movements. It is the center of attention of all progressive mankind. This is quite natural, for the CPSU--the party of the great Lenin--is the vanguard of international communist and workers movements, and since the Soviet Union is the most powerful socialist state and the bulwark and hope of the peoples of the world.

Like all guests of the congress, the delegation of the Communist Party of Vietnam listened with unabated attention to the report submitted by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, the worthy continuator of Lenin's cause, outstanding leader of the international communist workers movements, and great friend of the Vietnamese people. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's report was the creative summation of the comprehensive constructive activities of the CPSU in the interval between its 25th and 26th congresses and, as a whole, the 1970's. The communist party and the Soviet people are fully entitled to be proud of the tremendous successes they have reached. These feelings are shared by all socialist fraternal countries. As Comrade Le Duan, the general secretary of our party's Central Committee, stated in his greetings to the 26th CPSU Congress, "every victory achieved by the USSR in the building of communism is a source of pride and hope for the freedom-loving peoples."

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's report clearly defines the road leading to new and even more impressive heights in the development of the national economy and science and technology for the good of the Soviet people and for the sake of the common interest of the members of the socialist comity and the defense of the peace throughout the world by the working class, kolkhoz peasantry and people's intelligentsia of the Soviet Union. The report provided a profound analysis of the international situation. It brought up the main trends of today's global development and formulated initiatives which clearly reflect the goodwill and sincere desire for peace of the Soviet Union. The forces of peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism see in this a mobilizing incentive for thoughts and practical actions.

The report by Comrade N. A. Tikhonov, USSR council of ministers chairman, on "Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985

and the Period Through 1990" will help us realize even more profoundly the scale reached by the Soviet people and the great tasks they face in the years to come.

The communist party, the working class and the people of the Soviet Union have made the most basic and decisive contribution to the changes which have taken place in the world over the past more than 60 years. Each CPSU congress makes the halo of Marxist-Leninist doctrine increasingly brilliant. The 26th congress is a beacon which will illuminate the path of mankind in the 1980's with the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's report and the other documents of the 26th CPSU Congress are an invaluable treasury of theoretical thinking and practical experience for all socialist countries and for the international communist and workers movements.

For many decades, the Vietnamese people were forced to fight foreign aggressors. We resolved the problem of the national-democratic revolution and left the entire country to the building of socialism following the total liberation of the southern part of Vietnam in April of 1975. Our party acquired the possibility of focusing its work of the leadership of the masses from the mobilization of the forces for a nationwide resistance to the interventionists to healing the wounds of the war and restoring and engaging in the further development of the national economy. The Fourth Communist Party of Vietnam Congress, which was held in December of 1976, earmarked a proper course for social and economic development, as a result of which we were able to achieve impressive successes. To us problems of national economic management are new, for which reason we were deeply interested in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's statement in his report that "national economic management is the core of all party and state activities. It is precisely in the field of economics that we lay the foundations for the solution of social problems and for strengthening the defense capability of the country and the foundations for an active foreign policy."

This statement by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev is a reminder of the need to study the experience of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries comprehensively in order to conduct our economic work even more successfully with a view to normalizing and improving the life of the people, building socialism, and insuring the reliable protection of our fatherland which is threatened by the expansionistic and hegemonistic policy of reactionary forces within the Chinese leadership.

Our party and people express their most profound and sincere gratitude to the communist party, the government and the people of the Soviet Union for the valuable, tremendous and comprehensive aid they gave our country in the restoration and development of the national economy. The 1978 friendship and cooperation treaty concluded between Vietnam and the Soviet Union, and the agreements which followed it, particularly those on cooperation in petroleum exploration and extraction, marked a new stage in the all-round interaction between our two countries. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out with perfect accuracy that "Today it is impossible to conceive of any confident development of one or another socialist country or the successful solution by it of problems such as securing power resources and raw materials and applying the latest achievements of science and technology without maintaining ties with the other fraternal countries."

The members of the socialist comity, whose bulwark is the Soviet Union, are a reliable bastion of peace throughout all the world and the hope of progress for mankind. The imperialists and their accomplices are doing everything possible to oppose the socialist countries, for they fear socialism like the owl fears sunlight. This is confirmed by the thoroughly coordinated treacherous and dangerous intrigues mounted by our class enemies, as is the case with Poland. From the rostrum of the 26th CPSU Congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev solemnly stated, "...The Polish communists, the Polish working class and the working people of that country can firmly rely on their friends and allies; we shall not leave socialist and fraternal Poland in trouble or to fend for itself!"

That is precisely the way the Soviet Union acted when the clique of Beijing leaders attacked Vietnam at the beginning of 1979. The USSR gave the Vietnamese people all the help they needed for the protection of our fatherland. The Soviet Union's words and actions reflect the highly principled nature of socialist internationalism. They set the example to the socialist countries and to the communist and workers' parties of fulfillment of duty strictly in accordance with the Leninist understanding of the task of uniting the proletariat of all countries and the oppressed nations.

It is indeed difficult to describe briefly all the thoughts triggered by the great congress of a great party!

These are merely initial impressions. In conclusion, allow me to express what is, in my view, the most important: the 26th CPSU Congress is a congress which embodies the mind and conscience of our epoch, a congress of builders of the people's happiness and of defenders of the peace.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

IN THE INTEREST OF ALL MANKIND

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 78-

[Article by Pen Sovan, deputy chairman of the People's Revolutionary Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea]

[Text] On behalf of the delegation of the United Front for National Salvation and the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea I would like to share the impressions we gained from the 26th CPSU Congress. This was a most progressive event in the world's communist movement and was welcomed by the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties.

The congress not only demonstrated the intensive efforts made by the CPSU for the building of communism in the Soviet Union but also pointed the road to be followed by the world communist movement with a view to preserving the peace and insuring the social progress and well-being of the peoples, which is consistent with the aspirations of all mankind.

The socialist gains and the political, economic and social course charted by the congress reflect the selfless efforts of the communist party and the Soviet working people, who have always assisted mankind in its progress. Without engaging in profound studies, we can cite two vivid examples in this area:

The great October Socialist Revolution created conditions for the appearance of world socialism. It was thanks to its existence that for the first time in the history of the development of human society, in which the oppression of the working people by the exploiting classes had always dominated, that a ratio of forces favoring the three global revolutionary currents of our time developed;

In World War II millions of Soviet people gave their lives in the struggle against fascism. These sacrifices contributed largely to the salvation of mankind from the threat of annihilation.

The CPSU Congress, as the highest rostrum of the Soviet communists, is also an inexhaustible source of information on the greatest positive factor of development in our epoch-- the progress toward peace and socialism. The 26th CPSU Congress formulated initiatives which assist the three global revolutionary currents in the implementation of their socialist tasks and in preventing the threat of war provoked by American imperialism and Beijing expansionism and hegemonism.

The domestic and foreign policy of the USSR, formulated at the 26th congress, enables the international public to realize unequivocally that this policy is the extension of the systematic and consistent struggle waged by the USSR for the consolidation of peace and the building of communism. This is confirmed by the program adopted for the development of all areas of economic life with a view to insuring the laying of the material-technical and spiritual foundations for communism along with upgrading the living standard and well-being of the people.

The implementation of the economic development program will make it possible for the Soviet Union to perform its international proletarian duty as well. This confirms its loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and is an eloquent confirmation of the humanistic ideals of the CPSU and the Soviet people. The example of the support which the Soviet Union gave our people in their struggle for national liberation and for the building of true socialism in Kampuchea enables the peoples who were or still are under the yoke of all types of oppression to gain a clear idea of the advantages of a socialist economy which enables weak countries proudly to take the road to progress.

The economic development of the Soviet Union reflects the aspiration of the industrious Soviet people to strengthen the defense capability of their country for the sake of the defense of socialism and peace the world over and to be a reliable bulwark against the threat of wars imposed by imperialism.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is a policy of peace, detente and international cooperation. Many of the important features of the CC CPSU accountability report, submitted by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to the congress, created great interest in the international public. This particularly applies to suggestions on expanding the existing zones and creating new zones of trust in military affairs, and to the formulation of other initiatives which contribute to limiting, reducing and gradually terminating all activities related to increasing nuclear armaments and manufacturing new types of weapons.

Recently the Soviet Union called upon the ASEAN members to hear and to accept the suggestions of the three countries in Indochina on defining reciprocal relations with a view to the conversion of Southeast Asia into a zone of peace and stability, for the sake of the specific implementation of ideas leading to securing peace on earth. A constructive position on the part of the ASEAN members regarding these suggestions would be consistent with the interests of the peoples of the area. Our peace initiatives and the active support of them by the Soviet Union, give us pride and faith in the international solidarity among the members of the great socialist family.

The People's Republic of Kampuchea sincerely and fully supports the policy and positive activities of the Soviet Union in the name of peace on earth. It expresses its most profound gratitude to the Soviet Union which is assisting in the social progress of Kampuchea with all its forces and wholeheartedly. We are firmly convinced that the implementation of the political, economic and social program formulated by the 26th CPSU Congress will lay an even stronger foundation for the strengthening and development of relations of brotherhood and fruitful cooperation between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Kampuchea.

OUR PRIMARY TASKS AND SOVIET COMMUNIST FORUM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 80-84

[Article by Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee, Revolutionary Council chairman and prime minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan]

[Text] The 26th CPSU Congress was an outstanding event for the Soviet people and for all progressive mankind. It already has and will continue to have, for a long time to come, a beneficial influence on strengthening all detachments of the global revolutionary process and on the preservation and consolidation of peace on earth.

The report by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, entitled "Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 26th CPSU Congress and on the Forthcoming Party Tasks in Domestic and Foreign Policy," provided a deep and comprehensive study of the results of the development of the Soviet state in all areas of social life--economic, sociopolitical and spiritual--on the status of political, organizational and ideological-educational party work and on the current situation in the world. It also provided an extensive program for the further building of communism in the USSR and defined the main directions of CPSU domestic and foreign policy. It brought up the basic problems to be resolved and indicated ways to resolve them.

Our entire party and the working people of DRA [Democratic Republic of Afghanistan] warmly wish our great neighbor and loyal friend, the Soviet Union, great successes in implementing the decisions of the 26th party congress. The successes achieved by the land of the soviets are the successes of the cause of peace and of the forces of social progress.

The CC CPSU accountability report to the party congress is a document of great theoretical and practical significance in which the creative development of scientific theory is combined with the formulation of topical problems facing the CPSU and the Soviet people. It arms the party members and all Soviet people with a knowledge of the present situation and of social development in the future.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's report is of exceptional value not only to the CPSU and the Soviet people. It considers from the positions of scientific theory problems of the development of the global socialist system, relations with the liberated countries and the capitalist world, and the situation in the international communist movement.

A substantial part of the report deals with the development of the liberated countries and their relations with the Soviet Union. We fully accept the report's conclusions which sum up the leading trends of the progress of the liberated countries. They help us to gain a better understanding of the course of social development in these countries. Naturally, each of these countries develops differently, in accordance with its internal conditions and relationships of the country in the area and throughout the world. However, the main directions of their progressive development are similar. They were concretized by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the CC CPSU accountability report to the congress.

What are the directions of progress discussed in the report? Let me list them:

Gradual elimination of the positions of the imperialist monopolies and of the local big bourgeoisie and the feudal lords, and restricting the activities of foreign capital; insuring the people's state command positions in the economy and conversion to the planned development of production forces and encouraging the cooperative movement in the countryside; upgrading the role of the toiling masses in social life and gradually strengthening state apparatus with national cadres loyal to the people; and adoption of an anti-imperialist foreign policy by such countries, whose revolutionary parties, which express the interests of the broad toiling masses, are strengthening.

It would be proper to mention that the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th Party Congress formulates the basic and most essential laws governing the organization of a new and progressive society in the liberated countries, consistent with the expectations and basic interests of the broad toiling masses.

Why were these laws discovered precisely by the Leninist party? First of all, because the party has long traditions in the formulation of a scientific theory of social development. Secondly, loyal to the principles of proletarian internationalism, the CPSU has always maintained contacts with the leaders of revolutionary-democratic parties and studied the experience of revolutionary struggle in different areas and countries. As most consistent internationalists the CPSU and the Soviet state are providing comprehensive economic, scientific and technical and cultural assistance to the developing countries. They train cadres and assign their specialists to build most important projects in such countries. Finally, these laws were discovered mainly because the CPSU Central Committee is headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, the worthy continuer of V. I. Lenin's work, a very great theoretician, an outstanding political leader of our time and a tireless fighter for peace and social progress.

The all-round study of the development of the liberated countries, provided at the 26th Congress, is of exceptional value to the NDPA [People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan]. The party, which recently became a ruling party, has a particular need for the theoretical substantiation of the future of the country's revolutionary-democratic development, a future which will take into consideration both objective conditions and subjective factors.

The CC CPSU accountability report defines most fully the position of the Soviet state regarding requests submitted by liberated countries for the strengthening of

the defense capability. It was expressed, fully and convincingly, toward our country as well. The position of the Soviet Union toward the DRA is consistent with the basic interests of our revolution and of the toiling people of Afghanistan. It guarantees the progress of the revolution and the socioeconomic progress of the DRA. We express our profound gratitude to the CPSU, and to the government and the heroic people of the Soviet Union for the firm support and all-round prompt aid given to our country in the most difficult period of its history, with a view to repelling the armed aggression of the forces of reaction and imperialism, and the defense of Afghanistan's independence and territorial integrity. It was the help of the Soviet Union which prevented the division of Afghanistan. It is precisely for this reason that the enemies of Afghanistan mounted a fierce slanderous propaganda campaign against USSR aid and against the new stage of the April revolution. Had the Soviet Union failed to give us this timely aid, no free, independent and sovereign Afghanistan would have existed today.

The victory of the new stage of the Afghan revolution marked the end to all persecution and unjustified repressions. The revolutionary legality and the true principles of the April revolution were restored. The inviolability of individual citizens was insured and conditions were created for the return to the homeland of individuals who had left it as a result of the threats and deceptions of the enemies, the imperialists and the reaction.

For the first time in our country's history the "Basic Principles of the DRA" were adopted. This is a provisional truly democratic constitution based on social justice and guaranteeing all the rights of the citizens of Afghanistan and a number of other laws. Various social organizations were founded. Conferences were held by the country's clergy, attended by more than 600 delegates. An all-Afghan conference of the intelligentsia was held, attended by more than 2,000 people; conferences were held by teachers and health and agricultural workers.

The Afghan trade unions, which number more than 160,000 workers, resumed their activities. The first congress of DRA trade unions was held in March of 1981. Unions of writers and poets and workers in the arts and journalists were founded. The Afghan Rural Cooperatives held a rally attended by 1,500 delegates from all parts of the country, who founded the Union of Afghan Cooperatives. The first all-Afghan conferences of women and young people were held, attended by dozens of foreign delegations. The conferences marked the beginning of a new stage in the women's and youth movements in Afghanistan. Dozens of tribal councils were set up as organs for the unification of the country's tribes. The conference of national and patriotic forces, summoned with a view to preparing the founding of a National Patriotic Front, was a most important measure. Representatives of all social organizations and political and social leaders participated in the proceedings of this noteworthy conference.

Despite the increase of the counterrevolution and its foreign supporters, the economic situation of the country gives us confidence. The 1980 volume of agricultural and industrial output was somewhat higher than the 1979 indicators. Foreign trade has become considerably energized. We are totally convinced that if foreign intervention and the subversive activities of gangs sent to us from abroad were to stop, we would reach even greater successes. Using the pretext of the

so-called "Afghan problem," U. S. imperialism is trying to intensify the arms race and fan against Afghanistan and the USSR the hysteria of cold war times.

At the present stage of the revolution we are facing big and difficult yet solvable problems of a economic, social and political nature. The defense of the revolution and of the revolutionary gains of the Afghan people from armed aggression remains the primary task, for the enemies of the revolution have not abandoned their attempts to create an atmosphere of uncertainty and concern in the country through terror, murders, arson of schools, hospitals and mosques, while U. S. imperialism and its Chinese accomplices, the Pakistani militaristic regime and the regime of Sadat and other revolutionaries are continuing to equip and arm the Afghan counterrevolution. We are confident, however, that we shall be able to deal a crushing rebuff to all such shameful attempts, for our people are fully resolved to defend their revolutionary gains. All progressive forces in the world, headed by the USSR, are on our side. We are equally confident that with the help of our friends we shall surmount all difficulties and build a new and just society in our country.

Our party is pursuing a consistent international policy based on the principles of peace, national sovereignty and further strengthening of international relations. We reassert the fact that free, independent and progressive Afghanistan will always be a good neighbor, as your friend, brother and fellow worker of the great Soviet Union. We shall develop our relations with all peace-loving countries on the basis of mutual respect, noninterference in reciprocal affairs and the solution of disputes through political talks.

We realize most clearly that the struggle for the great ideals of our revolution is no simple matter and that it will require numerous victims and the stress of all our forces. However, we are optimists and believe firmly that, with the help of the inexhaustible strength of the Afghan people and the all-round aid of our friends, headed by the great Soviet Union, we shall win the final victory. We shall unquestionably win and the cause for which the Afghan revolutionaries are giving their lives in the struggle against imperialism, reaction and hegemonism is just and historically justified.

To the Afghan revolutionaries the 26th CPSU Congress has become yet another powerful source of inspiration in the struggle for this just and great cause.

During the congress, on 27 February, to be specific, I met with Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the Kremlin. In the course of the talk, which took place in a warm and fraternal atmosphere, problems of the further development of relations between the NDPA and the CPSU and of the intensification of all-round Afghan-Soviet cooperation were discussed. Views were exchanged on some international problems. The intrigues of imperialist and hegemonistic forces and of the regional reaction, aimed against the Afghan revolution, were condemned and the firm resolve was expressed to defend Afghan independence and sovereignty. The inflexible desire to help in the political settlement of the Afghan circumstances, on the basis of the principles formulated in the 14 May 1980 declaration of the DRA government and the Afghan-Soviet 16 October 1980 declaration, was emphasized.

During the talk, once again, on behalf of the NDPA, I expressed full agreement with the suggestions contained in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's report to the 26th CPSU Congress on strengthening the peace and security of the peoples as a whole and in the area of the Persian Gulf in particular.

We value highly the messages we received from Comrades L. I. Brezhnev and N. A. Tikhonov on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the conclusion of the friendship treaty between Afghanistan and Soviet Russia of 28 February 1921.

During our stay in the USSR we met with working people and the public. I addressed the Arsenal Production Collection in Kiev, famous for its revolutionary and labor traditions, and the working people of Moscow on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Afghan-Soviet treaty.

We studied the documents of the 26th CPSU Congress at the fifth plenum of the NDPA Central Committee. The plenum gave a high rating to the work of the 26th CPSU Congress and pointed out that a great deal remains to be done for the members of the NDPA to master the ideas of the congress and to formulate documents, concepts and slogans aimed at the implementation of the ideals of the April revolution in daily practice creatively, in accordance with the specific situation of the DRA.

The 26th CPSU Congress is the congress of a great party, of Lenin's party. Its documents confirmed yet once again that the life-asserting ideas of peace and fraternity among nations, social justice and social progress originate in Moscow and radiate around the world. We warmly wish the newly elected party Central Committee, headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, the true Leninist and general secretary, great success in the implementation of the plans formulated by the congress.

5003
CSO:1802/13

ARSENAL OF RICH EXPERIENCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 84-86

[Article by Carlos Nunez Tellez, member of the National Leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front and chairman of the State Council of the Republic of Nicaragua]

[Text] The 26th CPSU Congress is of tremendous importance to us. It is, first of all, a source of instructive experience. We studied closely the report which Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, submitted to the congress. It provided an excellent assessment not only of the accomplishments of the Soviet people, headed by the CPSU, but of the international situation as well. In our view, this mature and profound report accurately reflects the realities of the world and the ideas it contains will be useful to the cause of peace. What impressed us most were the far-reaching Soviet proposals in the area of international policy, particularly the appeal for a restraint in the arms race. It is our sincere conviction that all mankind is interested in putting an end to the arms race and we support this appeal with all our hearts.

In order to gain their freedom, our people and our political organization--the Sandinista National Liberation Front--had to resort to arms, to war. That is why we are familiar with its consequences and are aware of its high cost. Therefore, when we heard from the lofty rostrum of the 26th CPSU Congress the appeal to put an end to the arms race and to encourage a policy of detente on a global scale, when we hear it now, at a time of increased tension throughout the world, this is to us of tremendous importance. Allow me to repeat once again that what impressed us most in the section of the report which dealt with CPSU international policy were the Soviet peace initiatives. Let us note in this connection that there were those throughout the world who expected bellicose statements of the Soviet communist congress. However, they were disappointed. Mankind needs peace and the people must do everything possible to achieve it. A world war would be catastrophic. It would mean the end of mankind and no one has the right to instigate such a risk. Comrade Brezhnev was right in drawing that conclusion. That is precisely why we rate his entire report highly.

As to the other aspects of the CC CPSU accountability to the congress, we would like to point out two features. The report synthesizes the tremendous tasks aimed at the all-round strengthening of the socialist society, the implementation of which is the purpose of the efforts of the Soviet people and their communist party. It reflects the numerous economic and social accomplishments achieved over the past 5 years. This applies particularly to the great social benefits enjoyed

by the Soviet people, workers and kolkhoz members, mainly, one five-year plan after another. The second aspect of the report we would wish to emphasize is the following: Comrade L. I. Brezhnev speaks of the CPSU and of its achievements, developments and maturity. Throughout the entire history of the Soviet Union, starting with the accomplishment of the first socialist revolution in the world and its triumph, the party has indeed always remained loyal to Lenin's behests. Once again, at its 26th congress, it proved its tremendous ability to engage in criticism and self-criticism, an ability wh' n sets an example for all. The party clearly described to the Soviet communists the great accomplishments and results of its leading activities while it simultaneously drew their attention to the need to avoid errors or to struggle against errors already made. The entire report is imbued with the feeling of the existence of a real party, of a real vanguard of the Soviet people, guided by the ideas of Leninism.

In addition to Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's brilliant report, naturally, there were other parts of the congress which drew our attention. Let us point out, in particular, the very accurate and energetic speech by Comrade Fidel Castro in which he exposed the policy of the United States, reasserted the loyalty of the Cuban revolution to its founding principles and clarified the position of the Republic of Cuba in the face of the military threats it faces.

I shall mention also briefly the impression made by the report submitted by Comrade N. A. Tikhonov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman, on problems of the Soviet national economy. He discussed economic and social objectives and tasks earmarked by the Soviet state and the CPSU for the 11th Five-Year Plan and through 1990. The report describes these objectives and tasks with impressive power. It creates a feeling of satisfaction when it informs us that the Soviet people--workers and employees and kolkhoz members--will receive a number of new social benefits. Our attention was drawn to the measures aimed at stimulating output in the interest of the entire people. At the same time, the formulation of such measures is combined with granting certain population groups some benefits in health care, social insurance and education. Let us note the benefits planned for working mothers alone.

As a whole, the 26th CPSU Congress was an excellent source of practical experience and great training for the Nicaraguan delegation.

Currently the Sandinista National Liberation Front of Nicaragua is resolving two interrelated and reciprocally complementing tasks which face the entire country as well: production upsurge and the strengthening of defense.

The state organs formulated a special "Self-Restriction and Effectiveness Plan" for 1981. Like the 1980 plan it is concentrated essentially on the development of the country's economy. Both from the economic and social viewpoints it could be said that most of our economy today is developing actively. This year we shall unquestionably dedicate substantial efforts to completing the recovery process of all economic life, which began with the victory of the revolution, and thus to meet the most basic material needs of our people. This could be considered our most important target.

We also intend to follow the road to total economic independence. To this end we shall be closing the gap which has developed in our foreign economic indebtedness and surmount restrictions on our economy imposed from the outside.

Furthermore, we are faced with the task of initiating the process of accumulation and of economic restructuring. Under the specific conditions of our country this presumes strict self-control over consumption, establishing priorities in consumption and, in the final account, insuring high productivity and production effectiveness. Broadly speaking, we can say that this was our specific objective in the formulation of the 1981 economic plan.

Let us emphasize that we are planning on carrying out our intentions within the framework of an economy which will include a private ownership, a state and a mixed sector. We believe that with their help the country will be able to come out of its economic stagnation and successfully develop and give new strength to the revolution.

Which are the most important forces involved in the implementation of the socioeconomic tasks? The most important among them is the working people, headed by the working class. When we speak of the working people we mean the working people of town and country, the petty producers, the people in the liberal professions and the technical specialists. It is precisely they who are the most energetic participants in the process of economic revival and, in general, are the most important linchpin of national unity. This year they must accomplish a qualitative leap forward in accordance with the self-restriction and effectiveness program, as demanded by the country's situation. They must display strict discipline and greater organizational talents. There is yet another very important character involved--our revolutionary state. Its efforts will be concentrated on strengthening the structures which appeared in the course of the revolution and on reorganizing them in order to achieve maximum national economic effectiveness and make full use of their leading role in economics.

Finally, the third important power in the implementation of the "Plan for Self-Restraint and Effectiveness" is the patriotic mood of the entrepreneurs. We are convinced that they will make full use of their manpower and material resources and, aware of their responsibility for the reconstruction of the country, will dedicate even greater efforts for the total restoration of the economy.

Briefly, the targets have been set and the motive forces defined. By combining them we are trying to raise the level of labor productivity and the prosperity of our people. This year the situation in this area can improve. Meanwhile, the revolution will be strengthened and preserve its firm base and depth.

S003
CSO: 1802/13

INTERVIEW WITH KOMMUNIST CONTRIBUTOR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 87-91

[Interview with Gisele Rabesahala, secretary general of the Madagascar Independence Congress Party (ACFM)]

[Text] [Question] Which of the problems of global development raised at the 26th CPSU Congress seem the most important to you?

[Answer] One could say a great deal about the important ideas formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress. However, first among the most fundamental ones was the reformulated idea of peace, which is one of the constants of Soviet policy. I have had the great honor to attend the 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU congresses, and I believe that at all these forums the problems of the preservation of peace and intensification of detente have held one of the central places. Various proposals were formulated for improving the international situation and the problem of how to put an end to existing problems in the world was raised. As we hear all of this discussed at the congress by the delegates, we feel that these are not merely wishes or declarations. When Comrade Brezhnev discusses the peace, the great principle of peace, he formulates the specific suggestions which provide answers to the questions asked not only by the Soviet people but by the entire world public, by anyone who is justifiably concerned with the spreading of aggression in various parts of the world.

I would like to mention something that is particularly worrisome to all progressive and revolutionary forces in the Democratic Republic of Madagascar and, naturally, to our party, the ACFM, something which we consider our main problem: the future of the peace in the Indian Ocean. Let me point out, on this subject, that as early as the 1970s we sponsored a meeting of representatives of area revolutionary parties and organizations in Antananarivo. The meeting was attended by the ACFM (the sponsor), the Communist Party of Reunion, and representatives of Mauritius and the Seychelles. We passed a resolution calling for vigilance toward the attempts being initiated at that time to militarize the Indian Ocean, and the widening of the network of imperialist military bases which are scattered today essentially throughout the Indian Ocean. Naturally, when we speak of the Indian Ocean we have in mind that its status does not affect the coastal states alone. The problems of security or militarization of this ocean affect all countries using its shipping lanes. Since time immemorial the Indian Ocean has been a main route for the fleets of all continents. That is why our party has always been very interested in the suggestions formulated by the USSR on this matter. Such was the case several years ago, when a Soviet-American meeting on detente in the Indian

Ocean took place on the initiative of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev; such was also the case during L. I. Brezhnev's last trip to India, when he formulated the Soviet proposals aimed at weakening the tension in the Indian Ocean area. Let us emphasize that what has made all these suggestions even more interesting to us is that for the past 10 years the Malagasy people and our party have paid close attention to this problem and President Ratsiraka of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar has also repeatedly expressed of late his concern regarding the threat hanging over this area. As early as 1973, as minister of foreign affairs, Ratsiraka exposed U. S. attempts to turn the island of Diego Garcia into a military base. As we know, this base is aimed mainly at the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. However, it also presents a threat to all neighboring countries. Last year, during the ceremonies marking the fifth anniversary of the adoption of a socialist orientation by Madagascar, President Ratsiraka formulated new proposals. He invited all interested parties to hold a conference in Antananarivo to study possible practical actions aimed at making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. At the same time, he called for the conclusion of a treaty which would insure safe navigation in the Indian Ocean.

And now, at the 26th CPSU Congress, Comrade Brezhnev's report raises the question of the Indian Ocean once again and reasserts USSR readiness to participate in any initiative which would truly contribute to the conversion of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. We realize the full extent of the importance of this statement and are confident that it will give new strength to the Malagasy people, to the leaders of our country and to the peoples of the other coastal states in their struggle against the threat of war in our area and in the rest of the world.

Along with the idea of peace, which imbues the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th Congress with the ideas of the advance of the global revolutionary process, the expansion and consolidation of the front of revolutionary and progressive forces and, most of all, the growth of the world communist movement play a key part. Naturally, all of these processes are interrelated and the successes of the revolutionary process and of its motive forces must be assessed in accordance with the overall global circumstances which are quite alarming today. This does not mean in the least, however, that the world's revolutionary movement is losing. For example, let us consider objectively the national liberation movement, which is a structural component of the world's revolutionary process. We have reasons to be optimistic in this area: very few countries remain under the heel of imperialism. Last year's proclamation of Zimbabwe's independence was yet another example of the insurmountability of the global revolutionary process. I consider this an important positive phenomenon which must be emphasized.

The irrepressible development of the national liberation movement is triggering a growing concern in the camp of global reaction, imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism. The point is that today the national liberation movement means a struggle not only for political but also for economic liberation if the struggle which the patriotic forces are waging for national independence is consistent in prescribing a progressive social nature to demands for respect for and recognition of national sovereignty. I think that this very fact is an achievement of the world's progressive movement. To begin with, it remains unabated with the passing of time. The October Revolution set for the peoples of the liberated country an example of the type of future they could have, a future free from all forms of

exploitation and oppression. Therefore, positive changes may be found in the development of the circumstances. However, the same circumstances contain certain alarming factors. The point is that, faced with the scope of the liberation struggle, the increased awareness of the peoples of the young countries and the strengthened relations between the movement for national liberation and the socialist camp, the capitalist forces are becoming increasingly uneasy. Today they are resorting to all possible maneuverings in order, first of all, to hold back the upsurge of the national liberation movement and, secondly, to divide and isolate from each other the three components of the global revolutionary process. They target their attacks against the young countries which are following the road to socialism. These countries, while few, have already become a real force. I believe that this is a noteworthy feature. It is a question of the experience in the building of socialism, an experience which must be developed. In Africa, for example, the appearance of countries choosing the socialist road of development is a relatively new phenomenon, if we remember the feelings which predominated 20 to 30 years ago. The very existence of these countries contributed to the intensification of the struggle for national liberation. We have the right to claim that the peoples which are still struggling for national independence and against racism and apartheid will find support above all among the progressive countries. It is understandable, therefore, that the intrigues of the racists are focused above all against countries such as Angola, Mozambique and the Democratic Republic of Madagascar. This situation is worth considering.

Speaking of military bases and international tension caused by imperialist intrigues, we note that currently Africa is one of the main targets of aggressive imperialist policy. The continent has tremendous natural resources which the multinational monopolies are attempting to take over in their pursuit of profits. However, countries with a socialist orientation may also be found in Africa. These countries are firmly supporting the fighters for national liberation in the southern part of Africa, in the Sahara and in other places. We see, therefore, that life itself has inseparably linked together the struggle for peace, for national liberation, for freedom and for social progress.

When the peoples demand the establishment of a new international economic order they are thinking of both the present and the future. I consider this too a characteristic feature of the age. Who is to be blamed for the global economic crisis? Who is using this crisis to put pressure on countries with a socialist orientation? Who is trying to force them to abandon their chosen path? It is precisely the forces who want war, who are urging the arms race on. It seems to me, therefore, that all progressive forces must always feel the connection between the policy of peace and problems of national development.

[Question] Based on the specific features of the Malagasy revolution, what are the current basic tasks of your party?

[Answer] It is true that the Malagasy revolution has a number of characteristic features of interest. This is mainly because for the first time in Madagascar the building of socialism was made the fundamental law of the country. As you know, this took place in 1975, when the charter of the Malagasy socialist revolution was adopted on the suggestion of President Ratsiraka. It was the result of the long

struggle waged by the Malagasy people. A great deal of blood was shed in this struggle which was marked by strikes, the movement of solidarity with imprisoned patriots and peasants and with other actions.

The fact that this charter was so unanimously supported by all revolutionary forces in Madagascar means that it is truly consistent with the expectations of our people. As you know, one year after the adoption of the constitution and the presidential elections, for the first time in Madagascar elections for the National People's Assembly were held on the basis of a single electoral list. This fact convincingly proves the increased awareness of the masses. Until that time the people voted for different candidates who described themselves as supporters of socialism, supporters of the revolution, and so on.

Furthermore, it seems to me that the distinguishing feature of the Malagasy revolution is the fact that we began the building of socialism not in the immediate aftermath of the victory of the liberation struggle but on the basis of the successes we had achieved through it, as a result of a national vote. It is precisely the people's choice that defined our political line which we now must codify juridically and implement most accurately. This creates certain difficulties. Such a line demands tremendous explanatory work among the masses. I stress that the main efforts of our party are aimed precisely in this direction. Starting with 1975 we have made tremendous efforts to increase the political activity of the masses. We have carried out extensive organizational work, for we believe that the occasionally inadequate ties between the leadership and the masses is one of the weak points of the national liberation and democratic movements. We support the idea of the classics of Marxism-Leninism that the revolution is made by the people and that the people must consider the revolution as its own if it is to be developed successfully.

Let me go back to the proceedings of the 26th congress. I was struck (in Madagascar, regardless of the distance which separates us, we tried to act in the same manner) by the fact that the basic directions formulated by the CC CPSU were submitted for a nationwide discussion and that every citizen could express his viewpoint and make critical remarks. This is an exceptionally important form of participation of the masses in the administration of the state. We, the members of the ACFM, are well aware of Lenin's thought that the state is strong when the people know everything being done in the country and that politics should not be a concern of a small group of people, for if the people are poorly informed the enemies, who are well informed, could manipulate public opinion to serve their own interests.

I was also impressed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's discussion of the importance for party work of letters sent by simple working people, party or nonparty members. I consider this to be very important. It is very important because it represents a constant tie with the masses. Let me remind you that Lenin believed and emphasized that no single letter should be left without an answer, for the working people write those letters not for the pleasure of writing but because they believe in us and because the letters are a manifestation of their trust.

I repeat that we too deem it necessary to pay tremendous attention to maintaining our ties with the masses and are engaged in extensive exploratory work among the

population. We pay particular attention to the unification of the various population strata within organizations. For example, a plan for the structuring of our Revolutionary Women's Organization was formulated at the latest ACFM congress. In 1975 we enacted a law according to which only members of organizations--members of the National Front for the Defense of the Revolution, i.e., the trade unions, the youth organizations, the creative associations and revolutionary organizations affiliated with a party--have the right to engage in political work. To this day this has been the subject of extensive discussions in our country. Some people who have probably not realized how important our revolution is to the Malagasy people believe that a certain party neutrality could be maintained. The ACFM disagrees. There can be no neutrality toward trade unions, the youth or the women's movement in the struggle for socialism. The choice is clear, for which reason the citizens must define their positions clearly. We know that not everyone in Madagascar shares this viewpoint. The reactionary forces are fighting it and speak of so-called "hegemonism" of the Front and of the organizations affiliated with it which actually cover the mass of the working people. The sad experience of many countries, however, has convincingly proved the need for the masses to acknowledge the leading role of the party in political matters. I believe this to be one of the characteristic features of our circumstances, although not understood by everyone. Sometimes people abroad express their amazement on this subject. Our answer is that "This is consistent with the requirements of the struggle waged by the Malagasy people at the present stage." What struggle is this? We are struggling for raising the political activeness of the masses, for the current international and domestic circumstances make it incumbent upon us to raise our political awareness. This is no easy task. You are perfectly aware of the fact that imperialism makes extensive use of the mass information media to disorient the masses, promote anticommunist, anti-Soviet and tribalist feelings and so on. In our view, if the ties between the party and the masses are not sufficiently strong the level of political activeness of the masses must be raised.

Naturally, in this work the ideological-political education of the party members, the party cadres, is particularly important. At our last congress we decided to create a central party school. This is an old but difficult plan to implement. Our country has a rather vast territory with very poor transport facilities. Furthermore, for the past few years we have been paying greater attention to cadre ideological training. We assigned young party workers (not exactly young but, let us say, people up to a certain age) to study political and ideological problems in the socialist countries. Our trainees are studying in the USSR, the GDR and Bulgaria. We consider this very important, for we believe that, on the one hand, the comrades acquire the possibility of gaining a first-hand knowledge of the achievements of the socialist countries and, on the other, of studying more intensively the great ideas and principles of Marxism-Leninism. However, we must also disseminate such knowledge, even on the most elementary basis, on the various levels of our organization and share them with the rank and file membership and the local section secretaries. This is being accomplished mainly through short political information seminars in which we try to describe the connection between the international situation and the domestic circumstances and to give specific answers to questions on the implementation of party congress decisions. We pay equal attention to ideological and political training.

In conclusion, I can only emphasize that the development of an international awareness has a particular role in this project. Effective internationalism, accepted profoundly and tangibly by the fighters for freedom, is not merely the living history of our entire struggle but is also our present in which the Malagasy people are realizing ever more profoundly the need for all-round cooperation with world socialism. We are certain that the 26th CPSU Congress will be an important milestone in the development of this life-bringing cooperation.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

MANKIND'S STRIDES IN SPACE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 92-101

[Article by Aviation Lt Gen Hero of the Soviet Union G. Titov, USSR flyer-cosmonaut]

[Text] : recall the unforgettable morning of 12 April 1961.

It seemed as though the bright sun was flooding the Kazakh Steppe with its rays particularly solemnly when we reached the launching pad of the spaceport. The final preparations were winding up and the launching time was getting closer. Everyone present felt a rising tension—members of the governmental commission, designers, research scientists and cosmonauts.

The prelaunch instructions thundered from the loudspeakers.

Yuriy Gagarin, chairman of the state commission, submitted a confident, clear report. Ready for launch!

"Launch!" the order was heard.

"We are off!" we heard our comrades say.

It was 7 minutes after 9:00, Moscow time. Vostok, the first manned spaceship with the first Soviet cosmonaut aboard, was launched.

Among the outstanding achievements of the 20th century this event justifiably holds one of the leading positions. Its most profound social meaning is that a party member, a citizen of the first state of workers and peasants in the world, became a pioneer in space.

It was not accident that it was precisely in our country that the idea of man in space, the scientific concept of cosmonautics and the target program for the conquest of space beyond the planet were born. The outstanding achievements of the creative genius of our people in all realms of spiritual culture provided the nutritive ground for this accomplishment.

However, the actual possibility of implementing the most daring plans appeared only with the victory of the great October Revolution and the establishment of the socialist system. The launching of the first artificial earth satellite by the Soviet Union, which opened the space age for mankind, and the other outstanding

successes of Soviet cosmonautics in the historical new fields of application of thoughts and talents, were convincing proofs of the power of Leninism, of the unparalleled economic and social progress of our homeland, and of the greatest industriousness, patriotism and courage of the Soviet people.

Yuriy Gagarin's space flight logically marked the completion of the initial stage of the conquest of outer space, inaugurated with the launching of the first Soviet earth satellites--the stage of the establishment of cosmonautics as a new comprehensive area of human practical activities. This short yet historically exceptionally important period proved that all essential problems of flight in outer space, those formulated by the theoreticians and those which were encountered in the initial launchings of ballistic rockets and satellites, can be resolved by contemporary science and technology. This provides a characteristic example which convincingly illustrates the familiar Marxian idea that "...Mankind always assigned itself only problems which it can resolve, for a close consideration always proves that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution are already available or, at least, are in the process of being established" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], V. 1 13, p. 7).

It was Konstantin Eduardovich Tsiolkovskiy, the noted Russian philosopher and scientist, who laid the foundations of the scientific theory of rocketry and outer space activity of mankind. His classical work "Study of the Universe with Jet-Propelled Instruments" was published in 1903. It described the main directions in the development of rocket technology, which were followed in subsequent scientific studies and engineering developments. Tsiolkovskiy himself studied the main principles of rocket ballistics, developed a system for a liquid-propelled jet engine, and defined the laws governing its jet power. He drew designs of spaceships and formulated rocket design principles which are extensively used today. Even more importantly, with his zealous propaganda activities, the great man from Kaluga gave a "space" direction to the development of human thought in our century. He scientifically substantiated the historical inevitability of man's emergence in outer space and the objective need for it. He provided basic developments of many essential problems of cosmonautics.

Full social recognition came to him at the time when socialism was advancing along the entire front. He was awarded the Order of the Labor Red Banner by the Soviet government. Tsiolkovskiy wrote: "...I spent a lifetime with the dream that my works could nudge mankind forward... I bequeath it to the Bolshevik party and the Soviet system--the true leaders of human progress--all my works on aviation, rocketry and interplanetary communications. I am confident that they will complete these works successfully..."

At this point I would like to stress that in addition to the great scientific services rendered by the father of cosmonautics, the high civic and moral example he set and which inspired many generations of young people who went into science and technology is no less important. It sets a fire in the hearts of those who dedicate themselves entirely to the creation of rocket and space systems and those who mastered their use with dedication.

Justifiably, we can name among them, first of all, Sergey Pavlovich Korolev, the chief designer of space rockets, the first artificial earth satellites and

interplanetary unmanned stations and spaceships, and Mstislav Vsevolodovich Keldysh, who headed a group of scientists who were assigned by the party and the government to develop the program for scientific experimentation in outer space. They were not only outstanding scientists but major organizers who were able to rally around themselves powerful creative collectives, infect them with their enthusiasm, convince them of the realness of the expected result and direct them toward their objectives, surmounting not only scientific and technical but strictly human difficulties such as psychological barriers, skepticism and doubts which were manifested in (sometimes fierce) discussions on the implementation of governmental decisions or the conservatism of individuals. In one of the "clashes" within the state commission, when the problem of the expedience of sending a cosmonaut in orbit around the world was only under discussion, M. V. Keldysh firmly supported the main designer: "...It is true that our information concerning space effects at our disposal may be inadequate and conflicting... Unquestionably, the first flight involves a certain entirely justified risk. However, is this precisely not the feature of true science? Can we tie up the legs of a toddler and force him to remain sitting?... We are told by some to 'solve earth problems first and then go into space.' This is absurd, monstrously absurd. I believe that discoveries in outer space will speed up the solution of many scientific, technical and other problems on earth and will make human life happier..."

Meanwhile, the training of the cosmonauts was nearing its end and the time for state examinations was approaching. I remember Sergey Pavlovich's words:

"We are not concealing from the cosmonauts the complexities and even the dangers of the forthcoming flights. The fact that they agree to them proves not only their understanding of the problems they must resolve but their courage and willingness to make the contribution to science. It is for this that we, the scientists, value and respect them highly."

Looking back at the days of intensive work which preceded the first manned space flight, we must mention the tremendous activities of the huge collective of Soviet people such as scientists, engineers, technicians, workers, employees and practitioners of a great variety of skills. Their efficiently coordinated efforts insured the implementation of this daring project.

Problems never encountered before were being resolved.

This, for example, was the creation and building of a flight control ground system which includes coordination-computing and ballistic centers, a number of ground and ship command-measurement points, and a landing area with its location and retrieval of the cosmonaut and the ship after landing.

Dozens of scientific research institutes, design bureaus and production enterprises took part in the creation of these unique technical systems.

The decision on building the Baykonur Spaceport was made in February of 1955. An area in Kazakhstan was chosen by a special governmental commission. The area had to satisfy a number of strict and sometimes even conflicting requirements. Thus, on the one hand, the spaceport had to be located at a sufficient distance from any settlement such as not to endanger it. On the other, it had to be near power and

supply centers. Another rather complex operation was to determine the launch orbits so as not to threaten the population or industrial and agricultural areas in the Soviet Union. At the same time, proper tracking stations and a variety of auxiliary services had to be located along or near such tracks.

It could be said that the construction of the spaceport created a new scientific and technological sector--spaceport building.

Now, as we attend the launching of a spaceship or watch it on television, we no longer think of this "facility" in the steppe, burning under the hot sun, without which space flights would be impossible. However, even the simple enumeration of the technological and general technical facilities which had to be procured, assembled, tested and commissioned within a rather short time prove the exceptional complexity of the entire ground system: control-testing and research stations, electric power, water, gas, heating, lighting, ventilation and refrigeration equipment; equipment for the transportation, installation, testing and mounting of the launching systems; facilities for fueling the booster rockets and the spaceship; and systems for controlling the hermetic sealing, gas analysis, communications, fire extinguishing, remote and automated controls, lifting facilities, and so on.

The successful launching of a space rocket is possible only on the basis of an efficiently organized, impeccable and reliable interaction of the exceedingly complex facilities which must operate as a single system.

The first intercontinental rocket was launched on 27 August 1957; less than one and a half months later the first swallow of the outer space spring of mankind--the PS-1 (PS stands for "simplest satellite")--the Soviet artificial earth satellite--was launched from the Baykonur Spaceport.

Today Baykonur is one of the largest spaceports in the world.

The Vostok rocket and satellite were one-of-a-kind technical systems in which the most advanced and perfect developments of science and technology reached at that time were concentrated. It would be no exaggeration to describe them as the apotheosis of the scientific and technical revolution, the materialization of its quintessence. The absolute majority of the problems facing the engineers had never been resolved before. This applied to the creation of powerful booster systems, rocket automated control instruments and motors, life support systems aboard the spaceship and equipment for safe reentry and landing.

Incidentally, let us point out that as they carried out their assignments the specialists were looking ahead to the creation of space apparatus of substantial weight and size which could carry to outer space for long operational periods a variety of scientific equipment, biological objects and, finally, people. This was, from the very beginning, the general course charted by the experimental design bureau, headed by S. P. Korolev and his co-workers.

Most of the design and ground tests of the Vostok spaceship-satellite were completed between the end of 1959 and the beginning of 1960. The results of the ground tests enabled us confidently to move on to the next stage--vehicle tests

(as yet unmanned) in outer space. Each such flight resolved not simply big but, I would say, key problems. Thus, the first experimental voyage of the ship-satellite in May 1960 confirmed the possibility of successfully using a liquid jet fuel under conditions of weightlessness. The second ship-satellite (August 1960) confirmed that the ship could successfully leave orbit and reenter the earth in the planned landing area. The two March 1961 flights, which directly preceded Yuriy Gagarin's flight, were based strictly on the program for future manned space flights. The experience acquired and the results of equipment tests enabled S. P. Korolev to report to the CPSU Central Committee that man was ready for flight in outer space.

By that time the technical and the launching facilities at the spaceport, the ground command-measurement complex with its coordination-computing and ballistic centers, the ground and ship measurement centers and the cosmonaut tracking and retrieval services were ready.

Were we to give its due to the creative exploit of the developers of space flight apparatus, it would be unfair to underestimate or to consider secondary the exploit of the creators of the most complex automated guidance and control systems. Actually, space flights would have been impossible without them as they would have been without the powerful jet engines. The development of systems which could track the trajectories of space apparatus and carrier rockets, the reception of telemetric data, control of systems aboard the ship, communications with the crew, and so on began in 1956.

The unusual responsibility of insuring the reliability and safety of space flights faced the command-measuring system with very strict requirements concerning the precision and operativeness in computing the coordinates of apparatus in outer space. Essentially new theoretical and engineering solutions had to be found for the new objectives such as processing the launching of a spaceship, the special computations required, the transmission of substantial amounts of data from the vehicle to earth, the use of television equipment and of radio communications between the earth and the cosmonaut, and the tracking and computation of the coordinates of the object in outer space during reentry and after landing.

Most computation-ballistic problems (determining the trajectory of the spaceship based on ground computations, predicting the movement of the space object, computation of time characteristics for the use of the braking engine system and others) are now considered relatively "simple." At that time, at the end of the 1950s, they had to be resolved for the first time and the proper theoretical substantiations and the necessary accuracy and operativeness of the computations had to be insured. This as well required a great deal of work on the part of many specialists. Here again, as in many new projects, we were faced with unexpected developments.

Here is an example:

In order to compute the time and place of landing of the instrument we had to compute in particular the time of firing the retrojets. Before that the position of the ship in outer space had to be determined. In the flights of the Vostok-type vehicles this operation was achieved on the basis of the location of the vehicle

in orbit in relation to the sun. In other words, the instruments for the Vostok orientation system had to "see" the sun. This could be achieved only by choosing the proper launching time from the spaceport. Therefore, parameters which might have seemed unrelated--the time of launch and the place of landing--in fact proved to be interdependent. This imposed some limitations on the vehicle launching program.

Many difficulties had to be surmounted. Allow me to emphasize, however, that in this entire collective effort in which everyone had his part in a general comprehensive assignment, a high level of reciprocal responsibility was maintained during all of these years.

Generally speaking, the subjective or human factor in the implementation of scientific and technical target programs is no less (if not more) important than objective conditions (available theoretical knowledge, proper material and technical facilities, experimental and production base, organizational-management support and others). In the final account the decisive prerequisite for the tremendous success which literally shook up mankind on that memorable day of April 1961 was people, profoundly dedicated to their work, skilled cadres who, in addition to everything else, possessed a high degree of civic-mindedness and were willing to sacrifice themselves for the triumph of the ideals of the socialist homeland.

...On the ground control center every word said by Yuriy Gagarin was closely listened to. Times of separation of the carrier rockets were clearly computed by the cosmonaut throughout the launch and reported to the ground.

When the ship reached its computed orbit, in accordance with the assignment and program of the flight Yuriy observed the work of the equipment and was in telephone and telegraph communications with the ground.

The state of weightlessness, which was of such great concern to the medical personnel, occurred immediately after the ship reached orbit. It was an entirely new feeling but the cosmonaut adapted to it soon. He remained in good condition throughout the flight and his capacity for work remained undiminished.

The retrojets were fired at 10:25. At 10:35 the Vostok spaceship entered the thick atmospheric strata. At 10:55 the first spaceship landed safely 30 kilometers away from the city of Engels, Saratovskaya Oblast.

The COSPAR (Committee for Space Research of the International Council of Scientific Associations) was in session in Florence at that time. A Soviet delegation was present, headed by Academician A. A. Blagonravov. Addressing the section, R. Porter, the head of the American delegation, stated that the U. S. scientists congratulate the Soviet Union for this outstanding scientific and technical accomplishment and salute Yuriy Gagarin, the first astronaut. "I am confident," R. Porter said, "that the first step of man in space will inspire all people on earth and will be an incentive for further successes in the development of science and technology."

Here is what F. Joliot-Curie, the outstanding French physicist and public personality, said: "This is a great victory for man. It is a turning point in the history of civilization. Man is no longer nailed down to his planet..."

Subsequent space flights brought about many basic achievements which not only enriched our knowledge of the world substantially but also greatly increased the practical power of mankind. They are both universally known and legitimate. We are justifiably proud of the fact that our country was the pioneer in this amazing activity of a tremendous scale.

The history of Soviet cosmonautics, a direct participant of which I had the luck to be, is crowded with outstanding pages. Each of them is based on stubborn efforts and on the concentration of the willpower required in crossing the barriers of the unknown which may hide mortal dangers. I reverently bow my head to the exploit of Vladimir Komarov, who was testing the Soyuz-1 new spaceship in April of 1967 and who carried out the planned research program, but who also tragically perished as a result of a landing accident. We shall also always remember Georgiy Dobrovolskiy, Vladislav Volkov and Viktor Patsayev, who were the first to be put in orbit on the Salyut scientific station, in June of 1971, and who proved that people can work in outer space for long periods of time. The sudden depressurizing of the capsule of the Soyuz-11 carrier ship, as the crew was returning to earth, was a fatally unexpected event. All of us will sacredly revere the memory of Pavel Belyayev, the outstanding cosmonaut and commander of the Vostok II spaceship, from which man emerged into outer space for the first time, who passed away prematurely.

Thanks to the concern of the communist party and the Soviet state and of our entire people, the implementation of the Soviet space program led to a number of outstanding accomplishments which contributed to the tremendous progress of global cosmonautics over the past 20 years. However, these successes are not self-seeking. It is no accident that the space topic has become a structural component of our country's national economic plans.

The need for the further study and development of outer space in the interest of scientific, technical and national economic progress is one of the most important problems on which specialists will focus their efforts in accordance with the "Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990," approved by the 26th CPSU Congress. Essentially, outer space has become a unique research area.

Information obtained from around the earth orbits are of great value to geographers, geologists, hydrologists, glaciologists, oceanographers and workers in agriculture, forestry, fishing resources, hydrological construction and many other sectors.

Work in manned satellites is of great interest to physicists, chemists and engineers from the viewpoint of a science such as the study of materials, for example. The study of the behavior and properties of various materials in outer space vacuum and exposed to high solar radiation directly in space laboratories leads to many discoveries which will unquestionably become of practical value in the future.

Space technology has made it possible to organize the study of our planet on a new basis. The very first satellites enabled us to determine the shape of the earth with greater accuracy. The solution of this problem with the help of ground instruments would have necessitated years of painstaking activities by big groups of scientists.

The study of the upper strata of the earth's atmosphere, particularly of the relationship between phenomena which occur within it and solar activities, and the structure of the interplanetary magnetic field, developed with the help of space instruments, are of tremendous importance.

In speaking of the progressive influence of cosmonautics on various aspects of social life we must particularly emphasize its impact on modern thinking. Through their fundamental works, which substantially broadened scientific concepts on the position of earth in space, our compatriots and pioneers of space natural sciences K. E. Tsiolkovskiy, V. I. Vernadskiy and A. L. Chizhevskiy, put a definitive end to the vestiges of geocentrism in the people's minds and forced everyone to think of the unique role of the "ship" sailing in infinite space, whose crew all of us are. The importance of this conceptual change created by the space flights of unmanned and manned vehicles would be difficult to overestimate. The creative power of the knowledgeable mind, which makes insignificant all superstitions or religious prejudices, was proved more convincingly than ever. ("...thus does false wisdom flicker and moulder when exposed to the immortal sun of the mind.") Awareness of the ecology reached a qualitatively higher level: the limits of life on earth became clearer and the level of social responsibility for it increased; the content of the natural scientific concept of "environment" broadened. Now it began to include the area around the earth with its specific physical characteristics (such as radiation belts, the magnetosphere and others); space factors which affect a number of biospheric processes began to be taken into consideration. The successes of cosmonautics contributed to the shaping of a global, all-embracing, planet-wide view on the various phenomena and processes on earth, a view which objectively requires a systemic, an integral approach based on materialism and dialectics, i.e., on Marxist methodology.

The speculations of isolated ivory tower scientists, engaged in the development of pseudoscientific sophistries and in idle games of abstractions as they formulate, for example, various "models" of evolution of the universe...involving the time rotation vector, or profoundly speculating on the preference of a "closed" model of the universe compared with an "open" one (i.e., an infinite one), on which materialistic philosophy "could not impose a taboo," seem dull and uninteresting against the background of the practical achievements of cosmonautics which has discovered and is continuing to discover "strange" things which are enriching man's mind and increasing his power over nature. While such scholastic practices can only hinder the development of creative thinking and raise barren flowers on the eternally green tree of knowledge, practical experience feeds knowledge with its live juices, assists the mind in following a proper direction in its work and is the only criterion of the veracity of theoretical achievements. How pertinent we find, in this connection, V. I. Lenin's words from his "Philosophical Notebooks:" "Practical experience is above (theoretical) knowledge, for it has not only the merit of universality but of immediate reality" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 29, p 195).

Naturally, this has nothing in common with primitive practicality.

In the light of these thoughts cosmonautics looks like an ideal field for the reciprocal fertilizing of theory and practice, in which practice has priority. This does not lower the tremendous role of theory in the least.

One month before the 20th anniversary of the first human flight into space, the 100th earth envoy--engineer Viktor Savinykh--began orbiting the world aboard the "Soyuz T-4" spaceship. This is the third time that Vladimir Kovalenok, the ship's captain, is in outer space. The ship was coupled with the Salyut-6 station and formed a new orbital complex.

Incidentally, let us note that Salyut-6 has been continuously in orbit for the past 3.5 years (manned for more than one-half of that time). The station has turned around the planet more than 20,000 times. In terms of conventional measurement units this represents about 850 million kilometers. This is an unprecedented flight, not only in terms of duration but of complexity and results. Seventeen transport and 12 freight spaceships have docked at the station. Nine times in the course of the flight the station's engines have been refueled. Dozens of trajectory corrections have been made. In one month alone the Salyut-6-Soyuz complex provides 500 communications, transmitting huge amounts of information.

Four long expeditions have stayed aboard the station for 96, 140, 175 and 185 days, respectively. The length of stay of man in space clearly proves the progress made by cosmonautics over the past 20 years. Let us remember that Yuriy Gagarin remained in space 1 hour and 48 minutes; the author of this article remained 1 day in outer space; the joint group flight by cosmonauts Andrian Nikolayev and Pavel Popovich was 3 days....This was at the beginning. Now the length of stay is half a year! Leonid Popov and Valeriy Ryumin covered this record distance perfectly. Their success was possible thanks not only to the outstanding personal qualities of the cosmonauts but to the great combination of modern design and technological solutions which insured the high reliability of the station's work, including its life support systems, and achievements in medicine and biology, which made it possible to prepare the human organism more effectively for flights in outer space and for remaining in orbit and for developing a working and living regimen most suitable to extraterrestrial conditions.

The more than 6 months stay in outer space by Leonid Popov and Valeriy Ryumin meant daily fruitful intensive and impeccable work. More than 4,500 photographs of various areas of dry land and oceans, about 40,000 spectrograms of the atmosphere and the earth's surface, reports on 150 hours of observations of interest to various economic sectors, approximately 250 samples of new materials and covers developed in weightlessness and numerous medical-biological and astrophysical studies represent a very partial list of the scientific baggage of the expedition. Subsequent development of such data enriched our knowledge about the "cradle of mankind" and the space around it even further and offered better possibilities for practical human activities.

The scientific and economic returns of our cosmonautics is increasing with each consecutive flight. Unquestionably, in the 11th Five-Year Plan it will gain considerable new experience, will greatly increase the arsenal of its technical means and will enable the Soviet people to please the world with new successes in outer space.

The aspiration to use such activities exclusively for peaceful purposes, to contribute to the progress of mankind through scientific studies, to strengthen peace on earth and to expand cooperation among countries is a major characteristic of Soviet space activities.

This was manifested particularly clearly in the joint work conducted by specialists from the socialist countries on the Interkosmos Program. Its success is determined by the fact that it is built on the common principles inherent in relations among fraternal countries--total equality, reciprocal understanding and comradely mutual aid. Such joint activities have been conducted over the past 14 years. They include a broad range of studies with the help of Soviet artificial earth satellites, geophysical and meteorological rockets and ground observation facilities.

Strong scientific and industrial centers equipped with modern facilities and capable of resolving the problems of the international space program, which is developing within the channel of socialist integration of scientific and technical research and development, have been organized in the countries participating in the Interkosmos program. The planned implementation of this program made it possible for citizens of Czechoslovakia, Poland, the GDR, Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam and Cuba to make orbital flights. Finally, the Eighth International Expedition, bearing the flags of the USSR and the Mongolian People's Republic, has just ended.

Comrades L. I. Brezhnev and Yu. Tsedenbal warmly greeted cosmonauts V. Kovalenko, V. Savinykh, V. Dzhanibekov and Zh. Gurrachu, the international crew of the Salyut-6--Soyuz T-4--Soyuz-39 orbital scientific research complex: "You took over the baton of space expeditions conducted by the members of the socialist comity in accordance with the long-term Interkosmos program. Your joint flight proves yet once again, convincingly, the great power of socialist internationalism and the great achievements of the fraternal nations in the conquest of space in the interest of the peace and well being of all mankind."

Each such flight around the planet proclaims to all people on earth that socialism means peace, progress and fraternity among nations. We remember that, as he presented to Yuriy Gagarin the Gold Star of Hero of the Soviet Union, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev described his exploit as a symbol of everything bright and noble which communism is bringing to our people.

The fact that the Soviet Union is the initiator of the use of cosmonautics for peaceful purposes is consistent with the very nature of socialism, for it is only under socialist conditions that the scientific and technical revolution assumes the right direction consistent with the interests of man and society and serves social progress, peace and the strengthening of friendship among nations. In turn, on the basis of the accelerated development of science and technology and particularly on the basis of the results achieved in outer space, the socialist society resolves the problems of the social revolution.

Socialism tries to make full use of all acquired knowledge and practical experience, including that gained in outer space, for the good of mankind.

The July 1975 Soyuz-Apollo flight was a positive example of international cooperation in the study and conquest of outer space. During the flight docking and coupling between Soviet and American manned vehicles were practiced and scientific and technical experiments were conducted.

The development of such joint activities serves the noble cause of detente throughout the world and strengthens the spirit of reciprocal trust and understanding among nations. The Soviet Union has always supported precisely such a line of development of relations in the world and has repeatedly called for the coordination of activities in the utilization of outer space.

However, under the conditions of an antagonistic society dominated by capital, any positive phenomenon has its antithesis, for the ruling political circles are always tormented by the idea of the militarization of space research and the use of outer space for military purposes. As it increases the arms race, the United States is energizing its efforts to create a high energy laser weapon which would be then put in orbit around the earth. According to the press, the Carter administration appropriated \$15 billion for this purpose over a five-year period. What could be politically more irresponsible to history than such effort, aimed at increasing international tension and hindering legitimate social progress by all possible means?

Outer space is infinite and so are the horizons of human accomplishments. Man will never be satisfied with his achievements and, in his unending aspiration toward new heights and new orbits, will be eternally daring, asserting the great qualities of his creative nature--his mind, character and goodwill.

5003
CSO: 1802/13

THE STRATEGY OF NUCLEAR MADNESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 102-111

[Article by A. Arbatov]

[Text] In the pre-nuclear era strategic conceptions interested few people outside a narrow circle of the professional military. Today the situation has drastically changed. Strategic ideas are often becoming an object of heated public debates and attract the close attention of the public at large. This is understandable. The world's stockpiles of thermonuclear arms, carrying a threat to the very existence of our civilization, have a deep imprint on the interdependence between military power, strategy and politics. In present-day conditions strategic plans and calculations not only determine how a war will be conducted should it suddenly break out but seriously affect the very probability of a nuclear conflict and, consequently, the durability of world peace. The danger of a global war has made the task of preventing a thermonuclear clash the cornerstone of international relations arms control negotiations the most important factor for its implementation. For this reason the problems of strategy, the question of the pace and scope of military rivalry have turned into a special area of relations between states; they affect the acuteness of political tensions in the world and the prospect of agreements in the field of disarmament. These are the causes of the broad worldwide discussion of the current U.S. strategic conceptions, in particular those set forth in Presidential Directive No 59. In August 1980 information seeped into the American press about the approval of this directive, which has reoriented the nuclear strategy of the United States. Although the directive remains secret, the news was followed by the explanations of senior government officials and commentaries of specialists from which its essence became obvious: in the first place it envisages dealing "selective" U.S. missile strikes against the command posts and military targets of the other side, above all those related to its strategic force; its aim is the conduct of a "limited" and "prolonged" nuclear war.

As Comrade L.I. Brezhnev stressed in the Central Committee accountability report to the 26th CPSU Congress, the peace-threatening doctrines like the notorious Carter Directive No 59 are a "grave threat to all nations, including the people of the United States. They are being condemned all over the world." Exposing such strategic doctrines and vigorously opposing them are an integral part of the struggle for the diminution of the danger of war and the limitation of the arms race.

It should be said at once that the originality of the strategic concepts inherent in Directive 59 is quite relative. Back in the early sixties, Robert McNamara, the then U.S. defense secretary, put forward a so-called doctrine of "counterstrike" which envisaged the possibility of nuclear strikes at the strategic targets of the other side, that is, essentially launching missile attacks against the Soviet Union with a view to disarming it. But with the equalization of the strategic balance towards the end of the sixties Washington was forced to abandon this suicidal strategy of achieving a "nuclear superiority" for the United States.

In the mid-seventies the then Defense Secretary James Schlesinger formulated another variant of "counterstrike" in the guise of a conception of "selective nuclear strikes." When the Carter administration came to power the Pentagon concentrated on the further development of this strategic idea. The results of this work were confirmed in Directive 59, which advanced the concept of "limited nuclear war" as one of the main elements of the strategy of "counteraction" proclaimed by Washington.

Therefore, it is not a question of the strategic views of an individual, an administration or a party. Essentially, we see a tendency in strategic thinking which three and even four administrations, both Democratic and Republican, have approved in some way or other and which has already taken root and is self-sustaining, little depending on presidential elections. Since the formulation of the directive the conception expressed in it has become even more apparent in U.S. military theory and policy.

It must be said that the arguments put forward in support of the above-mentioned strategy are quite subtle. Their point of departure is the assertion that the military equilibrium on which the "nuclear containment" strategy of the late sixties and the seventies was based will substantially change in certain aspects in the eighties. Let us recall that by the end of the sixties, as strategic parity took shape between the USSR and the United States, the U.S. leadership was compelled to recognize that the Soviet Union had acquired the indisputable ability to destroy a hypothetical aggressor by retaliation. This possibility was called a capacity for "assured destruction" as a result of retaliation, and the United States could not but reckon with the fact that the possibility had developed more or less symmetrically for the two sides.

So what, in Washington's opinion, changed in this regard during the seventies? The U.S. military and political leadership claims that a number of strategic armament programs, first of all the arming of intercontinental missiles with multiple warheads and the enhancement of their combat power, have opened up the possibility of an effective missile attack on the ground targets of the strategic forces, and primarily the command centers and protected silos, of the other side. True, the latter, as before, retains the capability of destroying the administrative-industrial centers of the enemy by retaliation from its air force and by missiles launched from its submarines. But this capacity, the Pentagon strategists assert, may be paralyzed by the threat of the initiator of the "nuclear exchange" to deal subsequent strikes at the cities of the other power with the help of his analogous reserve forces. Thus, the administrative-industrial centers of the two sides would be held "hostage" even if intercontinental salvos were fired at ground military targets.

From this kind of reasoning the U.S. leadership draws its much-publicized conclusion about the need for the United States to develop an additional potential for dealing various combinations of a "limited strike" at protected military installations along with the so-called potential of "assured destruction." Former U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown, in particular, declared that "...We should have a capability for attacking in a selective and calculated way a number of military, industrial or political and administrative targets while at the same time keeping the capability of assured destruction in reserve." Examining such "theoretical" constructs of the American strategists, one cannot help recalling the characterization of investigations of this kind given by Karl Marx, who a century ago wrote that in the wars of the "latest period of the imperialist bourgeoisie...the general inclination toward barbarity acquires a methodical nature, immorality is elevated into a system, lawlessness finds its legislators, and naked force, its codes" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 13, p 464). Directive 59 and the calculations underlying it are another "acme" of American strategic thought, cold-bloodedly manipulating with abstract scenarios of nuclear strikes and abstract "levels of damage" behind which the nightmarish realities of thousands of possible Hiroshimas are hidden.

II

As was to be expected, the U.S. militarist circles are trying to blame the other side for the present changes in their nuclear strategy. The argument about the Soviet Union's alleged aspiration for "nuclear superiority," above all, in terms of intercontinental ballistic missiles, is one of the chief motives behind the massive "Soviet threat" campaign which has been waged over the last few years. It is claimed that their improvement will make American missiles in silos vulnerable in the early eighties and that, it is argued, will give the USSR an opportunity to effect the previously mentioned "counterstrikes." These allegations regarding the Soviet Union's intentions have become the propaganda trumpcard of the military-industrial complex which calls for building up American strategic armaments and revising U.S. military concepts. This campaign has likewise been at the root of the effort of the enemies of detente to undermine the SALT-2 Treaty.

Those who come up with such "arguments" deliberately pass over the fact that the existing disproportion between the USSR and the United States in terms of land-based strategic missiles reflects the objective historically established difference in the military-technological development of the two powers and their geographic location, and that some advantages of the Soviet Union are counter-balanced in the general relation of strategic forces by other factors favorable to the U. S. As can be judged even from some American sources, suffice it to compare the "retaliatory" capabilities of both sides with due regard for the fighting capacity of all of their other elements, rather than within the artificial limits of a single particular component of strategic forces, to find that there is no USSR "superiority" at all, nor will there be any in the early eighties.

As to the intentions of the USSR, the Soviet side has repeatedly explained at the most authoritative level that our strategic doctrine is purely defensive in character and that our missile and nuclear capability serves to deter the potential aggressor. The Soviet Union is not planning any preemptive strikes against

anyone. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has emphasized: "Our only concern is to prevent either a first or a second strike or a nuclear war in general. The meaning of our approach to these matters can be summed up as follows: the Soviet Union must have a sufficient defense potential to stop anyone from venturing to disrupt our peaceful life."

No, it is not the alleged "Soviet threat" that has brought about further reforms of the United States' nuclear strategy. On the contrary, the campaign now under way in the West regarding the coming "nuclear superiority" of the USSR is meant to disguise the intention of aggressive imperialist elements to upset the military balance to their advantage. It is pertinent to recall at this point that it is not the Soviet Union but the United States that initiated a series of military programs in the seventies aimed at upsetting the strategic balance. These include, first and foremost, the programs for providing the U. S. missile forces with multiple independently targeted vehicles (MIRVs in American terminology) which roughly quadrupled the total number of nuclear warheads in the American missile arsenal. The Pentagon departments with their scientific and technical subcontractors keep developing and introducing increasingly effective warheads and more accurate targeting systems (for example, MK-12A warheads) and enhancing the flexibility of retargeting U. S. strategic missiles and improving their guidance and communication systems.

Here is a point to note: the recurrent "Soviet threat" campaigns of the last two or three decades have been used, as a rule, to present the Soviet Union as having the very same military superiority which the United States itself wanted to secure with each new campaign of military jitters. There is no doubt that the current ballyhoo about the "counterstrike superiority" of Soviet missiles is designed as an excuse to justify the deployment of yet another generation of more sophisticated and destructive U. S. strategic armaments in the eighties. These include ground-based MX intercontinental mobile missiles, ballistic Trident-1 and Trident-2 missiles aboard giant Ohio-type nuclear submarines, and long-range air-land or sea-based cruise missiles. What the strategic concepts, officially postulating the need to "counter" the alleged "threat of Soviet counterstrike" mean, in fact, is developing precisely such a threat by the United States itself. For from the military-technological point of view, the forces created by the Pentagon supposedly for "retaliation" can be used for a pre-emptive missile attack as well.

III

There has been yet another pattern in the development of American nuclear strategy in the last 20-30 years. The more subtle and complex Washington's strategic concepts became, the more they were divorced from the realities of the international situation. All new additions to the arsenals of global devastation change practically nothing in the adequate nuclear potential, already stockpiled, for destroying life on earth many times over. Indeed, the very idea of military superiority, in its traditional meaning, that is, as an ability to win in battle no longer has any sense and becomes unattainable in the presence of the current immense stockpiles of nuclear weapons. The partisans of the arms race find it increasingly difficult to explain the continued buildup and improvement of the nuclear potential. So they are resorting to more far-fetched arguments. However,

the fact that such arguments cannot withstand serious criticism does not embarrass their makers in any way. Real military hardware worth billions of dollars is being developed to bear out the new concepts.

First of all, what does a limited "counterstrike" mean? Official American explanations on this subject are deliberately ambiguous which does not, however, make the designs behind them in any way justified militarily. If they mean, say, launching several missiles against their adversary's military installations, then this is no less absurd than the threat of a suicidal massive strike. For such a move would quite obviously mean starting a "central" thermonuclear conflict and, at the same time, would leave the other side free to use its practically intact strategic capability. If Washington planners mean a coordinated missile strike at the entire complex of ground-based strategic targets, that would mean, consequently, dropping several thousand nuclear warheads on the territory of another country. In that case, the aggressor must not doubt that the reply to such a "selective" strike would be full-scale devastating retaliation, possibly without waiting for the "counterstrike" attack to hit the target.

It is no less important that the above-mentioned concepts are totally divorced from military-political and psychological realities. It is perfectly obvious that a thermonuclear war, which would be the most dreadful disaster in the history of mankind, cannot be waged in accordance with the models calculated by the Pentagon computers ignoring the "human" factor. "Counterstrike" superiority is losing its real military-political meaning also because, with the present balance of forces, it cannot signify a disarming strike capability. For to speak about the possibility of a "victory" by estimating the balance of warheads that could remain in reserve after the oil refineries, electric power stations and other vitally essential capacities have been destroyed--and that is precisely the way many American experts are reasoning--means, in point of fact, to mock common sense. L. I. Brezhnev said very accurately and unequivocally on this subject at the 26th CPSU Congress that "To try to outstrip each other in the arms race and to count on a victory in a nuclear war is dangerous madness."

It is not just the speculative findings of Pentagon experts that are behind the changes in the American nuclear concepts. The U. S. course in the area of strategic armaments is being directed by far more tangible driving forces. The former Defense Secretary Harold Brown, speaking in Annapolis in 1980, touched on those factors when he said that the commonly recognized purpose behind strategic concepts was not to formulate plans for a real war. It was to create the possibility of action which, once known, would discourage the opponent from trying us out or exercising too strong a pressure on us. Translated from Washington officialese, this means that the measures the United States has been taking in the strategic field have been largely prompted by political considerations which lead up to the official endorsement of rather dubious military concepts.

IV

The purpose of the "information leak" about Directive No 59 to the U. S. press, deliberately engineered in August 1980, is quite obvious. The U. S. ruling circles are known to be in the habit of turning the most important questions of

international security, disarmament and detente into a "football" knocked about on the domestic political scene. Speculations on the subject during the election campaign of the Democratic Party were intended to win the sympathies of U. S. right-wing forces and of those who believed the latter's arguments, and at the same time to "bring into line" the Democrats' liberals who opposed the escalation of the arms race. But the trends of nuclear strategy that were formulated in Directive No 59, as we pointed out, have survived more than one presidential election. This alone indicates that their motive forces should be sought in more serious political factors than the considerations of the past electoral clash.

The further changes in the global ratio of forces in favor of socialism throughout the seventies and the powerful upsurge of the national liberation movement prompted the energizing of the attempts of the more reactionary imperialist circles to "replay" detente in their favor if not scuttle it altogether. Here the social nature of imperialist policy itself stipulated the choice of the main instruments of countering detente and progressive changes in the world. The main emphasis was laid on building up arms arsenals and on the use or threat of force. The buildup of the nuclear arsenal is an integral and most important element of the policy of urging the arms race on, exacerbating confrontation with the Soviet Union and its manifestation on a high level of armed confrontation between socialism and imperialism. That is why, beginning approximately with the mid-1970s, the United States stepped up its efforts to find ways to break the strategic deadlock by launching another round of the arms race and formulating new concepts for global war. As H. Kahn, one of the U. S. leading "armchair strategists," cynically explained, "We want to make the nuclear forces and nuclear war itself more rational, which means to make them more usable as a political instrument."

Since an all-out nuclear attack on the Soviet Union would be suicidal for the United States and since a disarming strike is impossible nowadays, it began searching a way out of the impasse by construing concepts of "selective missile attacks" and "limited counterstrikes," intended to give the United States a means of pressuring the other side politically. The ideas of a "limited nuclear war" and the arms backing these ideas are meant by their authors to convince the world that the United States does not regard the use of first tactical and then strategic nuclear weapons as unthinkable because supposedly universal destruction would not be imminent. Exposing the basic motivation of this approach, L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress: "They want people to believe that nuclear war can be limited, they want to reconcile them with the idea that such a war is admissible."

In appraising the line taken by the U. S. political leadership on strategic arms, it is necessary to bear in mind that, given objective military parity between the USSR and the United States the official criteria of old strategic concepts are becoming too narrow for the activities of the forces wishing the continuation of the arms race. In this situation ever new variations on the subject of the mythical "Soviet threat" are made up and new strategic tasks involving the use of the U. S. thermonuclear potential are formulated in order to justify and at the same time to impart a sense of purpose to the further expansion of the arsenal of mass destruction weapons. Essentially, this process is a vivid illustration of the dialectic relationship among the ways and means of conducting warfare, armaments, tactics

and strategy, which was revealed by the classics of Marxism. The organizations of armies and the methods of warfare they use, Engels wrote, depend on material conditions. He stressed that "advances in technology, as soon as they became applicable, were in fact immediately put to military use--and immediately produced changes and even revolutions in the methods of warfare" (K. Marks and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 20, p 176). The fear of a crushing retaliatory strike prevents the imperialists from using nuclear missiles in practice. At the same time the sinister dialectics of the development of strategic arms under conditions of the rapid scientific and technical revolution makes itself felt in the fact that new U. S. military concepts, as the product of the nuclear missile race, pave the way for carrying it on in new forms and also for attempts to use the strategic threat in foreign policy.

For instance, the rapid deployment of ballistic missiles by the United States gave rise to McNamara's strategy of "counterforce" which, in turn, spurred on the development of multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles. The fielding of MIRVs in the seventies was accompanied by the proclamation of Schlesinger's concept of "selective nuclear strikes," in accordance with the development of new weapons systems mounted on mobile launchers and having an enhanced capacity for hitting protected targets was accelerated. It is their deployment in the 1980s that the "limited nuclear war" concept, part and parcel of the "counteraction" strategy, is called upon to substantiate.

Such strategic programs also pursue political objectives of a different kind. The Pentagon leaders are setting themselves the task of imposing on the Soviet Union during this decade another round of the costly arms race in areas in which the Americans believe themselves to be particularly strong. Washington does not conceal its intention to "economically exhaust" the USSR in the future cycle of the production and deployment of the new generation of nuclear missiles. It is therefore clear that Directive No 59 represents serious and long-term political plans of U. S. imperialism and that it is these plans that have turned dubious strategic ideas into a real factor of U. S. politics.

V

The entire postwar history of the nuclear arms race is a story of U. S. imperialism's unsuccessful attempts to get out of a nuclear impasse. The hopes of American politicians and strategists to gain nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union or, at least, to insure the U. S. a unilateral military advantage did not come true in the past and are the more doomed to failure under the present global ratio of forces. Our country's economy, science and technology have reached such a high level that we can develop in a very short time any type of weapons on which the enemies of peace would like to rely. The Soviet Union did not let, and will not let, anyone address it in the language of threats and blackmail.

As the 26th CPSU Congress stated, "the military and strategic balance prevailing between the USSR and the United States, between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, is objectively a safeguard of world peace. We have not sought, nor do we now seek, military superiority over the other side. That is not our policy. But neither will we allow it to establish such a superiority over us. Such attempts and talking to us from positions of strength are absolutely futile."

Equally unsound are the plans for the "economic exhaustion" of the USSR through an unrestricted arms race. In line with the projections of the Democratic Administration, U. S. military spending between 1980 and 1985 would be in the vicinity of \$1 trillion. The militarist circles, however, are not satisfied even with this astronomical figure, demanding an additional \$300-\$500 billion to finance the drive to an incontestable military superiority. Such a course would make, above all, the burden shouldered by the American economy itself ever heavier.

Judging by everything, Washington's calculations to rally under its leadership its capitalist allies in Western Europe and to draw them into the orbit of an anti-Soviet policy by escalating the arms race are equally unjustified. Recent events have shown that America's partners display a growing inclination for independence and concern for their own interests which are, far more than those of their overseas "patron," related to the prospects of detente and cooperation in Europe. The peace-loving forces of the continent are becoming increasingly alarmed by Washington's ever more sophisticated strategic ideas and plans to step up the arms race. This is understandable: what may be considered a "limited nuclear war" on an overseas theater by the United States would be total nuclear annihilation for the Europeans.

Thus, the military-political and other results which Washington would like to achieve by the innovations in its nuclear policy are rather illusory. The dangerous consequences and the cost of this course, however, can be quite real. Reorientation of the U. S. nuclear-missile policy to the conceptions of "limited" or "selective" strikes leads to the lowering of a so-called "nuclear threshold," i.e., it increases the probability of using nuclear weapons at an earlier stage of a conflict. Some American experts note that the growing vulnerability of major elements of the strategic forces will increase the probability of their preemptive use in fear of losing these forces as a result of the other side's strike.

The innovations in American strategy leading to the destabilization of the strategic equilibrium can only lead to a new round in the build-up of thermonuclear arsenals. In the political field they predetermine the aggravation of tension and the growth of animosity and mistrust in intergovernmental relations, while in the economic field they will eat up billions of dollars which could otherwise be used for creative purposes. Finally, a new round in the arms race would seriously aggravate negotiations on all problems of military detente. Some of the programs prodded on by the militarists exceed the limits which have been or are being set by the SALT talks, while the qualitative characteristics of a number of new weapons systems, such as cruise and mobile ballistic missiles, complicate reciprocal control over the observance of possible agreements on their limitation.

To go back to the causes of Washington's dangerous moves in the nuclear missile field, it is obviously insufficient to reduce everything to references to malicious relapses of U. S. foreign policy expansionism or to the latest intensification of the activities of reactionary militarist quarters inside that country. Though these factors play an important role, they do not account for everything. In analyzing the difficulties which arose on the way to detente and arms limitation on the threshold of the 1980s, one must not underestimate the fact that

the monstrous potentials which threaten the world with destruction have acquired, one may say, a self-sufficing character, a sort of inertia of self-accumulation and renovation. This, rather than mythical Soviet supremacy, is one of the most dangerous real sources of the threat of war.

The strategic balance of forces between the United States and the USSR, even with an overall nuclear balance, embraces also many separate disproportions stemming from objective differences in the position and history of the two powers. Arms race advocates in the United States exaggerate in every way the significance of some individual advantages of the other side and demand their elimination. While glossing over the cancelling role of disproportions favorable to the United States. Scientific and technical progress periodically makes it possible to develop ever more advanced weapons systems, which the U. S. military-industrial complex insists on introducing on the pretext that the same might be done by the other side which would thus upset the strategic parity. Besides, missiles, aircraft and submarines are subject to physical wear and tear and to moral obsolescence. Interested circles demand their "timely" replacement by newer and naturally more effective systems capable of effecting qualitative changes in the military balance. Worse, the enormous cost and long time required in the development and manufacturing of strategic weapons make planning in this area necessary for many years ahead (5 to 10). This offers the military-industrial complex further opportunities to invent further "threats" to U. S. security.

This is not, of course, a question of the arms race having become a depersonalized and objectively inevitable process. The arms race is backed by quite specific social strata, organizations and individuals. Of late, in particular, a greater role in U. S. ruling circles is being played by aggressive groups which insist on a further reorientation of strategy towards limiting U. S. losses to an "acceptable level." The same forces also seek not only to revise the SALT-II Treaty, but also to scuttle the entire process of arms limitation. Also clear, incidentally, is the fact that in the arms race special sorts of built-in development mechanisms, powerful "flywheels" and tried and tested techniques and arguments have appeared. Time and time again the arms race champions are trying to justify their measures by citing the supreme interests of "national security," demanding that "trump cards" be made available in the form of new armaments, allegedly for the sake of creating favorable conditions for talks on limiting the nuclear missile rivalry.

In practice, however--as the events of the 1970s made it quite clear--the arms race can neither secure military superiority for the United States nor can it solve any of the problems which are raised in order to justify this race. Actually, armaments programs, rather than righting strategic disproportions, destabilize the military balance. Attempts to gain unilateral advantages or threaten one aspect or another of the other side's defense capability inevitably lead to countermeasures and rebound on the initiators. An arms buildup and concepts of more effective use of arms, instead of making the "deterrence" stronger, add to the probability of a global clash. Naturally, this does not strengthen the security of the United States or of any other country.

In the nuclear age, as its first thirty years bear witness, security problems do not and cannot have a military solution. Security cannot be enhanced through an

arms race, but requires an entirely different approach. The successes of detente and the initial major agreements on arms limitation reached in the 1970s showed the possibilities and tremendous advantages of such an approach.

The opponents of detente and the advocates of an unrestrained arms race in the United States are trying to cash in on the complications in the international arena and the difficulties involved in adapting U. S. policy to the objective strategic parity of the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s. The influence of these circles has not yet become absolute, but their provocative activities are causing quite tangible political damage. At the same time, even in the complicated situation created both inside the United States and elsewhere, a rather large number of members of the U. S. ruling circles who--although unwillingly and not always wholeheartedly or without reservations--are compelled to acknowledge the expediency of the continuation of the SALT talks. This reveals the powerful effect of nuclear age realities and the imperatives of today's global balance of forces, which promises the United States no gains from an unbridled arms race and confrontation.

The 26th CPSU Congress was highlighted by a whole series of major new initiatives and proposals by the Soviet Union in the military detente field, bearing on various kinds and types of armaments and armed forces, embracing many areas of the world and envisaging measures of a political and military nature. In the sphere of strategic arms, the USSR has once again called for restraint, declaring its readiness to continue without further delay the appropriate negotiations with the United States, while preserving all the positive elements which have so far been attained in the SALT area.

The CPSU Central Committee accountability report reaffirmed the desire of the Soviet Union to negotiate the limitation of any kinds of nuclear missile weapons on the principles of equality and equal security of the sides. In particular, it was proposed that the deployment of new nuclear-powered missile-carrying submarines by the United States (of the Ohio class) and of similar systems by the USSR (of the Typhoon class) be limited. A mutual ban on modernization of existing and development of new ballistic missiles for such submarines was also proposed. Such agreement would be very important from the point of view of stabilizing the strategic balance, bearing in mind the assumed ability of such weapons systems to deliver highly accurate and sudden "counterstrikes" (with minimum missile travel time to targets).

All of these and other Soviet proposals share a single purpose. As the CPSU Central Committee accountability report stressed, "To safeguard peace-- no task is more important now on the international plane for our party, for our people and, for that matter, for all the peoples of the world." By advocating progress in the limitation of strategic and other arms, the Soviet Union asks for no one's favors. Its peace-loving policy is not a sign of weakness, but evidence of strength and confidence in the firmness of its positions. Military balance, and the security of the Soviet people and their allies will be insured in the coming years both under the conditions of new SALT agreements or, if worst comes to worst, without them. However, aware of the great dangers and cost of an unrestrained buildup of destructive potentials, the CPSU leadership and the Soviet government,

even in the present complicated international situation, are not slackening their efforts to improve the global political climate and curb the arms race. Herein lies the supreme measure of realism in contemporary conditions, for in the nuclear age the only alternative to such a policy is an inevitable growth of the threat of universal destruction. There is no third way, nor will it ever be discovered by any innovations in U. S. nuclear strategy.

CSO: 1802/13

CERTAIN ASPECTS OF CHINESE POLICY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 112-122

[Article by O. Borisov]

[Text] The 26th CPSU Congress was an event of world-historical significance both in the scale and importance of the problems discussed and the scope and duration of the adopted decisions and also in its impact on the course of world processes and influence on the fate of peace worldwide. The report of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "CPSU Central Committee Report to the 26th CPSU Congress and the Party's Immediate Tasks in the Sphere of Domestic and Foreign Policy"--this outstanding document of creative Marxism-Leninism--contains an all-embracing analysis of the contemporary stage of world development and the struggle of the peoples for peace, national independence and social progress.

Questions connected with the policy of the present Chinese leadership and problems of the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations occupied a fitting place in the work and materials of the 26th congress. Particular relevance is attached to these questions in connection with the fact that a role of considerable importance is being assigned in the plans of adventurist, aggressive imperialist circles to the Beijing hegemonists, who are operating in unison with these circles.

Beijing is not only an active accomplice of the opponents of peace and detente but is actually implementing an anti-Soviet, hegemonist policy coordinated with the imperialists. Although changes are occurring within the country following the death of Mao Zedong, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stated from the platform of the 26th congress, "We cannot yet, unfortunately, speak of any changes for the better in Beijing's foreign policy. It is, as before, aimed at exacerbation of the international situation and is linking up with the policy of imperialism."

The 26th congress made a high-minded evaluation of Beijing's dangerous foreign policy and demonstrated the continuity and consistency of the CPSU's policy in respect of China determined by the 24th and 25th party congresses.

I

The points contained in the material of the 26th CPSU Congress reveal the main trends of Beijing's foreign and domestic policy. They make it possible to ascertain China's role in the struggle of the two opposed social systems and to expose the improper, risky game, which is dangerous to world peace and its participants themselves, which is playing together with the West.

Following a hegemonist, chauvinist course, Beijing is actively supporting, together with the imperialist powers and their aggressive military blocs, the creation of the "broadest" anti-Soviet "united front" and some "international structure" opposed to the USSR, which translated into language intelligible to all means an alliance with the supporters of reaction and war to impede the growth of the forces of peace and progress and the strengthening of the positions of the socialist community. The PRC's leaders have accomplished a transition "from the left" to the right--from ultrarevolutionary slogans to a direct conspiracy with imperialist reaction, which, in turn, is attempting in every way to hold China to positions hostile to the Soviet Union, the socialist community as a whole and all present-day revolutionary forces. Nor is this made a secret by present U.S. President R. Reagan, who candidly acknowledged that China "is experiencing a very difficult and troubled, but highly promising period.... China's policy is entirely in accordance with Americans' expectations." It could not, it would seem, be put more clearly!

The Chinese leadership's present policy is characterized on the one hand by the utmost urging of the United States and the other NATO countries and also of Japan toward an exacerbation of relations with the Soviet Union and, on the other, by an endeavor to gain time for the accelerated creation with the aid of capitalist countries of a strong military-economic potential capable, considering China's human resources, of in the future rivaling the leading world powers. China's joint actions with the United States and other NATO countries and Japan are aimed at disrupting to the benefit of imperialism the military-strategic balance which exists in the world.

This policy of China's is encouraging the adventurism of imperialist circles and creating in them the illusion of the possibility of restoring lost positions and changing the correlation of forces in the world to their benefit. In other words, the hegemonist, anti-Soviet policy of China's leaders serves as a factor stimulating the growth of imperialism's aggressiveness and in pushing the world toward cold war times and a new twist of the arms race spiral.

How futile are the hopes that the imperialists will help the Chinese people effect the country's truly socialist reorganization which would make China a state with progressive industry, culture, science and technology is perfectly obvious.

The West is building its own, purely pragmatic (and, incidentally, myopic) calculations for taking advantage of the hostility of the Beijing leaders toward the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community in order to tie China to the capitalist system and military blocs with numerous threads of dependence and secure channels of imperialist penetration.

The Chinese leadership has recently been attempting to garb itself in the mantle of peace-lover and to assuage the idea of it as the apologist of a new world war which is unfavorable to Beijing. However, in practice the present Chinese leaders, as before, consider a new world war inevitable and are actually linking with this hopes of achieving their hegemonist goals. During a meeting with a French Socialist Party delegation on 13 February 1981 Deng Xiaoping, deputy chairman of the CCP Central Committee, repeated over and over, intimidating the visitors with

the "Soviet threat," that "threat of war is growing.... We in China have made a sober study of this question and have made full preparations for it." Obviously, Deng Xiaoping was referring to the campaign of many years' standing of the country's persistent militarization, in the course of which direct and indirect spending for military purposes has actually risen to 40 percent of the national budget. This has led to a weakening of the economy, a tremendous increase in inflation, serious disproportions in the national economy and a sharp fall in the already low living standard of the working people. Essentially Deng Xiaoping's statement was tantamount to extolling the "guns for rice" slogan, which Beijing's leaders have made a reality.

Officials and the press repeat insistently that "the factors of war are growing." However, this can in no way be attributed to a genuine concern for the fate of peace. On the contrary, Beijing is endeavoring in every way to whitewash the imperialist warmongers and at the same time conceal its own expansionist plans behind a verbal screen. Painting black as white with the utmost cynicism, Beijing figures are portraying U.S. imperialism and also the revanchist forces of the FRG and Japan as "the guarantors of peace and international security."

In contrast to the Soviet Union, which invariably and consistently advocates general disarmament and opposes the arms race, which was strikingly manifested once again in the proposals on these issues put forward by the 26th CPSU Congress, the Chinese leadership, while sometimes condemning the arms race in words, is in practice continuing to impede all steps toward limiting it and banning nuclear weapons and toward their nonproliferation. Beijing is persistently calling on the West and Japan to build up their military might in every way and is readily supporting the misanthropic plans of the American military, particularly with respect to production of the neutron bomb. The Chinese side is exonerating imperialism's militarist circles, shifting responsibility for the arms race from imperialism onto...the socialist countries.

At the same time China is fiercely resisting all the socialist countries' peace initiatives. The proposals for insuring peace and security in the Persian Gulf put forward by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev during a visit to India in December in 1980 were sharply attacked, for example. Beijing is reacting negatively to the set of peace-loving, constructive initiatives promulgated at the 26th CPSU Congress. Chinese propaganda is creating a hostile atmosphere around them. NCNA even went to such lengths as to declare the proposals put forward by the congress "bait" and a "tactical propaganda maneuver." At the same time Beijing is blowing up in every possible way the myth of the "Soviet threat" and anti-Soviet hysteria.

Gambling on war, Beijing is actively supporting the imperialists in the expansion of the arms race, the strengthening of aggressive military-political blocs and the whipping up of international tension. Following the Republican Party's victory in the presidential election in the United States, Beijing propaganda began to expound in detail and in a clearly approbatory tone statements by figures of this party concerning the need to pursue a "tough policy" in respect of the USSR and for an arms buildup and "the achievement of military superiority." It is readily taking up the bellicose anti-Soviet rhetoric of R. Reagan, A. Haig, and Pentagon figures. Beijing is persistently suggesting to Washington the idea of the "parallel nature of the strategic interests" of China and the United States as a

counter to the policy of detente and the growth of the international influence of the socialist forces. As the facts testify, precisely this was the main topic at Deng Xiaoping's talks with former U. S. President Ford during his visit to the PRC in March 1981.

The idea of the organization of the "broadest united front" of struggle against the USSR and all socialist and national liberation forces is now being supplemented with practical measures aimed at strengthening not only the political but also the military partnership of the PRC with the United States, West Europe and Japan. An important step on this path is the extension of China's military cooperation with the imperialist powers, which is providing Beijing access to the arsenals of the Pentagon and NATO as a whole.

In 1980 the U.S. Commerce Department issued 500 licenses for the sale of "dual purpose"--military and civil--goods to the PRC. The Chinese authorities are striving for the conclusion of agreements on obtaining from the United States and other NATO countries certain types of modern arms and equipment or the technology of their manufacture. We refer primarily to aviation and tank engines, certain missile and artillery armament models, military transport aircraft and helicopters, radio electronic equipment, computers and means of communication. Reports have appeared in the Western press that the United States and the other countries which participate in NATO's coordinating committee for controlling exports have reached agreement on lifting restrictions on supplies of offensive weapons, excluding nuclear, to China. Meanwhile Chinese representatives have entered into contact with more than 40 American firms which manufacture and supply arms and ammunition.

The Chinese leadership links the accelerated buildup of the PRC's military-economic might on the basis of the modernization of the base and military sectors of the economy with active use of the experience and assistance of the United States, other Western countries and Japan. Relations between the military departments of China and the NATO countries are continuing to develop. Adm H. Leach (July), chief of staff of the British Navy, General Smet (September), chief of staff of the Belgian Air Force, W. Perry (September), deputy U.S. defense secretary, and R. Pirie (December), assistant U.S. defense secretary, visited China in the latter half of 1980. Considerable assertiveness can be observed in the development of the exchange of military delegations with Japan.

Beijing's inflammatory policy has taken the path of confrontation with all peace-loving forces and countries and all who oppose preparations for war and the arms race. The Chinese leadership is attempting to put the aggressive endeavors of imperialism and the anticommunist and anti-Soviet prejudices of Western politicians at the service of its own hegemonist ambitions.

Having betrayed the class interests of the working people and the ideals of the Chinese revolution, from leftist, revolutionist appeals for the immediate destruction of the "paper tiger--American imperialism" the Maoists have slid as far as forming a direct military-political bloc with them. In Comrade M. A. Suslov's report the CPSU Central Committee predicted back at the February (1964) Plenum the logic of such development: "It is to be feared that in proceeding along their

incorrect, anti-Leninist path the Chinese leaders will arrive at an actual linkup with reactionary, bellicose imperialist elements." This, unfortunately, is just what has happened.

Beijing's anti-Soviet, antisocialist policy is acquiring an additional material foundation thanks to the accelerated development of military potential buttressed by cooperation with the United States, the NATO bloc and Japan.

At the same time it is impossible not to see that there are divergences and contradictions in the positions of the Chinese leadership and the imperialists, even though they are united by anti-Sovietism and antisocialism. Each side is endeavoring to bind the partner, but is unwilling to forfeit a free hand and bind itself with far-reaching commitments. In the United States, for example, particularly with the advent of the Republican administration, fears are being expressed, and not without reason, that a strengthened China could direct its expansion into the zone of American influence. In any event, one thing is certain: Chinese hegemonism will sooner or later clash with the interests of the imperialist powers, primarily the United States and Japan.

Taiwan remains a highly delicate problem for the United States and the PRC. Having adopted a policy of the intensive development of relations with the imperialist powers, the Beijing rulers have essentially recognized the "two China" situation. Shortly after the normalization of relations with the PRC, in April 1979 the United States enacted a bill on relations with Taiwan which in practice preserved their political, economic, cultural and other relations untouched. Trade between the United States and Taiwan (\$11 billion in 1980, according to estimates) is more than double American-Chinese trade; in 1979 alone American capital investments on Taiwan increased by \$80 million. In the 2 years since the establishment of diplomatic relations with the PRC the United States has supplied Taiwan with arms worth a total of roughly \$1 billion.

Following the victory in the presidential election, R. Reagan confirmed his readiness to develop relations with Taiwan. The opinion is widely held among Republicans that Beijing needs the United States more than the other way about and that for this reason there is no need for concessions to China on the Taiwan problem. Washington is reacting with relative composure to Beijing's verbal "thunder and lightning," believing it to be intended, apart from anything else, to disguise the true, capitulationist nature of the Chinese leaders' position on the Taiwan issue.

The all-around rapprochement with Japan has occupied and continues to occupy a special place in the Beijing leadership's geopolitical plans. The basis of it is anti-Sovietism and an endeavor to take advantage of Japan's potential for the stabilization and subsequent modernization of the PRC economy in order to speed up the country's militarization and realize its foreign policy designs in the Far East and in South and Southeast Asia. Japan's ruling circles are trying to take advantage of these aspirations. As the CPSU Central Committee report to the 26th congress pointed out, "negative features--playing up to the dangerous plans of Washington and Beijing and a trend toward militarization--are strengthening" in Japan's foreign policy.

The galvanization of the political and military cooperation of Beijing and Tokyo under the conditions of the present growth in Japan of militarist and revanchist trends, which are being encouraged by the Chinese leaders, contains a particularly serious threat to peace in the Far East and to the security of all countries of the region. The situation taking shape here urgently demands the development and implementation of measures which would contribute to the creation of a system of the mutual security of the countries of the region with the participation therein of the PRC, Japan, the DPRK and also the United States. The proposal put forward at the 26th CPSU Congress for concrete talks on confidence-building measures in the Far East with all parties concerned serves precisely this purpose.

The realistic, well-considered proposals of the Soviet Union, which take account of the interests of all possible participants in the talks, including China, just like the peace-loving, constructive initiatives put forward earlier by our country and other socialist states, are aimed at a relaxation of tension in Asia and the Far East, including in Soviet-Chinese relations. These proposals cut off at the roots the fraudulent inventions concerning a "Soviet threat" and the imaginary "hegemonism" of the USSR. The Soviet proposals are not to the Beijing leaders' liking. After all, their realization would lead to the establishment of normal good neighborly relations between countries on the principles of peaceful coexistence, which, as is known, envisages not only respect for the partners' sovereignty but also inviolability of borders, noninterference in their internal affairs and mutually profitable cooperation. In other words, this would require that Beijing cast aside the "territorial registers" in which it has arbitrarily inscribed 10 million square kilometers of the territory of neighboring states, abandon the attempts to "teach lessons" to countries unwilling to submit to Chinese diktat and cease interference in the internal affairs of many countries, primarily long-suffering Kampuchea and Afghanistan.

Within the framework of the same anti-Soviet global strategy China is continuing to galvanize relations with West European states. China's leaders are pursuing a policy aimed simultaneously at the political and military strengthening of NATO and frustration of the detente process and exacerbation of the confrontation of the United States and West Europe with world socialism.

But the high hopes of certain Western circles of employing in their political and military plans the "China card" against the USSR and other socialist community countries are collapsing. And for China the flirting with the West is proving to be a serious problem exacerbating the country's internal political and economic situation.

Beijing's hopes that the West and Japan would compensate it for expenditure brought about by the country's militarization, the miscalculations of Deng Xiaoping's policy of cooperation with imperialism and the economic adventurism of the Chinese leaders as a whole have not been fulfilled. The hopelessness of Beijing as a trading-economic partner which is now coming to light is accelerating considerably the process of transition from the recent raptures apropos the "imminent Chinese market" to prosaic humdrum, when both China's weakness and the reality of serious contradictions between the Western countries and the PRC are being reflected increasingly distinctly.

Under the conditions of the exacerbation of the international situation there is under way a further development of the interaction of Beijing and the West, which are endeavoring to impede the positive line of the socialist countries in the international arena. In this situation the Chinese leaders are introducing new elements to their policy of a differentiated approach to the socialist countries, and this approach is becoming increasingly insidious, moreover. Beijing is combining in more subtle fashion methods of flirting with pressure and a variety of tactical steps with an individual approach to each country. On an anti-Soviet basis Beijing is endeavoring to draw closer to and find a common language with the remnants of antisocialist elements in individual socialist countries in order to subsequently attempt to destabilize the situation in them. The fraternal states are rebuffing these Beijing intrigues.

At the same time the Chinese leadership has not given up its attacks on Vietnam, Laos, the Mongolian People's Republic and also Cuba. It is threatening a repetition of the aggression against socialist Vietnam, rejecting its proposals for a resumption of Chinese-Vietnamese talks and continuing provocations and maintaining tension on the borders with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

The pro-imperialist, anti-Soviet policy is also being displayed in Beijing's relations with the developing countries and national liberation movements. China no longer regards the developing countries, which, according to the Chinese scheme, are part of the so-called Third World, as the main buttress of its global policy. It is reducing economic and military assistance to them and openly nudging them toward cooperation with the United States and the former metropolis. The Chinese leadership is gambling in the Third World mainly on reactionary regimes which enjoy the support of imperialist circles.

Beijing is paying its main attention to the countries of Southeast and South Asia, endeavoring to consolidate China's positions in Southeast Asia on the whole and in Burma, impeding its mediation efforts in the organization of relations between Vietnam and the ASEAN countries. Actions to discredit the new initiatives of Vietnam, Laos and the People's Republic of Kampuchea aimed at normalization of the situation in Southeast Asia and the creation of a zone of peace and stability there continue.

Now is the Chinese leadership ceasing its attempts to weaken the international positions of a great Asian power--India--and to disrupt its territorial unity and integrity. Beijing is reacting with irritation to the strengthening mutually profitable Soviet-Indian cooperation, which received new impetus as a result of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's visit to India.

The Beijing's foreign policy is a factor undermining the cause of peace and detente and represents a threat to the security of neighboring countries. At the same time this policy is doing enormous damage to the fundamental national interests of the Chinese people themselves and the cause of the socialism in this country since it is essentially turning China into an accomplice of the aggressive imperialist forces. Observing that linkage with imperialism would do China no good, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev declared at the 26th CPSU Congress: "This will not, of course, return China to a healthy development path. Imperialists will not be the friends of socialism."

Practice has fully corroborated the well-founded nature of our party's analysis of the processes which have occurred in China since the end of the 1950's and the correctness and class-based scrupulousness of the conclusions concerning the ruinous theory and practice of Maoism. "The experience of the PRC's socioeconomic development in the last two decades is a harsh lesson showing to what distortion of the principles of socialism and its essence both in domestic and international policy leads," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th congress. "China's present leaders themselves call the practices in their country in the period of the so-called cultural revolution 'the cruelest feudal-fascist dictatorship.' We have nothing to add to this evaluation."

At the end of the 1950's our party criticized the voluntarism of Mao Zedong and the "barracks communism" which he had implanted and warned of the ruinous consequences which the attempts to accomplish a "great leap forward" in the development of the economy and "communize" the countryside in a hurry could entail. Today China also considers 1958, when these attempts came to be made in practice, "the year of the start of the decline."

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out in September 1967: "What the Mao Zedong group calls the 'cultural revolution' it would be more correct to call counterrevolution." Our party exposed the tyranny and inhuman repression which reigned in China at that time. Today Beijing admits that Mao Zedong made many mistakes, although it tries to attribute all the crimes to the "counterrevolutionary Lin Biao and Chiang Ching grouping." The "cultural revolution" is now described as a "truly staggering monstrous catastrophe" which plunged the people into an "abyss of suffering" and as "great counterrevolutionary destruction."

The CPSU Central Committee report to the 26th party congress draws attention to the fact that changes are now occurring in China's domestic policy. "Time has still to show their true meaning," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev observed. "It will show to what extent the present Chinese leadership has succeeded in overcoming the Maoist legacy."

The question of overcoming this legacy is a fundamental problem on whose solution the PRC's future depends since it is expressed in the disorganization of the country's economy and the antidemocratic practices established at the time of the "cultural revolution," in the working people's lack of rights and their very grave material living conditions, in Maoist ideology and in the "crisis of trust" in the ideals of socialism.

China's economy is experiencing great difficulties. After Mao Zedong's death, the Chinese leadership made of paramount importance the task of the country's modernization, interpreted in the great power nationalist spirit. But the attempts to accomplish it at an accelerated pace collapsed. Now, as the CCP Central Committee newspaper RENMIN RIBAO wrote, the PRC is faced with the "threat of a serious financial-economic crisis." The rate of development is slowing down, and the lagging of the fuel-raw material sectors is increasing. Approximately one-third of industry's production capacity is being underutilized as a result of the shortage

of power. There has been a sharp increase in the national budget deficit, inflationary trends are on the increase and retail prices for consumer goods are rising.

The working people's material situation is not appreciably improving. Whereas initially Beijing's leaders spoke of the need "to show concern for the life of the people," Mao Zedong's slogan "do not fear deprivation, do not fear death" is now being propagandized increasingly loudly. Mass unemployment continues in the country. At least 100 million people are going hungry. At the same time the PRC is the world's third biggest spender on military needs.

The Chinese leadership is seeking a way out in two principal directions: thanks to tighter implementation of the "policy of adjustment," which in practice means economic stagnation, and also on the paths of stimulation of private-enterprise initiative. Material is appearing in the Chinese press to the effect that "some exploitation" should be permitted for a "whole historical stage" and that the development of private enterprise is the "state's long-term policy." The question of incorporation in the constitution of a clause enshrining the right to private ownership of the means of production is being discussed.

Collective property is being divided up in the countryside. The land, agricultural implements and livestock, which are formally owned by the production brigades, are being distributed among links and individual peasant homesteads. By the end of 1980 approximately 20 percent of the country's agricultural brigades had switched in practice to a system of small-group and individual land tenure. The Chinese leadership is preaching the slogan "let some peasants grow rich first." The policy of supporting "strong farms" is condemning the poorest peasants to a scanty existence. It is leading to the property differentiation of the countryside and is fraught with the risk of the emergence of acute social conflicts.

Opportunities are being created for the private enterprise activity of the national Chinese and foreign bourgeoisie. Confiscated bank deposits have been returned to Chinese capitalists, and laws have been passed giving access in the PRC to foreign capital and granting Western investors considerable tax privileges.

The prolonged coexistence of economic structures differing in their socioeconomic nature (socialist, small-scale commodity, private capitalist and state-capitalist) in combination with elements of the market regulation of production in the state sector is portrayed by Beijing as a kind of "Chinese model" of economic development.

Certain changes are occurring in the internal political situation. It is now seldom that a Chinese leader's speech avoids mention of the leading role of the working class and the Communist Party and the need for the development of democracy and legality. Sessions of the All-China Assembly of People's Representatives (AAPR) have come to be convened more regularly. The central bodies of the union, youth, women's and other public organizations have resumed their work, and direct elections to the district organs of power are being held for the first time.

In practice the PRC working class is not the leading force of Chinese society and has no real opportunity to influence the country's domestic and foreign policy. The Chinese leadership arbitrarily includes heterogeneous strata in its ranks. In

January 1981 former industrialists and merchants were declared "new members of the working class." The fact that the AAPR Third Session (September 1980), which adopted the decision to revise the country's constitution, spoke of the PRC as a "state of new democracy," that is, a state based on an alliance not only of workers and peasants but also the petite urban and national bourgeoisie, whereas the constitution which has been in effect since 1978 describes China as a "state of the dictatorship of the proletariat," merits attention in this connection.

As under Mao Zedong, the CCP is not the vanguard of the PRC working class and does not express its interests. It has 38 million members, of whom approximately 20 million are trained workers ([*gan'bu*]). The CCP basically remains a peasant party in its social composition. Representatives of the working class constitute an absolute minority. Approximately half the CCP members joined it at the time of the "cultural revolution."

Although it is now openly admitted in China that Mao Zedong made mistakes, his basic ideas are, as before, given out as the "quintessence of the wisdom of the entire party" and remain its ideological-political platform. The lack of faith of many CCP members in the correctness of the party's political line, its capacity for leading Chinese society and its possibility of "modernizing the country" has become very widespread. Leftist and reactionary-nationalist views and petit bourgeois concepts circulate extensively.

The ideological and organizational confusion is creating difficulties for the convening of the 12th CCP Congress. According to a Central Committee plenum decision, the delegates to the congress were to have been determined by November 1980, but party conferences have as of this time been held only in certain provinces. The date of the convening of the congress has not yet been settled.

The main bulwark of the present regime is the army (PLA). Despite the reduction in the number of its representatives in the party and state bodies, the army continues to occupy strong political positions. According to RENJIN RIBAO, in 1980 it "sent over 50,000 groups of servicemen to more than 150,000 centers of population and establishments for the solution of concrete questions." At an all-army conference on political work among the troops in January 1981 Deng Xiaoping, Hu Yaoban and other leading figures called on the PLA to make the "maximum contribution possible" to implementation of the present political course and to "struggle against counterrevolutionary elements and various criminals!"

As is known, a chronic phenomenon in China in Mao Zedong's time were mass political campaigns with the aid of which the working people's resistance to Maoist practices was overcome and any dissidence was persecuted. The incessant campaigns deprived the Chinese people of the possibility of working tranquilly and in planned fashion in the name of an improvement in material and cultural living conditions. In December 1978 a CCP Central Committee Plenum adopted a decree on "a shift in the center of gravity of the work of the entire party and the switches of the attention of the country's entire people to modernization," which provided for the abandonment of political campaigns and stress on "class struggle." But this decision is not being fulfilled: China is in a fever of campaigns, as before.

Thus almost all of 1980 was connected with the preparation and proceedings of the trial of the "bourgeois-revolutionary Lin Biao and Chiang Ching grouping." The legal proceedings were needed by the Chinese leadership primarily to divert the working people's attention from the serious situation in the country and beat down the swelling wave of popular discontent, shift responsibility for the flagrant tyranny and repression, economic confusion and the people's low living standard onto Chiang Ching and her supporters and also to create a legal precedent for the persecution of its political rivals in the power struggle.

Nevertheless, public disturbances in the PRC have increased since the end of 1980. The newspaper RENMIN RIBAO wrote on 2 February that "a wave of sabotage, protest and despair has rolled over the country." Leaflets and underground publications have appeared in Beijing and a number of China's big cities which accuse Deng Xiaoping and other Mao Zedong's successors of "betraying the revolution and restoring capitalism" and call for "a revolution against them." Increasing repression and punitive measures, under these conditions the Maoists have again begun to talk about an exacerbation of the "class struggle" in its earlier interpretation, when all those disgruntled with the regime were categorized as "class enemies." A purge based on a period of 3-5 years, as a result of which it is planned to expel several million members from the party, continues in the CCP.

An acute power struggle continues within the ruling grouping itself. The Americans, who are endeavoring to support Deng Xiaoping, extolling him in every way as a "strong personality" and "true friend of the West," are interfering almost openly in this struggle. However, the strife at the Beijing upper level does not affect the strategic goals proclaimed by Mao Zedong. All the Chinese leaders are united by the desire to turn the PRC into a strong military-industrial power. They all support the platform of the "sinization of Marxism" and positions of great-power chauvinism, hegemonism and anti-Sovietism. The differences between them concern mainly the methods and pace of the accomplishment of the set tasks.

Analyzing the processes currently occurring in China, it may be stated that the Maoist legacy continues to tower over the policy of Beijing's present leaders, and without a decisive break with it the PRC will be unable to return to a healthy development path. And the sooner such a break occurs, the better it will be for the Chinese working people.

111

The 26th CPSU Congress confirmed that in relations with China our party abides by the policy determined by its 24th and 25th congress. This long-time policy combines high-minded struggle against Beijing's ideology and policy, which are hostile to Marxism-Leninism, with the readiness to normalize relations with the PRC on the principles of peaceful coexistence and to build up links with it on a good-neighborly basis. "If Soviet-Chinese relations remain frozen, our position is not the reason for this," the CPSU Central Committee report to the 26th party congress says.

As is known, following the the 25th CPSU Congress, the Soviet side took a number of concrete steps aimed at improving Soviet-Chinese relations. Here are the most important of them. In 1976-1977 and in 1978 the latest rounds of negotiations on

the border settlement were conducted in Beijing on the USSR's initiative. On 24 February 1978 the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium sent the AAPP Standing Committee an appeal calling for the normalization of relations, talks and the signing of an agreement on the principles of relations between the USSR and the PRC. The first round of talks was held in September-November 1979 in Moscow at USSR and PRC government delegation level on interstate questions. The Soviet side has repeatedly confirmed the validity of its proposals concerning the conclusion of a mutual nonaggression treaty and a treaty on the nonuse of force, drafts of which were submitted to the PRC Government in 1971 and 1972 respectively.

But Beijing has not supported one of the Soviet initiatives. Moreover, it has toughened its anti-Soviet policy. The PRC Government annulled the 1950 Soviet-Chinese Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance Treaty. The Chinese side is displaying no interest in resumption of talks with the USSR on the border settlement and conducting a second round of negotiations on the interstate questions, which, according to the arrangement, is to be conducted in Beijing. It is demanding of the USSR as preliminary conditions that it end its support of Vietnam and insisting that the Soviet Union unilaterally withdraw its forces from the borders with China and recognize as being "in dispute" (in fact, Chinese) a number of areas on Soviet territory. The Chinese leadership has demanded that the USSR reexamine its entire foreign policy, declaring that otherwise "there will be no change in Soviet-Chinese relations in 10-20 years even," which Deng Xiaoping declared in November 1980.

Beijing is continuing to wage a bitter propaganda war against the USSR. In 1980 RENMIN RIBAO alone carried more than 300 articles (including over 100 anti-Soviet utterances by members of the CCP Central Committee Politburo) attacking the USSR's domestic and foreign policy and leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

Chinese propaganda greeted the 26th CPSU Congress with malicious slander. The wish to build relations with the PRC on a good-neighborly basis and the feelings of respect for and friendship toward the Chinese people expressed in the CPSU Central Committee report were marked down as "unbridled attacks" on China. The PRC press has not only glossed over the Soviet people's achievements in building communism entirely but is persistently spreading the inventions about the situations in the USSR fabricated by anticommunist centers and the CIA. Beijing's leaders are trying with all their might to convince the imperialists that China will not change its attitude toward the USSR as "enemy number one."

The 26th CPSU Congress again confirmed that in relations with other countries the Soviet Union pursues a high-minded Leninist policy which serves the interests of socialism and peace. This applies fully to our relations with China. In the report to the congress the CPSU Central Committee made a critical analysis of the Chinese leadership's course in both domestic and international policy and made a class-based evaluation of it.

Not only the delegates to the 26th CPSU Congress but also the heads of the fraternal parties of the socialist countries and all foreign guests who touched on the China question in their speeches identified themselves fully with this evaluation. "The 26th CPSU Congress confirms convincingly that the Soviet Union is

consistently continuing its truly humane foreign policy, the basis of which is the Peace Program of the 24th and 25th party congresses," E. Honecker, general secretary of the PDS Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, said. "It will not be diverted from this path either by the confrontation on which certain NATO circles, particularly the United States, have embarked or by the Beijing leaders who, pursuing great-power, chauvinist and hegemonist goals, are entering into a dangerous compact with the most aggressive forces of monopoly capital."

"We are convinced that the decisions of your congress," Jorge del Prado, general secretary of the Peruvian Communist Party Central Committee, said, "will serve to reinforce the world revolutionary movement and intensify resistance to the aggressiveness of imperialism and its Beijing accomplices and the struggle in the name of the achievement of new victories in the interests of mankind and in the interests of strengthening peace."

The 26th CPSU Congress demonstrated our party's all-round approach to a solution of urgent problems, which combines fair criticism with a constructive quest for an acceptable way out of this complex situation or the other. The section of the CPSU Central Committee report concerning China is imbued with sincere concern for the genuine interests of the Chinese people.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized from the high tribune of the party congress: "The Soviet Union has not sought and does not seek confrontation with the PRC. We are abiding by the policy determined by the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses and would like to build relations with it on a good-neighborly basis. Our proposals aimed at a normalization of relations with China hold good just as our feelings of respect for and friendship toward the Chinese people remain unchanged."

Soviet people believe that ultimately friendship and cooperation between the peoples of the USSR and the PRC will be restored.

CSS: 1802/13

FOR THE SUCCESSFUL BUILDING OF SOCIALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 81 pp 123-128

[Review by V. Fomichev of the book "Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biograficheskaya Khronika. 1870-1924" [Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biographical Chronicle. 1870-1924]. Vol 11, July-November 1921. Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 783 pages with illustrations]

[Text] The transition from the policy of war communism to the new economic policy, stipulated in the decisions of the 10th RKP(b) Congress, marked a sharp turn in the life of the Soviet state. It required a radical change in the style and methods of work of party and state organs and the mobilization of the country's entire forces for the solution of the forthcoming tasks--the restoration of the national economy, the strengthening of the alliance between the working class and the toiling peasantry, the development of trade between town and country, the organization of a credit-monetary system, and the finding of new forms of production management.

The following basic problem was on the agenda: who will outstrip whom--the capitalist or the Soviet system, and who will benefit sooner from this new situation? "If the capitalists succeed in organizing themselves sooner, they shall chase off the communists....or else the proletarian state power will be able, with the support of the peasantry, to keep the capitalists in proper harness in order to guide capitalism along the state channel and to create a capitalism subordinate to the state and serving the state. The question must be posed soberly.It is a question either of organizing proletarian power, which task the frontranking workers and the small segment of progressive peasants will realize and will be able to organize a popular movement around, at which point we shall win, or else being unable to organize it, at which point the enemy, who will be technologically stronger, will inevitably defeat us" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 44, pp 161, 163-164). In other words, the NEP policy relied on the victory of socialist over capitalist elements, the total elimination of the latter and the building of socialism.

The activities of V. I. Lenin, the leader of the communist party and the people and the head of the Soviet government, toward the implementation of these new complex tasks of peaceful socialist construction has been reflected comprehensively in the latest volume of his Biographical Chronicle. The volume contains more than 3,000 facts (including 937 new documents) which describe in the greatest detail Lenin's life and work from 12 July to 13 November 1921. They indicate how

in the most difficult circumstances of dislocation, hunger and deprivation, the party he led found the way to surmount incredible difficulties, found reserves for the growth of the economy and resolved most complex social problems.

The materials and the documents contained in the volume cover Lenin's activities in the supreme party organs extensively. With his participation, within the 142 days which represent the chronological limits of the work, there were seven Central Committee plenums and 25 politburo meetings. They considered and resolved a number of problems covering all aspects of party and governmental policy. The reader's attention will be drawn on facts which reveal the systematic and irreconcilable struggle against some members of the defeated "workers' opposition" who tried to continue their antiparty activity despite the decisions passed at the 10th RKP(b) Congress. Thus at the 9 August Central Committee Plenum, which convened on the basis of Item 7 of the 10th congress decree "On Party Unity," Vladimir Il'ich submitted the motion that A. G. Shlyapnikov, one of the leaders of the "workers' opposition," be expelled from the Central Committee and the RKP(b) for slanderous fabrications against the party. Lenin firmly rebuffed G. I. Myasnikov, another member of the "workers' opposition," who believed in the possibility of proclaiming in the country freedom of the press and speech for everyone, "from monarchists to anarchists inclusive." Lenin proved that it is the Soviet state that offers the best solution to the problem of granting freedom of the press, while the "freedom of the press" discussed by Myasnikov, under conditions in which the bourgeoisie has been defeated but not as yet eliminated, means nothing other than granting the bourgeoisie the freedom of establishing political organizations against the working people.

One of the most important tasks of that time was the all-round consolidation of the organizational and ideological unity of the communist party, the enhancement of its role in the life of society and the state, and the purging of its ranks from antiparty or unsuitable elements. This was the purpose of the party purge, which took place in the second half of 1921, and whose organization and course were always kept in sight by Vladimir Il'ich. As the materials in the volume make clear, the question of a purge had been repeatedly submitted for consideration by the plenum and politburo of the RKP(b) Central Committee, in whose proceedings Lenin participated. He followed its development in the local party organizations and issued the necessary recommendations. On 20 September he wrote a PRAVDA editorial entitled "On The Party Purge," in which the purposes of the purge were defined with maximum clarity: "To clean up the party...from the swindlers, the bureaucrats, the dishonest, the flaky communists and the Mensheviks who have changed their appearance but have remained Mensheviks in their hearts," and to make the party the vanguard "more firmly linked with the class, better capable of leading it to victory among the mass of difficulties and dangers" ("Poin. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, pp 123-124). In the course of the purge 24.1 percent of the membership of the RKP(b) were either expelled or dropped out. This improved the health of the party, strengthened its proletarian nucleus and its ties with the masses, and contributed greatly to upgrading the responsibility of the party members for the solution of the difficult tasks facing the country.

From the viewpoint of party propaganda tasks and of the close ties between propaganda and economic construction, the letter which Vladimir Il'ich wrote on

1 September to the editors of *ECONOMICHESTKAYA ZHIZN'* was quite topical. It emphasized that the newspaper must become a battle organ and not only provide regular and truthful information on the country's economy but also analyze such information and process it scientifically in order to obtain accurate conclusions with a view to managing industry and to urging on all personnel on the economic front, approving successful work and submitting to the judgement of the public inaccurate, backward and unskillful workers or straggling enterprises, establishments or sectors (see p 268).

The volume gives the dates of all of Lenin's speeches of July-November 1921 and of the articles he wrote within that time segment, in which he continued his creative development of Marxist theory and discussion of problems of the building of socialism in our country. In his address to Seventh Moscow Guberniya Party Conference, entitled "On The New Economic Policy," Vladimir Il'ich firmly emphasized that the task of converting to the NEP was not "a storming onslaught, but the laying of a very hard, difficult and unpleasant siege, involving a number of retreats" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 205). Lenin considered the new methods of economic management and organization of production and labor important aspects of the new economic policy. He called for boldly replacing the previous bankrupt views of the ways and means of economic construction with conclusions and concepts based on the objective requirements of the period. In his article "On The Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution," Vladimir Il'ich proved that preparations for communism will require long years of effort and many transitional steps. "Initially build firm bridges to the small peasantry, leading from state capitalism to socialism, based not directly on enthusiasm but with the help of the enthusiasm born of the great revolution, on the basis of personal interest and economic profit," the article stated. "Otherwise you will not reach communism, you will not lead dozens and dozens of millions of people to communism" (Ibid., p 151).

Under circumstances in which the economic linking of town with country has become the most important task of the day, "the proletarian state," Lenin wrote, "must become a cautious, thrifty and skillful 'boss,' and a meticulous wholesale merchant..." (Ibid., p 152). In summing up the practical experience acquired in elaboration and application of the principles of the new economic policy, in his article "On the Importance of Gold Now and After the Full Victory of Socialism," Lenin substantiated the thesis of trade as a separate "link" in the historical chain of events, "which we, the proletarian state system, the ruling communist party, must hold on to with all our strength" (Ibid., p 225).

Subsequently, at the Ninth All-Russian Congress of Soviets, Lenin said that "our main task" in 1921 would be to take the first steps in the transition to the new economic policy, "and to learn how to take these steps, to adapt to them our legislation and our administration..." (Ibid., p 305). The volume describes in detail the process of "adaptation of the legislation" to the changed working conditions. One of the most important documents dealing with this problem was the "Soyznarkom Order on the Implementation of the Beginnings of the New Economic Policy," drafted on Vladimir Il'ich's initiative and with his participation. On 21 July Lenin read the rough draft of the theses of this document, drafted by a commission of the RKP(b) Central Committee, edited, deleted, underlined and noted parts of the document with the initials NB. In reference to the archive document,

the volume states that on 7 August he reread one of the drafts of the theses, made notes, and emphasized the item on the need to reorganize the Gosplan and, particularly, the words "a plan can be drafted only by those who will be implementing it;" "the plan must be based on the big nationalized industry as its linchpin" (p. 170). Vladimir Il'ich participated in the session of the RKP(b) Central Committee Plenum in the morning of 9 August, at which the theses with Lenin's amendments were adopted as a basis. They were legislatively codified after the adoption of the "Order" which the Sovnarkom issued the same day. The order defined the basic directions governing the organization of industry and the principles for industrial management. It stipulated, in particular, that the work of the enterprises must be based "on accurate cost effectiveness." The task of insuring production profitability was formulated. It was emphasized that workers in industrial enterprises "must be compensated to the extent of their interest in the production process and in such a way as to encourage their initiative in raising productivity."

The materials in this volume indicate also that other important legislative acts were drafted and implemented after the "Sovnarkom Order on the Implementation of the Principle of the New Economic Policy." On 12 August the Labor And Defense Council passed the "Basic Stipulations on Measures for the Restoration of Big Industry and for Improving and Developing Production." On 16 August Lenin signed the Sovnarkom decree "On Expanding the Rights of State Enterprises in the Areas of Financing and Handling Material Resources;" On 25 August he signed the draft Sovnarkom decree "On Measures to Raise the Level of Engineering and Technical Knowledge in the Country and to Improve the Living Conditions of Engineering and Technical Workers in the RSFSR." The land of the soviets was gathering the necessary pace for the peaceful building of socialism.

Lenin kept track of problems related to the further development of large-scale industry, mainly of electrification. He emphasized that "large-scale machine industry means nothing but the electrification of the entire country" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 50). For example, concerned with the implementation of the GOELRO plan and the building of the first Soviet electric power plants, he requested from the People's Commissariat of Foreign Trade information on the fulfillment of the orders for the Kashir Electric Power Plant which he considered "supremely important." He signed a cable to be sent by telephone to the People's Commissariat of Labor on the need to strengthen the detachment under the jurisdiction of the People's Commissariat working at the Kashir construction project to total 700 people--masons, stone masons and general workers; he asked the Main Administration of the Fuel Industry to deliver over a 3-day period 1,000 poods of casting coke to the Podol'sk plant so that the latter could meet the orders placed by the Kashir construction project; he made it incumbent upon the presidium of the Sovnarkhoz, in connection with the report submitted by G. O. Graftio, the chief engineer of Volkhovskaya, "immediately to supply the construction project of the Volkhovskaya Hydroelectric Power Plant with the necessary funds in order to insure the accelerated pursuit of the project...." (pp 305-306).

Subsequently, as he summed up the results of electrification in 1921 at the Ninth All-Russian Congress of Soviets, Lenin was to say, with a feeling of legitimate

pride, that the initial successes "indicate how progress can be made despite the existence of difficulties unheard of in any other country" (Vol 44, p 620).

Lenin showed tremendous concern for the elimination of the fuel crisis in the country. As head of the fuel commission of the Labor and Defense Council, he continually supervised the course of wood procurement, the organization of peat and shale extraction, and the application of progressive forms of organizing production and labor in their extraction. However, Vladimir Il'ich paid particular attention to raising coal and petroleum extraction. Thus, on 20 July he asked the Sovnarkhoz Main Coal Mining Administration to provide an immediate answer to the prevailing situation with the purchase of coal-cutting machines for the Donbass and to determine where it would be better to purchase them, "in Germany or England, and how soon could this take place;" on 10 October he addressed a telegram to all guberniya executive committees, party committees, trade union councils, and labor commissions on increasing their efforts to assist in the return to the Donbass mines of underground workers and suggested that such workers be guaranteed bread supplies and that new regulations be drafted regarding their wages in terms of food and cash payments, based on productivity and for the elimination of equalized rations (see pp 458-459). He displayed also very great interest in improving work at the Urals and Siberia coal mines.

The volume includes a great deal of proof of the tireless attention Lenin paid to the state of affairs in other industrial sectors. For example, he received I. I. Mezhlauk, chairman of the board of the Yugostal' trust, with whom he discussed possibilities of considerably increasing metal production. He asked how much money was needed for raising metallurgy in the south to the prewar level; he acceded to the request of the Ivanovo-Voznesenskaya Guberniya economic conference to supply it with 40,000 food rations and 4 billion rubles monthly, which were needed for operating 22 textile enterprises.

Lenin supported scientific discoveries and technical improvements, which he considered an important prerequisite for the growth of labor productivity, such as a hydraulic peat extraction method, the development of an electric plow, the study and utilization of chemical raw materials in Kara-Bogaz-Gol Bay and others. On 3 September, in a letter to N. P. Gorbunov, in charge of Sovnarkom affairs, he criticized the work of the scientific and technical department of the Sovnarkhoz. Vladimir Il'ich suggested "to establish who specifically will be in charge of informing us of European and American technology in clear and practical terms, promptly, and not bureaucratically." In particular, he asked that Moscow have one sample of the latest most important machines "so that it may learn and teach" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 53, pp 163-164).

The restoration of the country's national economy was a complex and difficult project. The hunger caused by the severe drought, mainly in the Volga area, of the summer of 1921 added to the difficulties caused by the general decline of the economy as a result of the war and foreign intervention. The fight against hunger, which spread over 34 guberniyas with a population of as many as 30 million people, assumed the priority in the life of the entire country. Lenin headed the efforts of the party and the Soviet government in the fight against hunger and actually headed the Central Commission for Aid to the Hungry, set up under the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

The PKP(b) Central Committee and the Soviet government proclaimed aid to the hungry a nationwide project. On 21 July PRAVDA published the Central Committee letter "To All PKP Members and Organizations," which called for the "immediate organization of planned systematic struggle against the natural disaster and for the creation of a powerful organization for help to the hungry population." The problems of the fight against hunger, as indicated in the volume, were discussed repeatedly in Central Committee plenums, the politburo, the Sovnarkom and the Labor and Defense Council). Lenin personally supervised the accelerated collection of the food tax in the guberniyas which had not suffered from the drought and the meeting of the grain itineraries. He instructed the party, soviet and food organs of the parts of the country which had grain, mainly Turkestan and Siberia, to speed up the shipment of grain to the areas along the Volga and the center, frequently describing them as the "Sovnarkom itineraries." On 2 August he wrote the "Appeal to the Peasants of the Ukraine," which stated the following: "Let there be no single farmer who has not shared his surplus with the hungry peasants along the Volga who have no seed to plant" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 77). In answer to this appeal, instead of 250,000 poods of grain, the working people of Turkestan shipped out 600,000; more than 31 million poods of grain were shipped from the Ukraine to the areas along the Volga and elsewhere in the country which had been affected by the drought. Lenin signed decrees on purchasing grain and seeds from foreign countries for the hungry guberniyas, appropriating 4 million silver rubles on 19 July and 32,318,000 gold rubles on 18 August.

Lenin's "Appeal to the International Proletariat," which he wrote on 2 August, asking for help for the guberniyas in the Soviet republic which had suffered from the poor harvest, met with great response throughout the world. An International Workers Committee for Aid to the Hungry was set up with the participation of the Comintern Executive Committee. It included Klara Zetkin, Henri Barbusse, Martin Andersen-Nexø and other famous public figures. Noted members of the Western intelligentsia such as Fridtjof Nansen, Bernard Shaw, Anatole France, Theodore Dreiser and others were active in the movement for aid to the hungry in Russia.

Thanks to the measures adopted by the party Central Committee and the Soviet government, the disasters caused by the 1921 bad harvest and the hunger were eased to a certain extent.

Along with the elimination of the consequences of the drought, the country was taking measures to insure the upsurge of agriculture and the growth of agricultural output. Greater attention was paid mainly to the successful 1921 sowing campaign, whose plan, signed by Lenin, was published in the newspaper IZVESTIYA VTSIK on 20 July, and to the procurement of seed even from abroad. This made it possible, essentially, to cope successfully with the autumn campaign and thus to lay good foundations for the 1922 crop. The readers will be equally interested in documents showing Vladimir Il'ich's concern for animal husbandry, the production of agricultural machinery and the raising of farming standards. He addressed the First Moscow Guberniya Agricultural Congress with a speech in which he emphasized the need for higher labor productivity and for the study of agronomy. Lenin reviewed the draft outline of the Sovnarkhoz theses "On Economic Policy," to which he added a text on the need to support the economic initiative of rural workers and to assist the peasants in establishing cooperatives. In his letter to N. P. Gorbunov he noted the model work of the sovkhoses managed by the Main Farming

Administration emphasizing the tremendous basic and practical significance of the successful development of this type of "truly proletarian farming," and asked that the problem of aid to the sovkhoses be urgently prepared for discussion at meetings of the Small Sovnarkom and the Labor and Defense Council. Those days, Vladimir Il'ich frequently mentioned the need for converting to large-scale socialist agricultural production in the future.

Lenin dealt extensively with problems of cultural construction. Facts confirm the broad range of his interests: the elimination of illiteracy, the writing of textbooks and training aids, the compilation of a "Russian Language Dictionary," increasing the production of paper, the organization of publishing and library work, the publication of works of fiction, the repair and reorganization of the building of the Bolshoy Theater, and so on, and so forth. In emphasizing the exceptional importance of the organization of the education and political instruction of the broad popular masses, Lenin pointed out the need of linking them closely to the growth of material production and the development of the Soviet economy. "We must not only eliminate illiteracy," he said, addressing the Second All-Russian Congress Of Political Educators, "...Our propaganda, our manuals, our pamphlets must be accepted by the people and result in improvements in the national economy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 175).

Let us note among the facts related to problems of national-state construction, contained in the volume, those which reflect the tremendous attention which Lenin paid to the organization and development of the Central Asian republics. Thus, after reading the "Resolution and Decree of the Sixth Congress of the Communist Party of Turkestan," on 31 August, Vladimir Il'ich underlined and noted with "NB" on the margins a number of places in this document, including the part on the powerful growth of associations of peasants with little or no land, which were the class organizations of the poor. "This is both true and important," he wrote opposite the item in the resolution which discussed "the need for the systematic purge of the associations of the poor and the farmhands from all nonproletarian elements, and their organizational strengthening through the introduction of strict association discipline and communist education among the semiproletarian masses" (p 262).

In explaining the features of the NEP in the republics of Central Asia, Lenin called upon them to pursue a wise and cautious policy toward the Muslim population. He considered necessary to draft and codify in a number of directives a policy which "should be a model for the entire East." Somewhat later, returning to the state of affairs in Turkestan, Bukhara and Khorezma, he suggested that particular attention be paid to defending the interests and gaining the trust of the local nationalities. "It is devilishly important in terms of our entire global politics," Vladimir Il'ich wrote. "to gain the trust of the natives, three or four times over; to prove to them that we are not imperialists and that we shall not tolerate any deviation toward imperialism. It would be no exaggeration to consider this a global problem" (P 334).

The materials contained in the volume describe Lenin's role in the preparations for the founding of a federation of the three Transcaucasian Soviet republics of

Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia, and his correspondence on this matter with, among others, G. K. Ordzhonikidze, chairman of the Caucasian Bureau of the RKP(b) Central Committee, and with J. V. Stalin, people's commissar for nationalities affairs.

The Soviet government remained unflinchingly loyal to the principles of a peaceful foreign policy, which was announced in October 1917 and was systematically and consistently pursued during the period under consideration. The facts prove the tremendous attention which Lenin paid to the establishment of friendly relations with the Oriental countries which were freeing themselves from colonial dependence. For example, there is an interesting document in which Lenin expresses his full agreement with the view of G. V. Chicherin, people's commissar for foreign affairs, according to which the Soviet state should not limit itself to giving political support to the national liberation movement in the East but should help the young national states in developing their economy and training cadres (see p 654). During the meeting with the Mongolian delegation, headed by D. Sukhet-Bator, the founder of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, Vladimir Il'ich answered many questions asked by the delegation and emphasized in particular the need for the Mongolian people to struggle for state and economic independence in a state of alliance with the workers and peasants of Soviet Russia. He developed the idea of the possibility and necessity of noncapitalist development of Mongolia and assured the delegation on behalf of the Soviet government that the latter would give comprehensive aid and support to the Mongolian revolution (see p 590).

Lenin used every single opportunity for establishing business and friendly relations with the capitalist countries. Thus, learning from a letter by M. M. Litvinov of the willingness of Italian banks to grant Russia a loan, with the knowledge of the Italian government, he suggested that the RKP(b) politburo set up a commission to consider this matter on an urgent basis, and wrote: "I consider this matter extremely important and urgent, for the conclusion of a loan with Italy, which would not require a recognition of the old debts, may represent a breach of the financial blockade" (p 464). Lenin met with A. Hammer, a representative of American business circles, to whom he expressed the idea of possible American participation in the rebuilding of Russian industry. With P. Christensen, the representative of the U.S. Farmer-Labor Party, he discussed the expediency of organizing mutually profitable Soviet-American trade.

Lenin always kept track of problems of the international communist and workers' movements and of the unification of truly revolutionary forces in the struggle against opportunism and reformism. He regularly studied Comintern documents and the minutes of its executive committee, and met with leaders of communist parties. The volume proves extensively Vladimir Il'ich's concern with the situation in the Communist Party of Germany, and the differences which had appeared within it. He discussed this frankly in his talks with K. Zetkin, W. Pieck and F. Heckert and expressed his viewpoint in his "Letter to the German Communists," dated 14 August, in which he advised them to strengthen their ties with the masses, train the young communists, make no concessions to the reformists and "patiently build a strong and skillful communist party, able truly to head the masses regardless of whatever turn the events may take" (p 203). On 28 November he received Korean communist delegation and asked it about the economic and political situation in Korea, the

organization of clandestine communist circles and groups, and the conditions under which the Korean revolutionaries were struggling. His office in the Kremlin was visited by comrades from the communist parties of Great Britain, Finland, Norway and other countries. He showed a lively interest in the situation of the workers movement in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Italy, France and India.

One of the characteristic features of this volume is the publication of a substantial number of orders, letters, notes and instructions issued by Vladimir Il'ich on improving the organization and work style of the apparatus of the Sovnarkom, the Labor and Defense Council and other state organs, the organization of control over the execution of decisions and the struggle against red tape and bureaucracy. He set a model of efficiency and organization in the work of the state apparatus (as can be clearly traced in the proceedings of the 18 Sovnarkom and 17 Labor and Defense Council meetings chaired by Lenin). He taught all senior executives to work with precision and accuracy. Particularly typical in this respect are Lenin's prescriptions to N. P. Gorbunov, in charge of Sovnarkom affairs, on improving the procedure for the summoning of reporters to Sovnarkom sessions, so that they may be asked to be present at a specific time and not wait more than 15 minutes. The suggestion was made to institute a special record which would contain Lenin's instructions and make it mandatory to all secretaries and, at night, all telephone operators, to record all of his instructions, indicate who accepted the instruction and note its execution. Vladimir Il'ich asked that particular attention be paid to the most thorough formulation of draft decrees, thus saving him from subsequent endless corrections. He emphasized that control of execution is a most important and necessary aspect of the activities of senior workers. He pointed out that control means, above all, to teach the people and to correct their errors promptly.

Clearly indicated was Lenin's intolerance of carelessness and sloth in the work, his intolerance of idlers and violators of state discipline. For example, reading in the newspaper IZVESTIYA VTsIK a note on the negligent storage of 2.5 million poods of valuable metal freight at the Lisino railroad station on the Moscow-Kazani railroad, where they were being stolen or spoiled, he asked A. S. Kiselev, the chairman of the Small Sovnarkom, to check on the accuracy of the facts stated in the article and, if confirmed, to take immediate measures to organize the registration and preservation of said property and the strictest possible prosecution of the responsible officials. He asked that a written report be submitted to him listing the names and positions of the culprits and that a report to this effect be submitted at the Labor and Defense Council meeting (see pp 341-342).

Lenin received many letters from workers, peasants, members of the intelligentsia, or party and soviet workers, the content of which may be found in the 11th volume. These letters express the thoughts of the Soviet people concerning the new life, suggestions and recommendations, criticisms of shortcomings and frequent complaints about the actions committed by one official or another. Not a single such letter remained unread. They were sent to various pertinent institutions or managers with a request to study the matter, to take measures to eliminate omissions and to help the center. Let us cite a single case: on 13 July, after reading the letter of I. A. Semyannikov, a party member and Red Army man, who had come to Moscow to discuss with Lenin cases of abuse of authority, theft and

negligence of food personnel and party members in official positions in the villages of Cherkasskiy Okrug, Donskaya Oblast, he wrote the following to L. A. Fotiyeva, his secretary: "Locate the author urgently, ask him to come, calm him down, tell him that I am sick but that I shall see to it that there is a follow up;" he asked that the Red Army man's letter be duplicated in several copies and sent to V. M. Molotov, Central Committee secretary and A. A. Sol'ts, chairman of the Central Auditing Commission. He suggested that the letter to Molotov include the request to send to the Don a control commission consisting of a member of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and of 10 or 20 students of the University imeni Ya. M. Sverdlov (see p 14).

Paying attention to the needs of the working people and being constantly in touch with them was a characteristic feature of Lenin. The volume provides information on all of Vladimir Il'ich's speeches within the time under consideration, whether at meetings, assemblies or workers' halls, at 166 receptions, meetings and talks with workers, peasants, party and state officials and representatives of Soviet republics and foreign leaders; it names the dates of Lenin's stay in Gorki and of his trips to several other areas around Moscow together with many other facts.

As in the previous volumes, the new volume of the Biographic Chronicle shows us Vladimir Il'ich Lenin as a great philosopher, a person who has dedicated all his strength to serving the working people and the building of socialism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1981

5003

CSO: 1802/13

- END -

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

10 Aug. 1981