

JPRS 80584

16 April 1982

# USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 2, January 1982



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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.

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.

16 April 1982

USSR REPORT  
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 2, January 1982

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

CONTENTS

Work Better and Live Better.....	1
Public Ownership in the Period of Developed Socialism (S. Sdobnov).....	12
Food Production is a Common Concern (P. Alekseyev).....	25
Live Creativity of the Masses (V. Fedinin).....	38
Problems of Social Planning and Educational Work (SOTSIOLOGICHESKIYE ISSLEDOVANIYA).....	49
Lofty Calling; On the Occasion of the 10th Anniversary of the CC CPSU Decree "On Literary-Artistic Criticism" (I. Dzeverin).....	59
Life and Destiny of the Arts; Pages of Philosophy and History (A. Vishnevskiy).....	68
The Party in the Struggle for Scientific and Technical Progress (Hans Modrow).....	84
The Prague Meeting of Communists (A. Kozlov and B. Likhachev).....	92
On a Slippery Road; Concerning Recent Statements by the Leadership of the Italian Communist Party.....	108
Moral Potential of Soviet Society (V. Motyashov).....	122

In the Interests of Socialist Change and a Spirit of Fraternal Friendship (G. Kiselev).....	131
For Aggressive Criticism of Our Critics (V. Mazur).....	137
Bookshelf.....	149
Journal's Mail for July-December 1981.....	152

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 2  
Jan 1982

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : Jan 1982

Signed to press : 25 January 1982

Copies : 800,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",  
"Kommunist", 1982

## WORK BETTER AND LIVE BETTER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 3-12

[Text] The labor rhythm of the land of the soviets, which has entered the second year of the 11th Five-Year Plan, is becoming increasingly confident. The constructive activities of the people are taking on truly unheard-of scope. This is understandable, for the plans earmarked by the party are tremendous and can be implemented only by the dedicated efforts of millions of people. The working class, kolkhoz peasantry and intelligentsia are implementing the historical resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress with optimism and confidence in their strength. The five-year plan approved at the sixth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is difficult and intense. However, this only means that we must double and triple our efforts to fulfill it. That is how Comrade L. I. Brezhnev formulated the problem at the November 1981 CC CPSU Plenum.

The first to respond to this in the light of the problems facing the country were the worker-party members, the heirs of those who marched in the front ranks of the troops in answer to the call "Communists, forward!" in the difficult year 1941. Seven of them -- Muscovites, noted innovators and congress delegates -- addressed an open letter to the all working people in their city. The levels of the 11th Five-Year Plan, the letter said, are difficult and broad. They can be achieved only by displaying the highest possible degree of organization and efficiency, and only by ensuring maximal returns from each job effort. The enthusiasm displayed by the authors of this letter is born of the infinite faith of the people in their party, whose political course they firmly support.

As it was formulated by the 26th CPSU Congress, the main task of the 11th Five-Year Plan is to ensure a further increase in the prosperity of the Soviet people on the basis of steady progress in the national economy, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the conversion of the economy to intensive development, the more efficient use of the country's production potential, the comprehensive conservation of all resources, and improved quality in the work.

The congress clearly earmarked the means for the solution of this problem. The course toward increasing the country's economic potential and economic effectiveness is being continued. The dynamic development of industry and agriculture and the concentration of capital investments will be ensured. Further steps will be taken in the development of Siberia and the Far East and

the development of the economy of each union republic. The increase in the economic potential will make it possible fully to satisfy the country's defense requirements. Better results must be achieved in ensuring the stricter conservation of resources, improving the functioning of the economic mechanism, strengthening the discipline and enhancing the responsibility of cadres.

Over the 5-year period, the national income going into consumption and accumulation will increase by 18 percent, compared with a 10.4 percent increase in capital investments and a substantial reduction in the increase in the number of people employed in production work. This represents a real conversion of the economy to intensive development, something which will be achieved in full in the course of the 1980s. Over the 5-year period, the volume of industrial production will increase by 26 percent, while gross agricultural output will increase by 13 percent (on an average annual basis). "Most importantly," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said, "on the basis of progressive equipment and the scientific organization of labor, it will be necessary considerably to increase labor productivity in our entire national economy, to the point that it will be not lower but higher than that in the most developed capitalist countries. The socialist system offers us all the necessary prerequisites to achieve this. The only problem is to be able to use them properly and to learn how to manage efficiently and thriftily." Labor productivity will increase by 23 percent in industry, by 23 percent in public farming (on an annual average), 15 percent in construction and 10.5 percent in railroad transportation. The implementation of this five-year plan task will account for 90 percent of the increased national income and the savings will equal the work of approximately 17 million workers.

The target of the party's economic policy, which is aimed at enhancing the well-being of the people, is reflected in the high rates of increase in the consumption fund, which will be augmented by 22 percent over the 5-year period. Such economic development will make it possible to raise the average monthly wage of workers and employees by 14.5 percent and the earnings of kolkhoz members on public farms by 20 percent. In 1985 the social consumption funds will be 23 percent higher, reaching 144 billion rubles.

The rapid pace of housing construction will be maintained. During this five-year plan 93 billion rubles will be spent for this purpose, thus adding 530 million square meters of housing area throughout the country. Housing construction will be developed on a priority basis in Siberia and the Far East. Available housing in the countryside will be increased by 30 million square meters as compared with the previous five-year plan.

The steps for the protection of the environment -- that priceless resource left to us by the preceding generations -- are also aimed at ensuring the good of the people. Our task is not only to preserve this resource for the future generations but to increase it as well. To this end, more than 10 billion rubles in state capital investments are being allocated during this five-year plan.

Great attention is being paid to the comprehensive target programs in which we see most clearly the connection between economic conditions and end social

results. The food program, which is being drafted currently, plays a particular role here.

As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out at the November 1981 CC CPSU Plenum, the food program is the economic and political problem of the five-year plan. Its solution depends on the level of agricultural production. We are encountering many difficulties in the pursuit of our policy to enhance the well-being of the people, above all in supplying them with meat, milk and some other products. Naturally, the Soviet people realize that the current difficulties have an objective basis as well. The country has had three consecutive droughts, which hurt agriculture severely. The features of this sector are such that a bad season not only has a direct impact, but also affects the results of economic growth in subsequent years, even if they are favorable from the agricultural production viewpoint. However, these difficulties might have been less tangible had it not been for the existence of a number of subjective reasons, most of which we can eliminate ourselves.

Production possibilities which enable us to compensate to a considerable degree for the consequences of the whims of nature are increasing with every passing year. Agricultural production must be better adapted to the specific climatic conditions of the various areas and take local characteristics more strictly into consideration than has been done in the past. This can be greatly facilitated by skillful handling of the equipment, the efficient use of technology in accordance with specific conditions, the growing of the most valuable and productive crop strains and the breeding of suitable cattle varieties. The extensive and scientific development of land reclamation and the effective use of fertilizers constitute reserves which can and must be put to use with no delay.

The purpose of the food program is to unify agricultural work with that of many related sectors engaged in production, procurement, storage, processing, transportation and trade for the sake of the single final objective -- to supply the country with the necessary variety of agricultural commodities within the planned deadlines.

Why has it been necessary to formulate the plans for increasing agricultural output as a program?

Because this requires substantial additional resources, the execution of measures of an intersectorial nature and coordination of the efforts of a large number of organizations for the implementation of the entire complex of interrelated measures which are subordinated to the solution of a single problem. Naturally, the formulation of a state food supply program presumes the full use of the various means for increasing agricultural output. It is also a question of utilizing local food resources and effective farming of the auxiliary plots.

The management of agriculture and the agroindustrial complex as a whole plays a most important role in the implementation of the food program. It must be organized in such a way as to let the kolkhozes and sovkhoses themselves have the final say in matters such as what to plant and where to plant it, and when to begin one operation or another. So far, the production organization



system, on the rayon level, for instance, does not always ensure the best possible utilization of the opportunities which socialist agriculture offers.

As we know, specialization is one of the means of upgrading production effectiveness. Specialization in agriculture has its specifics, which are not always taken into consideration. It frequently happens that virtually all sovkhoses in a rayon find themselves under the jurisdiction of one specialized organization or another and the rayon becomes a conglomerate of autonomous and strictly specialized farms. However, the association or trust concerned with the specialized production of specific items may not pay suitable attention to matters outside its specialized functions. The result is that the individual farms struggle to produce pork or poultry meat, while "nonspecialized" products such as grain, potatoes, milk or wool become outcasts. The possibilities offered by the land, the universal productive capital, remain underutilized and the general effectiveness of the sector drops. Undesirable consequences of the inefficient organization of management are seen. For example, most of the specialists directly involved in production work transfer to the apparatus of the trusts and associations. The administrative costs, wages in particular, rise, while returns decline. The reduced role of the rayon level of agricultural management fragments responsibility for results, and sometimes no one is answerable for losses and errors. The excessive discoordination of management becomes a hindrance to interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration.

Within the organizational structure of the agroindustrial complex, the kolkhozes and sovkhoses must actually assume the role of the main link, which should be served by all other links, ensuring the increased effectiveness of agricultural production and economically contributing to the development of initiative and socialist enterprise within it. Such relations would prevent the servicing organizations within the system of the agroindustrial complex from showing earnings and receiving bonuses while the sovkhoses and kolkhozes they service are showing losses.

A major feature of the 11th Five-Year Plan is seen in the fact that the socioeconomic development of the country becomes intrinsically tied to the further improvement of all planning and organizational work, which has today become the decisive link in the struggle for the implementation of the intensive plans for 1982 and the entire 5-year period.

Our country has everything that is needed for the successful implementation of the plans. We have highly developed production forces, sociopolitical and ideological unity among the Soviet people and an efficient strategy for further progress, embodied in the resolutions of the 26th congress. The point now is to raise the level of organizational work in economic construction even higher. Organization, efficiency and discipline are the mandatory prerequisites for the activities of all party, state and economic organs.

Naturally, the socialist economic management system, national economic planning above all, does not stand still. Production targets and resources are better coordinated this in five-year plan, as compared with the past; the new methodical and legal documents aimed at production intensification have been taken into consideration; assignments on resource conservation have been

included in the plan, etc. A steady process of improving the forms, structures, individual elements and management methods is under way. The CC CPSU and Council of Ministers decree "On Improving Planning and Intensifying the Influence of the Economic Mechanism on Upgrading Production Effectiveness and Work Quality" defines the specific possibilities for this work during the current period. More than 2 years have passed since the decree was adopted but it is still being implemented slowly and halfheartedly.

It is necessary, most importantly, to enhance the purposefulness of state economic and social development plans. Whereas earlier, during the first five-year plans, the targets and priorities for the allocation of resources were determined by the sociopolitical circumstances, and the number of enterprises was smaller and relations among them less complex, as the scale of social production expanded and relations within it became more complex, and as the number of alternatives for the possible utilization of resources grew, it became increasingly difficult to include proper combinations of current and future targets and end social requirements in the plans. The determination of overall social requirements is increasingly becoming the starting feature in planning. The social production structure must be brought steadily closer to the structure of the increasing needs of the working people in the developed socialist society.

The expansion of the planning horizon, intensified social targeting of the plans and the solution of major economic problems require the fuller consideration of long-term results.

The multiplying economic consequences of major shifts in science, equipment and technology and the development of huge new territories and demographic processes must be reflected more fully in the five-year plans, the 20-year comprehensive program for scientific and technical progress and the basic directions in the economic and social development of the country over the next decade.

Increasing the comprehensiveness of the plan is a major means of improving its quality. This means strengthening the ties between the planning of the development of production forces, the forecasting of their influence on production relations and ensuring the coordination of social, economic and production-technological planning on the basis of the prospects and potential for scientific and technical progress with the harmonious combination of the territorial and the sectorial aspects of development. Attention must also be paid to ensuring the coordinated solution of current and long-term problems and to maintaining the quality indicators while expanding the large-scale work of the economic mechanism working in such directions. The need for a fuller and more comprehensive consideration of the totality of socioeconomic and scientific and technical conditions governing societal life and all aspects of the expanded reproduction process developed considerably when the national economy began to encompass all areas of social production distribution and trade on a national scale and became a single national organism.

The importance of centralized planning, combined with the development of the initiative and economic autonomy of sectors, associations and enterprises, is presented in a different fashion in the light of the expanding scale of the

national economy and the rising level of production socialization. The coordination of planning assignments with economic incentives requires the extensive use of all forms and methods of cost effectiveness along with improvement in the functioning of centralized planning and management. The efficient combination of centralized planning with day-to-day control enhances the role of economic norms which encourage the collectives to fulfill intensive plan assignments for production, material and technical procurements, capital investments, labor, production costs and services.

With the existence of powerful economic machinery, the social goals of economic development can be reached by a variety of methods. The handling of resources for the purpose of achieving the fullest and most effective possible satisfaction of requirements while steadily raising the level of the balancing of the plans is a difficult task. However, the need to resolve it is becoming greater. One reason for this is the fact that objective factors are interfering with the obtaining of a number of primary raw materials and that the increasing dynamism of social life triggers the urgent need to keep production facilities in reserve and to shift priorities in the solution of social and economic problems with suitable speed.

The economic development of our society is characterized by its increasing participation in the international division of labor and further intensification of foreign economic cooperation on a long-term basis. This applies mainly to the members of the socialist comity. The comprehensive program for socialist economic integration and the plans for multilateral national measures are the result of the joint efforts of the CEMA-member countries. The broadening of this area of our planning activities, the development of foreign economic relations as a whole and the conversion of foreign trade into a separate and important economic sector presume the intensified use of methodology in this area of planning, the corresponding development of this section of national economic plans and the strengthening of the inter-connection between it and the other sections and indicators.

The expansion and intensification of planning require the enhancement of the role of the USSR Gosplan in the organization and coordination of this work in the country. We must enhance the role of ministries and departments in their capacity as state organs of sectorial administration in charge of all current planning problems and must upgrade the responsibility of republic and local organs for the planning of the comprehensive development of the respective areas, resolving problems in social and cultural development and meeting population requirements. Upgrading the stability of the plans, strengthening their directival aspect and increasing control over their implementation are important directions in the improvement of planning.

The increased substantiation and scientific nature of the plans cannot be separated from their strict and unconditional implementation. Steady and active organizational influence is needed if the economy is to develop in accordance with the plans instead of merely determining the existence of disparities between one result or another and the planned assignments. Such an approach presumes a profound knowledge of the current economic processes, the prompt assessment of developing trends and the skilled resolution of problems related to the ways and means of correcting developing situations.

Unfortunately, practical efforts to improve planning are still lagging behind current requirements.

We must bear in mind that this work is a living, creative matter. Here formalism and unfounded reliance on the belief that everything can develop all by itself are intolerable. For example, it is of vital importance to relate the improvement of indicators with enhanced responsibility for their achievement. Without an active and interested approach by the personnel toward their jobs and without the desire to obtain high end results and to enhance production effectiveness, no indicator, however well substantiated it might be, can achieve anything. On the contrary, it will only create doubts as to its expediency. The nature of the results expected by some ministries (ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy, light industry), which continue to adhere to the old indicators and delay the application of the new ones, is puzzling. Each party organization has a duty to help economic managers become aware of the requirements of the times as quickly as possible and to abandon the obsolete system of economic thinking.

It also sometimes happens that amending the plan downward at the end of the year becomes the main purpose of any initiative and enterprise undertaken. Occasionally, this has the support of the party committee, although, as we know, the practice of amending plans downward has been the target of harsh and just criticism.

The instruction according to which the responsibility of suppliers who violate contractual obligations is increased becomes operative as of this year.

Withholdings for the material incentive fund for production, procurement, marketing and trade associations, enterprises and organizations which have failed to fulfill their assignments for the delivery of goods and products in accordance with signed contracts will be reduced after their activities have been assessed. The leading personnel in such associations, enterprises and organizations will be deprived fully or in part of bonuses granted for the basic results of economic activities (depending on the degree to which they were underfulfilled). Such collectives will be deprived of the right to earn the red challenge banner or to win second or third place in the summing up of the results of the all-union and republic socialist competition. This is an important and timely measure which provides for stricter requirements for the production, planning-economic and juridical activities of associations, enterprises and organizations and encourages efficient and rhythmical work by the labor collectives.

Real progress must be made in improving the economic mechanism. At the same time, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has pointed out, there are problems the solution of which requires no additional outlays but could yield substantial economic results.

The party's admonition to the effect that "the economy must be economical" is addressed to all working people. In order to meet this requirement, enterprises and associations must observe at least the following requirements: they must maintain high-level production organization, a normal process of capital investment which does not operate to the detriment of the collective

of the enterprise (effective reconstruction, modernization and technical updating of the production process), must ensure the unhindered use of new equipment and technologies and, most essentially, must ensure proper material and technical procurements which create a healthy "metabolism" within the economic organism. The solution of these fundamental production problems requires a broad and original approach, for today we come across situations in which capital investments in the social area, for instance, may yield greater production than similar investments made directly in technology or equipment. This no longer requires a purely economic or engineering approach to the problem, but a social, a political one.

In order to formulate a scientific and intensive yet realistic plan which will take into consideration all production reserves, the enterprise needs a work chart. This will enable it effectively to eliminate disproportions along the production lines and to increase productive capital returns. However, not all enterprises update their work charts in accordance with the development of their production processes, as a result of which the charts cannot be used to their fullest extent as stipulated in the decree on improving the economic mechanism.

The successful operation of the fuel and energy complex is the most important material prerequisite for the development of the production process. The characteristics of the contemporary scientific and technical revolution and the new types of production are creating a rapid increase in the country's needs for fuel and energy. Although the plan calls for a substantially augmented volume of such resources, the more rapid increase in requirements dictates the development of the means necessary so that the planned assignments can be overfulfilled and, on the other hand, all levers and incentives can be put to use to achieve comprehensive fuel and energy conservation.

Nature has not been stingy in allocating fuel and energy resources to our country. However, in order to extract them, to ensure an uninterrupted supply of them for our country and to provide the necessary quantities for export, heroic effort by the Soviet people, who have already gained access to new and priceless deposits, will be necessary. All that is required now is to handle such resources thriftily and intelligently.

Improving end results is the distinguishing feature of capital construction during the current five-year plan, in 1982 in particular. This was already pointed out in the comparison of the increase in the national income and capital investments. This ratio can be improved by increasing the commissioning of capital assets substantially through maximal concentration of resources on target projects.

The current five-year plan calls for a further increase in the share of capital investments used in the reconstruction and technical retooling of operating enterprises. Such outlays are substantially more effective than the cost of new construction. During the 11th Five-Year Plan they will be increased by 21.2 percent and they will account for 32.5 percent of the capital investments in industrial construction as compared with 29.2 percent during the 10th Five-Year Plan.

Construction in the light and food industrial sectors (ranging from reconstruction to the construction of new enterprises) and in other sectors, for the purpose of increasing the production of consumer goods, is an important capital construction activity directly related to the social program. Here the planned assignments must be met with the same degree of responsibility and control as in the production of any other commodity.

Scientific and technical progress and the extensive practical utilization of such achievements are of decisive importance in upgrading production effectiveness and converting the entire national economy to intensive development. This is no simple matter demanding only enthusiasm. It requires the meeting of a number of prerequisites. Above all, we must make scientific research itself more effective. We must firmly close down unproductive laboratories and scientific organizations and concentrate our strength and facilities in hopeful directions from which promising returns may be expected. We must also be aware of the need to coordinate the requirements of sectors and groups of sectors in terms of scientific and technical developments with the capacities of the scientific institutions called upon to provide such developments.

Scientific and technical progress not only changes various aspects of the production forces but considerably complicates the needs of society and its members, raising the standard and enriching the content of such needs. In the modern world, science plays a role such that its development, in addition to being reflected directly in the plans for the development of science and technology, must be properly taken into consideration in terms of all sections and indicators of the state plan and plans for the development of individual rayons, sectors, associations and enterprises. This is closely related to the creation of conditions for the type of functioning of the economic mechanism which will ensure the shortest line from the birth of an idea to the application and mass production of its results.

One of the most important aspects of production organization is the effective utilization of human resources. In the pursuit of this course we must deal mainly with the consequences of the adverse demographic situation which limits the flow of manpower into the national economy. This should provide the efforts aimed at resolving the most important problem of the building of communism -- the elimination of the major disparities between physical and mental work -- with a new impetus. Such efforts must be directed toward accelerating the process of production mechanization and automation and the use of industrial robots in order to ensure the most rapid reduction possible in manual labor, which still represents the labor of about 70 percent of all industrial workers and an even higher percentage in the construction and service industries. "As a social system," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out at the November 1981 CC CPSU Plenum, "socialism contains a tremendous potential for the rational and humane use of the main productive force in society -- the working man. Such opportunities must be used to the fullest extent."

Efficient allocation of labor resources requires the profound study of the production requirements for cadres on different skill levels, the creation of conditions for their maximally efficient use, and the observance of specific ratios in the training of specialists in various fields. Careful studies must

be made of shifts in the structure of industrial-production personnel and measures must be adopted so as to achieve optimal ratios in this area.

The problem of effective utilization of manpower has another aspect as well. The greater scale of our national economy means the development and strengthening of socialist social ownership, which is the foundation of all production and distribution relations. Particular attention must be paid to the improvement of the latter, for this leads directly to the systematic implementation of the socialist principle of distribution according to labor.

As practical experience has indicated, the use of collective forms of wage organization and payment is an effective means of accelerating economic growth considerably. The brigade form of labor will become basic during in the 11th Five-Year Plan. However, we must avoid the purely mechanical organization of workers practicing the same skill within brigades. It is important to create most effective comprehensive and combined brigades based on the technological characteristics of the production process. In this connection, wages based on the fulfillment of a single order ensure the best work results.

The material incentive system must be such as to encourage the working people to participate actively in the production process. The social consumption funds must work in the same direction. Their use must contribute to the development and strengthening of the collectivistic principles in society and a profound interest on the part of all workers employed in our huge economy in the successful results of their efforts.

Currently the collectives are actively engaged in finding reserves for further production intensification. It is clear that suggestions aimed at improving organization, strengthening discipline, making economical use of raw and other materials and improving wages can be implemented with substantially greater speed wherever there is initiative, efficiency and a feeling of individual responsibility for the overall state of affairs.

The struggle for better discipline requires a comprehensive approach. The key prerequisite for success in this matter is the development of the collectivistic principle in the organization of the work. If the collective knows who is doing what work and how well he is doing it, if everyone is given his just due and if there is confidence that good work and proper behavior will be fully acknowledged and appreciated and will earn the respect and gratitude of one's comrades, conscious discipline, exigency and order become the natural attributes of those involved in the production process. Under such circumstances there will be no tolerance of time-wasters, idlers, drifters and waste-makers, or of anyone who hinders the conscientious work of the real working people.

This year we are celebrating the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR. The slogan "60 Shock Labor Weeks for the 60 Years Since the Founding of the USSR" has been launched and the campaign is gathering strength. In order for this movement to strengthen with every passing day, we must see to it that everyone is provided with the necessary facilities for the fulfillment of his pledges.

The participants in the competition are focusing their efforts on the main problems of the five-year plan through their socialist pledges for 1982: to upgrade production effectiveness, to accelerate scientific and technical progress, to improve labor productivity and production quality, and to resolve social problems. The initiative of the Moscow enterprises on the conservation of resources on the basis of scientific and technical achievements; that of the working people in Rostovskaya Oblast on the installation and mastery of production capacities (for all indicators) as rapidly as possible ; that of the working people in Yaroslavskaya Oblast on increasing industrial output without increasing the number of workers; that of the workers in Sverdlovskaya Oblast on implementing the five-year plan assignments with smaller brigades; and that of the agricultural workers in Cherkasskaya Oblast on increasing the production and sale to the state of animal husbandry products must be disseminated more broadly.

The party members and the primary party organizations play a particularly important and responsible role in the implementation of economic plans. The labor mood and atmosphere in the collective and, in the final account, the implementation of production assignments, depend on how the party members -- the vanguard of society -- do their work. All that our country enjoys has been created through the people's toil. However, in order for our fatherland to be more beautiful and powerful and for all of us to live better, we must work better. We must formulate and implement the plans in a better way. We must organize production and produce better.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/8



## PUBLIC OWNERSHIP IN THE PERIOD OF DEVELOPED SOCIALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 13-24

[Article by S. Sdobnov, doctor of economic sciences]

[Text] The public ownership of productive capital is the basis of the economic system of developed socialism and its growth into communism. This basic feature of the new system has been properly reflected and codified in the USSR Constitution. Public ownership embodies the very essence of the socialist system, its economic and social nature and its decisive advantage over capitalism. It is a basic prerequisite for the systematic and dynamic development of the country's productive forces.

### 1

The scientific substantiation of the role and significance of public ownership is of major theoretical and practical importance in the building of socialism and communism. It was pointed out at the October 1979 All-Union Conference of Ideological Workers that one of the main tasks in social science is the study of the entire set of ownership relations in our economy. This is understandable, for the solution of major problems such as the accelerated growth of the country's production forces, the improvement of economic relations and the economic mechanism, improved methods of national economic planning and management, increased public production effectiveness, the gradual elimination of major disparities between town and country and intensification of social homogeneity is inseparably linked with the problem of socialist ownership and the accurate determination of its line of development.

Our country is confidently progressing in all socioeconomic directions and is systematically resolving the problem of building the material and technical foundations for communism on the basis of public ownership. The Soviet state entered the new decade with a powerful economic and scientific and technical potential. Suffice it to say that at the beginning of 1981, productive capital in the national economy, which is the material foundation of public ownership, was more than double the 1970 level and had reached the huge sum of 1,742 billion rubles. This represents a major further leap forward in the development of our social production forces.

Having emphasized the continuity in the party's economic strategy, the 26th CPSU Congress developed it further in accordance with the conditions of the 1980s. It clearly determined the forthcoming and long-range tasks in the country's economic and social development and earmarked reliable guidelines for many future years to come. The congress wrote new pages in the history of revolutionary Marxist-Leninist thought and in the theory and practice of scientific communism. The new decade represents an important stage in the creation of the material and technical foundations for communism, the development of socialist social relations, the rapprochement between the forms of socialist ownership and the shaping of the new man.

As an economic category, ownership expresses relations among people in the area of the acquisition of material goods, mainly productive capital. The principal question in ownership relations has to do with who acquires the means of production. A system of production relations and the economic foundation of society appear and develop on the basis of the form of ownership. It is also important to emphasize that ownership is the basic, the determining relation in this system, which enables us to penetrate, as Marx said, "the most profound secret, the hidden foundation of the entire social system..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 25, Part II, p 354).

Marxism-Leninism has comprehensively substantiated the role and significance of public ownership in the establishment and development of the new economic system. As a basic socialist category, public ownership expresses qualitatively new relations among people, characterized by increasing social equality and collectivism. Marx had the future in mind when he emphasized that the public ownership of productive capital would become "the basis of a society consisting of the association of free and equal producers engaged in public labor on the basis of a general and rational plan" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch," Vol 18, p 57). This prediction by the founders of scientific communism has come entirely true. A developed socialist society was created and is strengthening and improving in the Soviet Union on the basis of public ownership. The same path is being followed by the other socialist countries. The new objective of socialist production is emerging and developing on the basis of public ownership. In this connection, the socialization of productive capital is being used in the common interest and consequently that of every member of society. Under such circumstances, labor tools no longer represent capital, a means for the exploitation of man by man. Socialism, V. I. Lenin wrote, means "the planned organization of the social production process aimed at ensuring the well-being and all-round development of all the members of society" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete collected Works], Vol 38, p 86).

Social practice shows that public ownership of productive capital plays a determining role in the establishment and development of the socialist society. However, it does not remain fixed in the course of economic and cultural construction, but improves and strengthens and acquires more mature features. Objectively, this creates a need for profound study and analysis of the changes taking place within it and identification of the new trends in and means for its subsequent development.

It must be said, however, that of late our economic and sociological publications have been showing a somewhat diminished interest in this most important problem. Frequently problems pertaining to the development of ownership relations are ignored in the works of economists dealing with the socialist society. It is sometimes even claimed that public ownership is merely a legal category and that it cannot be used either as an initial or basic socialist production relation. We cannot agree with any such approach.

In order to gain a proper understanding of the nature and characteristics of the processes occurring in ownership relations, we must bear in mind that ownership is characterized by the unity of two features -- the socioeconomic and the material-technical, without which no form of ownership exists. Therefore, when it is a question of the development of socialist ownership, it is important to consider the changes which take place in all of its aspects.

Production forces and the material and technical foundations of society are of decisive importance in the development of public ownership. Furthermore, the accelerated development of production forces is assisted by socialist ownership, the social nature of which is consistent with the social nature of these forces. Such close interaction between ownership and production forces is an objective law of the socialist society. As socialism develops, public ownership changes quantitatively and qualitatively, acquiring a new content and becoming steadily better.

On the basis of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the two phases of communism, our party has elaborated an efficient concept of developed socialism. As was pointed out at the 26th CPSU Congress, its scientific substantiation makes a major contribution to the party's theoretical arsenal. This concept provides an overall picture of the most important features of mature socialism, its political and economic system, the forms of public ownership and the means of bringing them closer to each other, the social development and culture of the country, socialist democracy, the rights and obligations of Soviet citizens, the Soviet governmental system and the management of its economy. "In the period of developed socialism," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the congress, "the reorganization of all social relations on the basis of the collectivistic principles inherent in the new system is accomplished."

The developed socialist society advances on its own basis. This means not only that socialist ownership has been fully established in the national economy, but also that a corresponding material and technical base has been created. "Under the conditions in our country," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out, "the task of laying the material and technical foundation required for mature socialism had to be implemented after the foundations of the new system had been laid down." That is why in terms of its inner content, role and nature of influence on socioeconomic progress, public ownership becomes increasingly mature under contemporary conditions and rests on the powerful material and technical base of the country. The totality of socialist production relations improves qualitatively as well.

In his time Marx pointed out that society develops like any other organism. "As an entity, this organic system has its own prerequisites and its

development toward a state of integrity involves precisely the subordination to it of all societal elements, or the creation from this organism of whatever organs are still lacking. It is thus that in the course of its historical development the system becomes an integral entity" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 46, Part I, p 229). It is precisely the developed socialist society in the USSR that is distinguished by the organic integrity and dynamism of its social system and inviolable internal unity. Public ownership was a decisive prerequisite for the establishment of this integral entity. Occupying a key position in the system of production relations, it determines the entire structure of these relations, their nature and essence, and gives them a historical determination and direction. Hence the conclusion that public ownership is the foundation of the socialist economic system.

2

In our country (as well as in the other socialist countries), socialist social ownership is found in two forms -- state (national) and kolkhoz-cooperative. The steady enhancement of the level of production socialization, which is objective and comprehensive, is the basis for their development and rapprochement. It is important to emphasize here that in the socialist society, this historical law does not operate spontaneously but on a planned basis, and in the interests of the working people.

State ownership, which is ownership by the entire Soviet people, plays the leading role in the socialist ownership system. It has undergone extensive development during the period of socialist construction. The changes which have taken place have affected both the material and technical foundation of state ownership as well as its socioeconomic nature.

It is mainly its material and technical foundations which have been steadily improving and strengthening. For example, the basic productive capital in the state economic sectors had increased by a factor of approximately 20 by 1981, as compared with 1940, i.e., most of them had been created from scratch with the help of socialist accumulations. At the start of 1981, more than 44,000 production and scientific-production associations, combines and industrial enterprises, about 27,000 primary contracting construction and installation organizations, 21,100 sovkhozes, 148,100 kilometers of railroad track for public use, 201,000 kilometers of main petroleum and gas pipelines, more than 500,000 retail trade and public catering enterprises and many other national economic projects were under state ownership. About 90 percent of the all productive capital in the national economy belongs to the state today. State ownership is currently characterized by a powerful material and technical base, which is the foundation of the country's single national economic complex, greater centralization and interconnection among the different production units, a widespread system of social division of labor and a qualitatively new level of technical labor facilities. As the joint property of the working people, state ownership means a single fund for the whole people used for the expansion of the entire public production process and the steady improvement of the well-being of the people.

At the same time, national state ownership is being further strengthened. As we know, at the socialist stage the subject of state ownership itself -- the people -- still remains heterogeneous, consisting of workers, kolkhoz members and labor intelligentsia. The relationship between the workers and kolkhoz members and the productive capital of the whole people has certain specific characteristics at the present time. In the course of the production process, the workers are directly linked with the state form of ownership, whereas the kolkhoz members base their production activities on kolkhoz-cooperative ownership and on the land, which is owned by the nation. Naturally, we must bear in mind that the kolkhoz members who, together with the workers and the intelligentsia, are the joint owners of the national assets, rely in their constructive work on the state-planned system of material and technical, energy and other support and on the comprehensive aid and support of the state. As our country continues its advance toward communism, class disparities are being eliminated and the class structure of Soviet society is taking shape. Consequently, the nationwide nature of state socialist ownership becomes intensified.

These processes are inseparably linked with the increased role of the working class as the leading force in Soviet society. The working class, which now numbers about 80 million people, or two thirds of the employed population, and which bases its production activities on ownership by the whole people, exerts a decisive influence on the comprehensive upsurge in the country's production forces and the sociopolitical development of Soviet society. The strengthening of the leading role of the working class in the life of society, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out at the 26th CPSU Congress, contributes to its increasing ideological and political maturity, education and professional skills. The very nature of the labor of the contemporary worker is changing as it acquires an increasing intellectual content.

The development of state socialist ownership at the present stage is also characterized by the steady increase in the level of the socialization of labor in the national economy, the retooling of productive capital, increased concentration and specialization and an improved public production structure. The process of creating and developing production associations and combined enterprises and establishing consolidated power and transportation and communications systems is being intensified currently. Large sectorial and territorial-production complexes are being organized. The country's industry already has more than 4,000 production and scientific-production associations, which account for approximately 48 percent of the entire output.

The equalization of material and technical conditions and organization of the production process in the various national economic units are taking place on the basis of the development of state ownership and the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. In fact, the state enterprises are still not by any means equal in terms of levels of technical facilities and economic activities. This affects labor conditions, workers' skills, and the availability and amounts of funds for the development of production and for stimulating the members of labor collectives. The importance of eliminating such disparities was pointed out at the 26th CPSU Congress, which indicated the need to equalize social conditions, which go beyond the framework of the

individuals classes and social groups, to ensure the comprehensive consideration of their characteristics and interests and to eliminate social disparities on the territorial level.

State ownership determines the content of the entire social reproduction process and the advancement of socialist production relations, as well as the nature and motive forces of economic progress. Thanks to this all the units within the national economy are developing on the basis of a single state plan in the interests of the steady enhancement of the people's well-being and the all-round development of the individual. Relations of comradesly cooperation and socialist mutual aid among people at work and in social life are becoming deeper and stronger. In the course of the socioeconomic changes which are taking place in Soviet society, state ownership will increasingly develop the features of communist ownership.

Speaking of the determining role of state ownership in the development of the socialist economy, we must point out that it is precisely this form of ownership that is the target of particularly violent attacks on the part of reformist, revisionist and other antisocialist ideologs. By supporting the splintering of state ownership in the socialist countries and its transfer to separate groups of people or private individuals, they are trying to undermine and destroy the economic foundations of socialism and thus to establish grounds for the restoration of the capitalist order. This is confirmed in particular by the events in Poland, where extremist elements in the Solidarity Trade Union and counterrevolutionary elements have openly called for the elimination of state property owned by the whole nation and a return to the private ownership of productive capital. That is why the question of state socialist ownership, its role, development and strengthening are not only of theoretical but major political importance as well.

In our country, the kolkhoz-cooperative ownership of productive capital is developing and showing quality improvement in close connection with and under the determining influence of nationwide state ownership. It is based on the fixed kolkhoz assets, which include all productive capital and cultural assets.

Having emerged on the basis of the socialization of the productive capital of the toiling peasantry, kolkhoz ownership has also changed radically during the building of socialism in terms of quantity and quality. It has reached a new level of maturity. Whereas in the mid-1930s, the public property of the kolkhozes largely consisted of the socialized property of the members of agricultural cooperatives, today it is essentially new property consisting of modern material and technical facilities and labor tools. Fixed kolkhoz capital totaled 110 billion rubles at the beginning of 1981. However, this is not a question of quantitative growth alone.

At the present stage, kolkhoz-cooperative ownership is also distinguished by a higher level of socialization. This process is based on the concentration and specialization of kolkhoz production, the expansion of economic relations among kolkhozes and the development of interfarm and agroindustrial integration. Average kolkhoz size was larger by a factor of more than six in 1980, as compared with 1940; the area under crops was larger by a factor of 7.4;

the cattle herd was larger by a factor of 22; and the number of tractors was larger by a factor of 21. Today there are 26,000 kolkhozes in our country. In 1980 the average farm had 6,600 hectares of farmland, 3,700 hectares under crops, 1,844 head of cattle, 41 tractors (in terms of physical units), 20 trucks and 4.2 million rubles' worth of fixed and working capital. It is also important to point out that in today's kolkhozes, the social division of labor is becoming increasingly intensified on the basis of production concentration. The farms' structure is improving and the progressive means and methods of labor organization inherent in national enterprises are being applied more extensively. The implementation of the CPSU agrarian policy, launched by the historical March 1965 CC CPSU Plenum, continues to exert its favorable influence on the quantitative and qualitative changes in kolkhoz-cooperative ownership and on the strengthening of its material foundations.

Kolkhoz-cooperative ownership is acquiring qualitatively new features as Soviet society advances and as the material and technical base of agriculture becomes stronger. Its gradual rapprochement with the property of the whole people is taking place. The socialist state is actively assisting this process which has been codified in the new USSR Constitution. "The state," the country's fundamental law stipulates, "contributes to the development of kolkhoz-cooperative ownership and its rapprochement with state ownership." Consequently, the solution of this most important communist construction problem is being found under the determining influence of socialist state ownership, the importance of which is steadily growing in agriculture.

The greater role of state ownership in the countryside at the present stage is directly manifested above all in the development of the sovkhoses and the building of large new state agricultural enterprises. During the last 15 years, the total number has almost doubled, now having reached more than 21,000. At the same time the state is carrying out the capital construction of other nationwide projects such as repair and processing enterprises, technical and agrochemical service stations, reclamation and hydrotechnical systems, power transmission lines, protective forest strips, elevators, warehouses and storage areas and many other installations which service kolkhoz and sovkhos production. Currently the state owns nearly three fifths of all agricultural productive capital.

The process of rapprochement between the two forms of socialist ownership in the countryside today is characterized by the increasingly intensive interaction between them. Since the main distinction between them is the degree of socialization of productive capital, the elimination of this difference on the basis of a steady increase in the level of production socialization in the kolkhoz and state economic sectors is the main direction pursued in bringing them closer together. This process in particular is being intensified under contemporary conditions. "At the developed socialist stage, as indicated by our experience," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev asserted, "the level of economic socialization becomes considerably enhanced and the state (nationwide) and kolkhoz-cooperative forms of socialist ownership come steadily closer together."

Our party comprehensively indicated the main paths for the rapprochement between the kolkhoz-cooperative and state forms of ownership and their growth into single ownership by the whole people. This means, above all, the qualitative reorganization of agricultural production and its conversion to an industrial basis through extensive utilization of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution. In implementing its agrarian policy, the CPSU is systematically pursuing a course of all-round intensification of agricultural production and creation of powerful production forces consistent with the requirements of communist construction. This leads to a steady rapprochement between the material and technical foundations of state and kolkhoz-cooperative ownership, which become equalized and assume a common industrial aspect. This is a decisive prerequisite for the conversion to single national ownership of productive capital in the national economy.

Secondly, this means the further economic upsurge of kolkhozes and sovkhoses, increased production specialization and concentration and development of interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration. Our country is actively pursuing the process of converting agriculture to large-scale specialized production involving the use of industrial methods and the extensive application of progressive technology. The development of production concentration and specialization under the conditions of interfarm cooperation represents a qualitatively new stage in the socialist socialization of production in the countryside. It is characterized by the intensification of interzonal, intrarayon and interfarm specialization, an expanded scale of production for the kolkhozes and sovkhoses in accordance with the basic development of their production activities and the combination of a part of the kolkhoz and sovkhos assets with a view to the creation of large, joint and highly productive industrial-type enterprises and associations, the expansion of intersectorial relations and establishment of agroindustrial complexes. All of this is having a tremendous influence on the development and enhancement of the social maturity of both forms of social ownership.

The shaping and development of the agroindustrial complex throughout the country and on a regional basis will enable us to deal jointly with problems in the development of agriculture and the economic sectors which service it. The 26th CPSU Congress indicated the need to ensure unified planning, the proportional and balanced development of the sectors within the agroindustrial complex, the substantial strengthening of its material and technical base, the improvement of economic relations among sectors and the organization of their effective interaction in order to improve the preservation, transportation and processing of products and delivery of them to the consumer. The development and expansion of production and economic relations within this complex will strengthen the material and technical foundations of both forms of socialist ownership. It will raise the level of production socialization and will enhance the more energetic interaction between the state and the kolkhoz agrarian economic sectors. The productive capital of the agroindustrial complex in the country already accounts for about 37 percent of its entire value within the national economy.

Third, this means a change in social conditions and the nature of labor, the broadening of economic relations between industry and agriculture and the



elimination of the major disparities between town and country. This process is based on comprehensive development of the production forces, increased technological availability for farm labor, its conversion into a variety of industrial work, strengthened social homogeneity in society and improvement in all social relations and the way of life. Currently a great deal in the development of the production and power base of the countryside is based on the joint investments of the state, the sovkhozes, the kolkhozes and other enterprises. The result is the direct combination of national and kolkhoz funds and the establishment of a single economic base for output, which creates objective conditions for the rapprochement of the two forms of ownership.

In the course of the advance of Soviet society toward communism, kolkhoz-cooperative ownership steadily acquires a new and richer content. The features typical of nationwide ownership appear and strengthen increasingly within it. Gradually, it will attain a level at which the two cannot be distinguished. Laying the material and technical foundations for communism is of decisive importance in this process.

The establishment of single ownership by the whole people legitimately presumes conversion to a single type of agricultural enterprise in terms of its social nature. This is related to the prospects for the development of the currently existing kolkhozes, sovkhozes and interfarm agricultural enterprises. The party proceeds from the fact that in the period of the building of communism, all forms of agricultural enterprises must be developed and improved. This is a single interrelated process, as was emphasized at the July 1978 CC CPSU Plenum. With the acceleration of socioeconomic progress in the countryside, kolkhozes, sovkhozes and interfarm enterprises develop and become increasingly similar in terms of technical facilities and production organization, the level of maturity in social relations, the nature of the work and the standards of worker prosperity and culture. However, this does not mean the transformation of some farms into farms of a different type. In the process of the building of communism, all types of enterprises will reach a high degree of maturity and will become enterprises of a national type. They will be based on single public ownership, with high production standards and organization, extensively developed democratic forms of economic management and active autonomous efforts on the part of the production workers.

3

The rapprochement between the forms of socialist ownership, their qualitative reorganization, the development of production associations in industry and agriculture, the broadening of economic relations between them and the higher level of production socialization legitimately lead to the improvement of production relations in developed socialism and their growth into communist relations. This is a single interdependent process in which ownership is the main link and motive force for the entire system of production relations, encompassing interrelated areas of production, distribution, trade and consumption.

The development and advancement of production relations under socialist conditions is not spontaneous, but is a systematically guided process. The management of socioeconomic changes in the building of communism is the most important aspect of the communist party's theoretical and practical activity. The 26th CPSU Congress noted that our party pays steady attention to this aspect.

In a socialist society, production relations involve collectivism and comradesly cooperation. This applies to all toiling classes and social groups. Collectivism and mutual support are inherent in the very nature of the new system and are based on the public ownership of productive capital. Such relations permeate all realms of production and social life. They are manifested in specific forms, such as the development of socialist labor cooperation, extensive sharing of leading experience among individuals, enterprises and economic areas, reciprocal assistance, etc.

Socialist competition plays a tremendous role in the development and strengthening of relations of collectivism. "Socialist competition," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, "is the creativity of the masses. By its very nature it is based on the high conscientiousness and initiative of the people." The main aspect of competition is the education of the people in a spirit of conscientiousness toward labor and development of their activeness in the struggle for higher labor productivity and production effectiveness and for the successful implementation of economic and social tasks. Practical experience has confirmed that in the course of socialist competition, important features of the Soviet person, such as conscious discipline, mutual support, concern for the interests of society and the individual collective and a thrifty attitude toward public property, develop and strengthen.

The historical decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress triggered a new impulse in the labor and social activeness of the masses. A widespread movement for the successful implementation of the party's plans spread throughout the country. Many participants in mass socialist competition are honorably keeping their word, producing substantial amounts of additional output and improving quality indicators. The creative and constructive efforts of workers, kolhoz members and intellectuals and the increased production and social actions of the masses confirm the fact that the level of maturity in economic and social relations in mature socialism has risen.

The labor collectives are of great importance in the advancement of social relations. As pointed out in the USSR Constitution, they take an active part in state and social affairs, production planning, social development and the improvement of working and living conditions. The labor collectives develop the creative energy of the workers, promote relations of friendship and comradesly mutual aid and help in the molding of the new man, the worthy builder of communism. "It is only within the collective," Marx and Engels wrote, "that the individual acquires the means which enable him to develop his qualities comprehensively..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 3, p 75). Our country has an increasing number of collectives with high standards, which skillfully combine concern with the professional and spiritual growth

of the workers with the successful solution of economic and social problems and the achievement of high production indicators. Our party pays steady attention to the molding of communist principles in the work of the labor collectives.

The development of a conscientious attitude toward the public good and the preservation and enhancement of material and spiritual values is the most important problem in the development of socialist ownership. "Plants, mines, blast furnaces, machines, tools and the latest automatic equipment -- all that is considered productive capital -- constitutes the tremendous wealth of the people. However," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized at his meeting with the workers at the Automotive Plant imeni Likhachev, "all this wealth must be utilized with real effectiveness." Suffice it to say that increasing the returns per ruble of productive capital by a single kopek increases the national income by more than 10 billion rubles. However, it is not a matter of economic benefits only. A thrifty attitude toward productive social capital and the proper and efficient use of it contribute to the development of communist conscientiousness in the working people and to greater creative activeness on the part of the masses in the course of their constructive activities. The importance of this problem was particularly stressed at the 26th CPSU Congress, which emphasized that a thrifty attitude toward the public good and the ability to make full and expedient use of everything we have is the pivot of the party's economic policy. The task calls for every Soviet person actively to participate in the struggle for economy and thrift, fully aware of his duty, making as great a contribution as he can to this nationwide project and thus contributing to the strengthening of public ownership as the economic foundation of socialism.

The basic advantage of socialist ownership is that it creates objective conditions for the acquisition of material benefits by the worker on the basis of the quantity and quality of labor invested. This is the main criterion for distribution under socialism. Our material and moral incentive system is aimed at ensuring the just and objective assessment of everyone's labor. The wages of workers and payments to kolkhoz members increase with the development of socialist output, and their material and cultural standards rise steadily. Those who make the greatest contribution to the multiplication of the country's social wealth are provided with proper incentives.

Unfortunately, there are still cases in which workers try to take from society more than they give, attempt to find circuitous ways of obtaining unearned income and encroaching on public property. The party's social policy is aimed at firmly eliminating all that could hinder the Soviet people in their efforts to work successfully and lead a worthy life. "...We must use all available organizational, financial and legal means," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, "in order firmly to plug all loopholes allowing parasitism, bribery, black marketeering, unearned income, or any kind of encroachment on public property." Safeguarding this property and the active participation of the Soviet people in this important matter are mandatory prerequisites for the further strengthening of the main foundations of our society.

Public ownership of capital goods is the deep source of the unity of our national, collective and individual interests. The subjective factor, however, is of great importance as well. The point is that state productive capital is given to the collectives of enterprises and organizations to use and to keep and to be applied on a cost effective basis, with a view to increasing output and ensuring profitability. For this reason, specific relations affecting the use of such capital are established between society and the labor collectives. Under certain circumstances, differences may arise between the economic interests of society, the individual enterprise collectives and the workers. Taking this into consideration, the party and the state formulate and implement the necessary economic measures designed to eliminate such disparities, to secure the basic interests of all classes and social groups and to direct them into a single channel.

The consciously maintained correlation between production relations and the nature and level of the development of production forces under socialist conditions becomes a permanently active factor in social progress. This is achieved by improving planning, balancing the plans, directing them increasingly toward the solution of social problems and augmenting the effectiveness of economic levers and incentives. As it improves the organization of cost effectiveness, financial and economic levers, the wage system and the economic relations among enterprises and associations, the state improves the production relations themselves as well, making them consistent with the higher level of production forces. All of this creates broader scope for the dynamic and accelerated development of public production and its increased effectiveness.

At the present stage, the improvement of production and social relations includes the development of the socioclass and national cultures of Soviet society and the strengthening of the economic and spiritual foundations of the socialist way of life. As was pointed out at the 26th CPSU Congress, an intensive process of rapprochement among all classes and social groups in our society is taking place in the period of developed socialism. Profound changes are occurring in the class structure of society and its constituent classes and social groups as a result of the very profound changes which are taking place in all the facets of social life and the powerful upsurge of the production forces. The social cohesiveness of the entire people is growing. The working class has strengthened organizationally and economically during the building of socialism and communism. Its political maturity and awareness and educational and cultural standards have risen and its professional skill has increased.

The quality of the kolkhoz peasantry is changing with the industrialization of agriculture. Its labor is becoming progressively more like that of the industrial workers, and industrial-type professions are becoming increasingly common in the countryside. The political consciousness of the rural workers and their cultural and technical standards are improving steadily. To an ever greater extent, the way of life of the kolkhoz peasantry is acquiring features similar to the way of life of the working class. The development of interfarm and agroindustrial integration, changes and improvements in the kolkhoz wage system and the extension of the social insurance system to the kolkhoz members, leading to the elimination of disparities between the social

status of workers and peasants, are contributing to the acceleration of these processes.

Our intelligentsia, which is organizationally linked with the working class and the kolkhoz peasantry, and which is becoming economically, socially and culturally closer to them, is growing rapidly. It is the second largest group, second only to the working class, and it is playing an increasingly significant role not only in science, education and culture but in material production and in all of social life as well. The labor of workers, kolkhoz members and intellectuals -- physical and mental work -- are becoming increasingly intertwined.

All of this taken together characterizes the process of eliminating class disparities and ensuring qualitative changes in our social structure. "Our objective," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, "is the creation of a type of society in which there will be no division of people into classes. It can be definitely said that we are progressing gradually but confidently toward this great objective." The congress formulated the important theoretical stipulation that the establishment of a classless structure in society will take place essentially within the historical framework of mature socialism.

The conversion to a classless social structure is not a one-time act but a lengthy historical process. As the forms of socialist ownership draw closer to each other and as the building of the material and technical foundations for communism goes on, the social relations between classes and social groups will gradually become smoother. An identical situation will be created in the public production and distribution systems for all working people in the national economy, turning them into a single association of equal and free laborers. This process will be accompanied not only by the elimination of class disparities but by the advancement of the entire system of socio-economic relations, the socialist way of life and the enhancement of the awareness of the Soviet people. The establishment of a classless social structure will constitute a decisive stage in the creation of a socially homogenous society and the growth of developed socialism into communism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/8

## FOOD PRODUCTION IS A COMMON CONCERN

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 25-36

[Article by P. Alekseyev, IZVESTIYA editor in chief]

[Text] The party has formulated a broad program for the further upsurge in the well-being of the people for the 11th Five-Year Plan and the 1980's. It covers all aspects of the life of the Soviet people. Measures aimed at improving population supplies, food supplies mainly, play a particularly major role in the program. "In order to ensure the radical solution of the problem," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, "the formulation of a special food program has been deemed necessary. Its purpose is to ensure a considerable increase in the production of agricultural commodities. It must link more closely agriculture with sectors engaged in the storing and processing of its output and, naturally, with trade. In other words, its purpose is to resolve the problem of the uninterrupted supply of the population with products within the shortest possible time."

In his address to the November 1981 CC CPSU Plenum, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that the food problem is the central problem of the entire five-year plan from both the economic and the political viewpoints. Its solution is based on the high pace of agricultural output. Agriculture is faced with the most important task of upgrading effectiveness and quality, systematically converting the sector to an industrial base and intensifying and improving its relations with all sectors within the agroindustrial complex.

In other words, the all-round upsurge of agriculture is by far not a strictly sectorial or economic concern. Here success depends on the effective utilization of the land, equipment and fertilizers, the development of the processing industry, the road system, reliable transportation and extensive construction of elevators, storage facilities and warehouses, on the one hand, and the skill of cadres, the attitude toward the work, conscientious efforts, and the moral and material incentive system, on the other. Success also depends on the extent to which we can eliminate the still-existing faulty practice of unjustifiable interference in the economic activities of kolkhozes and sovkhazes on the part of some party and soviet workers. The CC CPSU March 1965 Plenum decree had already stated that "we must firmly abandon the practice of bureaucratic administration, ordering, or replacing managers and specialists in kolkhozes and sovkhazes...."

Now as well, at the November Central Committee Plenum, Leonid Il'ich deemed it necessary to reemphasize that "the kolkhozes and sovkhazes themselves must have the final say as to what to plant and when to conduct one operation or another. The rayon management level must be strengthened comprehensively. Conditions must be created such as to encourage actively the growth and intensiveness of agricultural production and the initiative of kolkhozes, sovkhazes and all units within the agroindustrial complex, making them work not for the sake of achieving intermediary indicators but high end results."

The main strategic guidelines for party and state activities in resolving the vitally important food supply problem were adopted by the IZVESTIYA journalists. Immediately after the 26th CPSU Congress, we introduced the section headed "The Formulation of the Food Problem Is the Most Important Task of the Soviets." In virtually every issue the newspaper carries appropriate materials or interesting experiences from one or another part of the country.

We must say that initially not everyone had a clear idea of what is to be done and how to undertake the formulation of the food program, awaiting special instructions and directives. I recall turning to some leading officials in oblasts and republics, and asking them to express their viewpoints on how they intend to undertake this work which, incidentally, brooked no postponement. I heard no intelligible answer, and suggestions to submit materials to the newspaper were rejected. As is proper for a newspaper, we assumed the role of collective organizer: the editors and our own correspondents located prestigious authors and developed the necessary methods for the collection of materials, showing local initiative and ways and means for the elaboration of a specific food program which could become a structural component of the union-wide program. We proceeded not on the basis of general wishes of one or another high official of a farm, rayon, oblast or republic, but on the basis of entirely specific searches for specific reserves and resources for ensuring an agricultural upsurge. It is a question for the kolkhozes, sovkhazes, rayons, oblasts and all republics to define specifically the extent of their maximal contribution to this matter of prime importance.

The successful implementation of the food program depends on the extent to which the project will be seriously and boldly organized in the farms, rayons, oblasts and republics, and the creative and totally informal way in which major problems in the development of the agroindustrial complex will be resolved. Unfortunately, here hindrances, departmental lack of coordination, sluggish thinking and old and obsolete management methods may be found. That is why the press and the other mass information media must nag at public opinion persistently and skillfully by posing vital problems of major economic and moral significance.

The most urgent problem here is that of the responsibility of anyone on whom the solution of the problem of supplying the population with food products, the most important for the country, depends. For example, a group of chairmen of Kul'skaya Oblast kolkhozes initiated such a discussion frankly and sharply, in their thorough letter entitled "Cost Effectiveness and Kolkhozes."

All projects begin with the drafting of an efficient, specific and scientific plan. The plan is an order, the most important assignment issued by the state to each labor collective. Its formulation necessarily presumes the extensive

participation of the labor collectives. That is precisely the way the party formulates the question. It is only thus that the plan can be of great educational importance, develop in the people a feeling of responsibility, mobilize creative efforts and awaken local initiative.

However, does planning in the countryside always meet these requirements? Far from it. To this day the farms are experiencing the petty supervision of superior organizations. Plans for areas under crops, number of cattle, cows, hogs, sheep, etc, are issued to kolkhozes and sovkhazes from the top-- from the republic ministry, via oblast and rayon services. As before, the chairman or director is strictly taken to task for "underplanting" potatoes or sugar beets or for keeping excess cattle.

Sometimes, the Tula kolkhoz chairman wrote, matters simply reach the point of absurdity. Methodically the kolkhozes are "issued" assignments from above dealing with...sow mating, with a quarterly or monthly breakdown. Should this too be regulated?!

The same occurs with planning the areas under crops. Who if not the local managers, specialists and farmers could know better where, what and how much to sow? The true farmer does not await instructions from above he finds them simply unnecessary.

The time has come firmly to abandon petty regulations and supervision in agricultural production planning. The plan-order must determine the main features: the amount of output which the farm must deliver to the state. Such a plan must be stable and stressed. It must take into consideration all available possibilities and realistic prospects for the development of the kolkhoz or sovkhaz. Such plan requirements must be observed strictly.

The most important thing is to resolve completely the basic problem of making the kolkhozes and sovkhazes full owners of the land entrusted to them by the state. However, here is what happens: all kinds of "industries" other than the kolkhozes, not to mention the Ministry of Agriculture, have the management of the land. Such "industries" issue arbitrary plans to the farms dealing, for example, with the planting of vegetables. The plan figures are increased with every passing year, but comes the autumn the vegetables are not accepted and they simply spoil. The kolkhozes should be issued delivery plans only on the basis of the climatic, land and economic conditions of the specific farms. Order must be introduced in relations between the kolkhozes and sovkhazes, on the one hand, and organizations and enterprises servicing agriculture, on the other. The responsibility of the latter for the end results of agricultural production must be increased.

Today success in farming depends a great deal on the efficient work of many industrial sectors which supply the countryside with machinery, equipment, fertilizers and other material and technical facilities, the coordinated efforts of Goskomsel'khoztekhnik service enterprises, Sel'khozkhimiya, land reclamation and transportation services and procurement and processing organizations. Anyone can understand that without them normal work in the countryside and the development of farming and animal husbandry on a modern basis are inconceivable.



Today all of these related subunits are not rear services in the least. Their role has increased immeasurably in recent years and is continuing to increase. That is why the rural workers are so profoundly affected by problems of economic, financial and moral relations with their partners.

They are also affected because so far, unfortunately, we are dealing with an unequal partnership and its consequences which, we must admit, are hardly pleasing to farm managers and rural workers. There are frequent cases of very unbusinesslike behavior on the part of some partners of kolkhozes such as, for example, the managers of a number of local subdivisions of Goskomsel'khoztekhnika. For example, transportation, construction and land reclamation subunits, meat combines and dairy processing plants are each "milking" the farms in their own way. Naturally, in each specific case the farm may become indignant and prove that it is right, for as a rule the numerous laws and instructions favor the producer. However, few of them are willing to start a conflict with the knowledge that tomorrow once again they will have to organize relations with the same partner. The farms have nominal rights while their partners control the real economic levers, and it is frequently the partners who have the funds. Who is stronger? It is better not to argue with such partners, for the eventual losses may be worse, is a decision frequently made by managers of weak farms.

The well-being of the numerous partners of the farmers is virtually independent of the results of working the land, the harvest, the milking or the weight increase. Essentially, it makes no difference to them whether or not the year was droughty or rainy, or whether or not the farm is profitable or losing. In all cases they will show a profit. Is this situation just? Obviously, we must jointly consider what is to be done in order to equalize the economic conditions under which all enterprises and organizations related to agriculture operate. Clearly, the basic production indicators of the rayon and the extent to which the plans for sales to the state of grain, meat, milk and other products should influence the amount of profit shown by that same Goskomsel'khoztekhnika and Sel'khozkhiimiya. For example, the harvest directly depends on the time of the work, which, in turn, depends on the quality with which the machines are repaired. In such a case the repairmen try to repair the equipment faster and to make it work more reliably. Obviously, it would be more just if the processing enterprises shared part of their profits with the kolkhozes and sovkhazes, for their successes largely depend on the condition of their raw material base, which is established precisely at the fields and farms of kolkhozes and sovkhazes.

The chairmen justifiably write that for some reason all the numerous services in the countryside, the moment they appear, immediately tend to "separate themselves" from the farms, and to become independent of the rayon. Hence the discoordination of activities and the erection of interdepartmental barriers. We believe that the rayon level should be strengthened and assume jurisdiction of all (or almost all) services whose purpose is to support the production of agricultural commodities locally.

It is strange but it is a fact that actually the Ministry of Agriculture in its present structure is not responsible for the results of land farming. The Tula kolkhoz chairmen suggest that, in order to ensure the successful solution of the new problems (we can only agree with their idea), perhaps a ministry

possessing the necessary rights should be created such as, for example, a USSR Ministry of Food Supply, which could provide effective management of this most important national economic sector.

Yes, the Tula chairmen have formulated the touchy problems of rural life sharply and, above all, accurately, and the newspaper supported them firmly. As has been frequently emphasized in party decisions, arbitrary planning and petty interference in farm affairs must be eliminated entirely, and departmentalism, which is still tangibly hindering the development of output, must be rejected more firmly. This is urgently demanded by life itself.

In this connection, I cannot fail to remember an article in IZVESTIYA entitled "Unequal Partnership," which was published in September 1981. Taking materials from the Tatarskaya ASSR, the article analyzes the reasons which are preventing us from resolving the food problem successfully.

Let us take milk production as an example. During the past 5 years, it has caused about 1 million rubles' worth of losses to the kolkhozes in Pestrechinskiy Rayon in Tatariya, while the dairy plant which, to put it more specifically, is a small branch of the Kazan' Combine, showed a profit of 1,384,000 rubles. A similar situation prevails in other rayons and in the republic at large. From milk alone the kolkhozes and sovkhoses are suffering losses running into the millions of rubles. The more they produce, the more indebted the farms become. Meanwhile, the production association of the milk industry is prospering! In the 10th Five-Year Plan it earned 18,966,000 rubles annually; in the first half of 1981 its profit totaled 10,380,000, including 652,000 rubles above the plan. What kind of arithmetic is this!

More than 700 farms are producing milk in Tatariya. So far, there are only 40 organized centers where the produce is accepted directly at the place of production and special transport facilities are used on a centralized basis. This innovation is being introduced sluggishly, although that same Pestrechinskiy Rayon and several others could have been almost totally converted to such a progressive organization of production marketing. This is hindered by inertial thinking and departmental barriers. The power of habit is supported by economic reasons: it is by far more profitable and easier, under the conditions of an unequal partnership, to "milk" the kolkhozes as in the past than to build roads and maintain them, deliver additional equipment to the farms, observe transportation schedules strictly and assume responsibility for the transportation of the freight.

The dairy industry is no exception. Let us consider the meat industry. Cattle procurements and deliveries to the meat combine are a difficult task even in the case of suburban farms. Thus, from Osipovskiy Sovkhoz, which is an interfarm cattle feeding enterprise, animals are herded to Kazan'. The distance is short--no more than 40 km--but even then the animals lose as much as 4 kg of meat per head. It is rare to find a single well-fed calf in a herd of 100 head. It was thus that imperceptibly the sovkhos lost 5.6 tons of meat in 1980.

Many other kolkhozes and sovkhoses in Tatariya find themselves in a far more difficult position. For example, shipping cattle out of Drozhzhanovskiy Rayon is a very troublesome matter. The nearby Buinskiy Meat Combine is small and

is unable to handle even its own district, for which reason the cattle must be driven to Sviyazhsk, which is more than 200 km away. It takes the trucks an entire day, the cattle are left without feed and water for a long period of time and their weight drops. That was the reason for which the rayon lost 10 tons of meat that same year. Things remain the same to this day.

However, the meat industry enterprises are hardly interested in the means and costs of cattle deliveries. An enterprise may unexpectedly announce a "nonreception" day and wreck the cattle delivery schedules. Particularly delinquent in this respect is the Chistopol' Combine. Before the slaughter, the animals are kept in unsuitable, dirty premises in Shemordan, Tetyushi and Nurlat. No unloading and receiving facilities for the cattle arriving by rail and no nighttime services exist at the Sviyarzhskiy Meat Combine.

The more familiar one becomes with the system of locating meat industry enterprises and the procedure governing cattle deliveries and acceptance, the more obvious it becomes that narrow departmental advantages here prevail over state interests. The meat industry dictates the conditions. The meat combines themselves weigh the cattle, determine its degree of fattening and process the animals according to their own rules, more concerned with their profit than with settling accounts with kolkhozes and sovkhoses fairly.

All of Tatarskaya has no more than a dozen specialized cattle trucks. The cattle are moved mainly by ordinary truck, unadapted to the transportation of such delicate freight. Conversion to centralized cattle procurements and haulage with specialized facilities must not be delayed. However, the meat industry production association is hardly concerned with kolkhoz interests.

The newspapers have published many articles on the need to place storage areas and enterprises engaged in the primary processing of products and the utilization of waste closer to the production areas. However, the departments prefer the creation of gigantic enterprises and the expansion of their capacities. The departmentalists are not particularly concerned with losses and transportation expenditures, for they are paid out of a different pocket.

But is this pocket really different? Is it not one and the same pocket? It is the kolkhozes and sovkhoses that suffer most from departmental lack of coordination. Substantial losses occur as a result of imperfections in the existing procurement system and the unequal status of the farms in their relations with processing sectors. The result is that in the Tatarskaya ASSR all enterprises engaged in the procurement and processing of agricultural commodities show substantial profits while the kolkhozes and sovkhoses are sometimes barely making ends meet.

"The purchasing system requires major improvement," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the November CC CPSU Plenum. "Today almost all of the purchased grain is shipped to elevators (frequently at a distance), although a substantial part of this grain must then be returned. Obviously, along with the building of big elevators we must set up small storage areas and bring the mixed feed shops closer to kolkhozes and sovkhoses. The building of very big enterprises for dairy processing, cattle slaughtering and meat processing is hardly justified. Frequently, both cattle and milk must be hauled over distances of hundreds of kilometers. This too leads to losses and unproductive outlays which must and can be reduced sharply."

The question of cost effectiveness relations in kolkhoz and sovkhos production activities is very topical. It has a direct influence on the success of the food program. Actually, many farms in our country exist in a state of indebtedness for years on end, borrow substantial funds from the Gosbank and...fail to repay them, for they have nothing to repay them with. The bank, however, is not a bottomless barrel. The people's money must be put to work rather than wasted. That is precisely the way our newspaper formulated the matter: "The Bank Is Not a Bottomless Barrel." This was the heading we gave to the correspondence from Voronezhskaya Oblast, which provided a study of the activities of a number of farms which have owed money over long periods of time and have not seriously undertaken the application of the cost effectiveness system.

Let us take as an example the Nizhnedevitskiy Zvezda Kolkhoz. Its land is excellent and it has plenty of people and equipment. The entire rayon is located in a good climatic area.

Why is it that its economy has been stagnating in recent years and has even taken a step backwards? Was this caused by the rather difficult weather conditions in recent years? No, that was not the only reason. During the past 5 years not a single indicator in the production plan was met.

Let us now consider the components of the lagging of this kolkhoz and its most difficult financial situation. Its grain, beet and sunflower harvests are far below not only those of the best farms but the average rayon indicators. In 1980, according to most conservative estimates, one half of the sugar beet roots remained unpicked; it is even embarrassing to write about the sunflower crop, which was only slightly more than...1 quintal per hectare.

The farm's grain harvest was half that of the rayon and the oblast in 1981, which was a rather difficult year, as well. Once again the beet and sunflower crops were nothing to boast about. A similar situation prevailed in animal husbandry. Milk production per cow was almost 200 kg less than in the other rayon farms. Weight increases were also far below average indicators.

A complete oil tank farm, which costs 330,000 rubles to install, has been idling not far from the management building for more than 10 years. Apparently, someone had failed to determine the need for such a facility....Several hundred meters away lies yet another "memorial" to waste--the building of a big feed shop. Rusty equipment surrounded by tall weeds may be found near and inside the building. The date "1971" stands out in red brick on the facade of the feed shop building. For the past 10 years, this facility, which cost more than 100,000 rubles, has yielded not one ruble in revenue. Close to the feed shop is the chemical fertilizer warehouse. No one has bothered to repair the roof, and eventually this scarce "earth vitamin" turns into garbage.

Is this what is meant by the use of credit?! After all this, is it strange that over the 5-year period capital returns here have dropped by one-half and that gross output per worker has been declining?

Are the farm managers unable to understand that by its very nature the kolkhoz is a cost efficiency subunit and that it cannot keep owing money year after year? The farm received a 2-million-ruble short-term loan. As we know, such

loans are granted with material values and kolkhoz income as collateral, together with intensive work, thrift and the initiative to save on the part of all the members of the collective. Nevertheless, the kolkhoz owes the bank 800,000 rubles in delinquent loans.

It is entirely natural that this kind of management, to use the word loosely, leads to a steady growth of indebtedness. In Nizhnedevitskiy Rayon the amount of short-term loans alone exceeds 21 million rubles (as much as in Talovskiy and Kalacheyevskiy Rayons combined), while gross output per ruble of credit is one half to one third that of the latter rayons.

However, both Voronezhskaya Oblast and the other oblasts and republics have gained interesting and instructive experience in the development of cost accounting in the rural areas. Let us look at the 40 Let Okyabrya Kolkhoz in Panfilovskiy Rayon, Taldy-Kurganskaya Oblast, Kazakh SSR, a detailed description of which was given in IZVESTIYA. Here there are high returns from each ruble invested in production, and the farm earns about 20,000 rubles net profit per working day. For the last 15 years the kolkhoz, headed by Hero of Socialist Labor Nikolay Nikitich Golovatskiy, USSR Supreme Society deputy, has been selling its entire output to the state and has never borrowed from the Gosbank. This highly profitable farm is an example of how to manage and to participate in the implementation of the food program.

IZVESTIYA has also extensively described the experience of the Talsy Unified Territorial Agroindustrial Association in the Latvian SSR. It includes not only all the rayon's kolkhozes and sovkhoses but enterprises and organizations servicing the countryside and processing the agricultural output. The association's activities are based on cost effectiveness. As a result, regardless of departmental affiliation, each collective is interested not only in its own production but in the success of every single one of its partners, of the association as a whole. The single task is to obtain as much agricultural output as possible with lower production outlays. For example, the system of economic and cost accounting levers operating within the association makes the results of the work of Sel'khoztekhnika directly dependent on the output of kolkhoz fields and livestock farms.

It is our deeply felt belief that in connection with this matter it is exceptionally useful not only to criticize harmful trends toward departmental exclusivity, concealed behind the banner of specialization, but to describe extensively, vividly and convincingly the experience in surmounting such trends and in providing a truly desirable solution to food problems.

Also in the interest of the project it is exceptionally important to upgrade comprehensively the production of agricultural commodities and equally so to protect the products of the fields and livestock farms thriftily and economically. However, such a great deal is being lost, wasted, spoiled! The labor of tens of thousands of people is reduced to naught. Such losses are not only material but moral and, if you wish, ideological, for there is nothing more "anti-educational" than negligence and uselessly wasted labor.

As was pointed out at the 26th party congress, during the past 5 years the average annual per capita consumption of vegetables and fruits increased considerably less rapidly than the output. Losses were the main reason for this.

That is why the purpose of the food program is to combine the development of agriculture with the servicing industrial sectors, procurement, storage, transportation, processing of agricultural output, the development of the food industry and trade in foodstuffs.

This is a qualitatively new task. It will require a largely different approach to the solution of a problem such as organizing the supply of potatoes, vegetables and fruits to industrial centers.

How can the needs of big cities be met better? The cities store up huge quantities of potatoes, fruits and vegetables. Nevertheless, it frequently happens that together with good-quality produce, customers buy from vegetable stores vegetables in such poor condition that thousands of tons of them (alas, uncountable!) end up as garbage. The customers are dissatisfied and the state suffers losses. The result is that the so-called guaranteed stock of fruits and vegetables in reality does not guarantee at all the availability of good-quality fruits and vegetables in the stores. Are such "guarantees" not false?

Estimates have indicated that about 70 percent of the potato harvest would be better stored where it is produced, while the remaining 30 percent should be sent to the consumption areas and that it would be expedient, starting in the autumn, to ship only what is necessary to meet current needs (1 or 2 months) and save for the cold season (December-February). As a rule, however, most of the produce is stored not in bases close to the specialized farms but in the cities.

However, the few examples of the storing of potatoes in the farms around Moscow, for example (the Volokolamskaya, Dmitrovskaya and other bases), have proved the many unquestionable advantages of such a system. This sharply reduced transportation requirements. It becomes possible to set aside substandard potatoes without haste and to use them to make starch, syrup, alcohol or simply as cattle feed. Such problems must be resolved precisely on the spot, concertedly, with the participation of the producers themselves. In the opposite case, as is currently the situation, all of the heavy work is shifted from the fields to the fruit and vegetable bases, although such operations are not part of the duties of such bases, which have neither the necessary area nor the proper equipment.

No other area of the national economy involves such a large quantity of manual labor. Hundreds of thousands of industrial workers, scientific associates and students are mobilized to unload freight cars, sort root crops, clean the cabbage and perform other operations during the season of the mass harvest and storage of potatoes, vegetables and fruits (September-October). In addition to the fact that this greatly complicates the work of many enterprises, such cadres are being used extremely inefficiently: the daily output of such workers does not exceed, as a rule, 1 ruble or even 30 to 40 kopeks per shift. People are constantly being reassigned to vegetable bases at other times of the year as well.

The storing of root crops at production sites would virtually exclude the shipping of substandard goods to consumption areas. Thousands and thousands of the most valuable fertile dirt will not be carried away in trucks and freight cars. We have a term to indicate the amount of dirt covering root

crops. Thus, in some shipments, dirt accounts for 20 to 30 percent of the entire volume of goods shipped, whereas according to state standards no more than 1 percent is allowed. Instead of going to the land, the fertile soil plugs up sewer mains in the cities or, at best, is spread on the lawn around the fruit and vegetable storage bases.

When shall we put an end to this waste? This is no longer the storing but the suppuration of goods produced through the toil and sweat of the farmer! According to the RSFSR Ministry of Agriculture Scientific Research Potato Farming Institute, during the harvest the overall damage caused to the potatoes directly at the farm accounts for 20 to 30 percent of the total crop. The loss rises to 40-50 percent along the road from the field to the storage area and during the loading process. In transshipments the optimal drop should not exceed 30 cm. However, this requirement is ignored virtually everywhere. Imagine the impact on the potatoes after a sharp drop from the dumptruck of a 5-ton mass of potatoes hitting the concrete!

Naturally, if the alternative of on-site storing is adopted, solid storage areas must be built in potato-growing areas. So far, there are few rural storage areas. In the Russian Federation, for example, no more than half of the potatoes are kept in special refrigerated premises.

That is why Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out at the November CC CPSU Plenum that "as we know, substantial losses are incurred in the storing of potatoes and vegetables in many cities. In order to correct this situation, the draft plan calls for increasing capital investments for the building of storage areas by 60 percent, and for the construction of intrafarm paved roads by 40 percent. Vegetable storage bins must be built both in the cities and in the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. This will make it possible to haul the goods as needed directly to the stores and cafeterias and will reduce losses considerably."

It is becoming increasingly clear today that in order to reach the proper level of storing, processing and delivering potatoes to the stores, particularly in prepackaged form, the fruit and vegetable bases must be relieved of the task of storing excessive amounts of this "second type of bread" and of other fruits and vegetables.

The GDR, which adopted the system of setting up cooperative associations for the building of modern storage areas, has acquired interesting experience in storing potatoes at production sites. An association includes producing farms, a marketing firm and a waste processing plant. All of this makes it possible to protect root crops and use the waste locally in the best possible manner.

In a word, both our own practice and global experience prove that the time has long come to reduce the shipment of potatoes to the cities. Potatoes, fruits and vegetables must be stored at production sites and shipped to the big cities as needed, in a maximally processed condition. This will enable us to link closely agriculture with sectors engaged in produce storing, processing and trade. The demand of the times is that the economy must be economical!

Transportation is a particularly weak link in the chain from the field to store shelves today. Specialized transportation facilities are needed for the uninterrupted shipment of potatoes to the cities; air-conditioned trucks must be used during the cold season. Transportation losses are the most tangible, particularly considering the current scale at which potatoes are shipped to the cities.

The problem of the containerized hauling of potatoes has remained unresolved for quite some time. The comprehensive use of containers ensures the best possible preservation in the transportation, storing and marketing of fruits and vegetables. The use of containers protects food crops from many unpleasant developments. However, how to procure them in sufficient quantities? So far, the mass production of wire mesh containers has not been organized in the country. However, even where containers are to be found, their advantage as reusable packaging is frequently ignored. The point is that containers can be used effectively only as part of a machine system, closely coordinated with specialized hauling facilities.

A container loaded in the field weighs about half a ton. This requires the use of a loader and, for subsequent transportation, a container carrier of corresponding dimensions; the storing area must also be aimed at receiving and processing containers. Most frequently, however, such facilities are not available. In some farms no facilities exist for unloading the empty containers. They are simply dumped, as a result of which they break down quickly, thus breaking the chain at the very beginning. Naturally, in the worst case potatoes can be loaded in 45-50-kg string bags. However, there is virtually no production of pliable unknotted bags, while potatoes packed in conventional bags become heavily damaged.

Assignments on marketing packed goods are not being implemented. By transshipping huge volumes of potatoes and vegetables, the fruit and vegetable bases have practically shifted to the stores the concern for packaging and, partially, the sorting of the shipped fruits and vegetables. Because of the scarcity of container carriers, from the fruit and vegetable bases the produce is frequently delivered in cases and must subsequently be re-stored in containers. Hundreds of store workers are engaged in the packaging and sorting of vegetables, as a result of which long lines develop in the stores and selling is slowed down.

Naturally, this entire mess hinders the organization of the efficient delivery to the population of the produce of the fields and truck gardens.

Even under the current circumstances, however, the commercial network could have coped better with its assignments. Let me mention the Omsk experience. The specialized Omichka Production Association raises and, let me emphasize, delivers in proper condition to the stores 100 kg of vegetables per city resident. Here spoilable goods are loaded and unloaded only once: they bypass the base and go to the stores straight from the farm. The organization of trade based on the "field-store" method has made it possible not only to speed up the delivery of vegetables to the stores and to preserve their high quality but to avoid losses and to reduce labor outlays for the processing of the produce for sale. There are no dumps of rotting piles of vegetables in the backyards of bases. There is no need for "total" mobilization of the citizens for the vegetable harvest. This experience must be looked at very closely.



The USSR Ministry of Fruits and Vegetables, which was created recently, is in charge of combining the efforts of producers of root crops and vegetables, procurers and those involved in their delivery and marketing. Currently it handles one-half of the gross output of fruits and vegetables. It has jurisdiction over the complex system aimed at supplying, for example, Muscovites with potatoes, fruits and vegetables. Let us hope that once and for all proper order will be brought into this important sector. That is precisely why the new ministry was created! Its immediate duty is to organize the uninterrupted supply of the population with fresh vegetables, potatoes, fruits and berries--with everything abundant in our land.

Having assumed the duty of systematically and sharply covering some basic directions of the all-union food program, IZVESTIYA proceeds from the fact that a discussion of problems, whether mentioned or not in this article, must be frank, honest in the party style and open.

I cannot avoid yet another most important problem, more urgent today than every before--roadlessness. In the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev described the lowering of transportation costs as a major national problem. The economy cannot remain economical without its solution. According to specialists, annual agricultural losses caused by roadlessness exceed 5 to 7 billion rubles. The lack of proper roads in rural areas means that the average automotive engine must idle 40 days per year. During the period of the thaw, as much as 60 percent of the available kolkhoz and sovkhoz tractors are used to pull trucks and deliver freight. Sociologists have proved that rural population migration is largely related precisely to the poor roads. In a word, the country is experiencing huge and irrecoverable losses from roadlessness. Actually, even at the present level of agricultural production the population could be fully supplied with many types of goods. Roadlessness, however, leads to substantial produce losses.

Yes, the lack of good roads is literally ruinous and sharply reduces the effectiveness of state material outlays in all economic sectors. Here again we are amazed at the stand taken by those whose duty it is to plan road construction and automotive production. Apparently, it is believed in some quarters that since road construction is expensive, it is precisely in this area that we should save. It is apparently written that it is our lot to live under conditions of roadlessness. In turn, operating on the basis of reality, so to speak, automotive designers design and build motor vehicles especially adapted to...poor roads, thus seeming to perpetuate the state of roadlessness. We must also point out that so far we have still not developed an important automotive industry sector such as the production of refrigerated trucks. Unfortunately, the country has an entirely unsatisfactory fleet of refrigerated cars--refrigerators on wheels. A great deal of aggravation would be spared us had we had an adequate supply of refrigerated trucks. I remember being told by Rostovskaya Oblast managers that with a sufficient amount of refrigerated trucks, the Don area alone could fully supply our capital with fruits and vegetables. The lack of refrigerated trucks results in the spoilage of thousands of tons of excellent produce. What about the gifts of the land of Central Asia, the Transcaucasus, Moldavia or Astrakhan'? It is no simple matter today to ship their produce to the center and to Siberia and the North!

We entitled a page in IZVESTIYA "Roadlessness Is the Enemy of the Economy." We pointed out that the need has come to make radical changes in the nature of the development of the automotive industry, automotive transportation and automotive roads. Such development must meet the task of the all-round intensification of the work of automotive transportation and the entire national economy and the accelerated increase in the productivity of the rolling stock. This can be achieved only by building roads and improving the road network at a faster pace.

Today the annual expansion of paved roads in our country is about 20,000 km. Estimates have indicated that in the next few years the average annual completion of paved roads must reach approximately 50,000 km and about 1,000 km of superior category highways must be built. This means that the volume of road construction must grow by 15 to 20 percent annually. Naturally, this is a difficult but entirely realistic task whose implementation will make a substantial contribution to the implementation of the all-union food program.

Such are some of the most important problems, the full size of which today confronts our national economy and, consequently, the mass information media, our newspaper in particular. We intent to continue actively to cover problems related to the formulation and implementation of the food program, actively involve ourselves in life and comprehensively help the party and the national economy to make our unionwide table abundant and generous.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/8

## LIVE CREATIVITY OF THE MASSES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 37-46

[Article by Dr of Economic Sciences V. Fedinin]

[Text] As our country's experience indicates, under mature socialist conditions the competition becomes a truly nationwide project. It embodies the revolutionary enthusiasm, consciousness and creative initiative of the masses. It has an increasingly growing impact on upgrading production effectiveness and developing all areas of social life--the economic, social and ideological-moral. Based on the increased activeness of the Soviet people, it carries within itself a tremendous educational charge.

According to Lenin, the purpose of the competition is to become the most important means for achieving radical changes in production and other areas of social life and a powerful lever for involving the toiling masses in economic and cultural construction; to contribute to the steady enhancement of organization, discipline and labor productivity, the mastery of new equipment and the saving of labor and funds; and to serve the cause of strengthening and uniting the working class on the basis of the ideas of socialist collectivism and communist morality.

The current turn which our economy has taken toward intensive and qualitative development factors and the solution of large-scale comprehensive problems is related above all to the fuller satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of the people. It opens new horizons to the competition. However, it also demands its better organization and increased influence on production and the solution of problems of social development and the communist education of the working people.

As a whole, the economic policy formulated by the party for the 11th Five-Year Plan and the 1980's reflects the basic interests of the state and the Soviet people. Its successful implementation depends entirely and fully on the efficient functioning of our entire socialist economic mechanism which, in the words of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, must ensure a proper outlet for the great energy and initiative of the working people. The CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress mentioned precisely the fact that the competition, as one of the vivid manifestations of the new attitude toward labor created by socialism, is based on the high conscientiousness and initiative of the Soviet people. In considering the socialist competition the most important means for the implementation of vital socioeconomic tasks, the congress

called for improving the organization, effectiveness and social and educational importance of the competition.

All of this assigns particular responsibility to the party and trade union organizations, the primary above all, which direct the socialist competition in their collectives, support the valuable initiatives of frontrankers and production innovators and create the necessary conditions for the dissemination of the best experience. The task is to make the management of the competition more competent and purposeful. Its implementation presumes familiarity with and consideration of the entire variety of factors and local characteristics and specific situations within each collective and each collective subdivision, and the ability always to select the most appropriate and effective means and methods for the solution of problems. What hinders the development of the initiative of the people at a given point in time, how to stimulate competitiveness within one or another collective in the best possible manner, and how to assess more accurately the results of the competition in accordance with the quantity and quality of output and the conservation of means and resources? The accurate and timely answers to such questions greatly determine the effectiveness and richness of the competition and its role in the upbringing and spiritual uplifting of the individual.

This requires the continual study of the laws governing the development of labor rivalry, the serious interpretation of progressive experience, the comprehensive consideration of the views and suggestions of the working people and a decisive struggle against even the most minor manifestations of formalism in the competition, which is an important, live project. Practical experience convincingly proves that the competition develops successfully in collectives which are steadily improving the organization of production and labor and engage in the struggle for the full and effective utilization of the production potential and for economy and thrift; where an atmosphere of truly comradely relations has been developed and the administration and the public organizations are concerned with improving the working and living conditions of the workers and with raising their cultural and technical standards through an individual approach and concern for every worker; and where the adoption of obligations and competition contracts is planned rather than formally approached, where the type of criteria for assessing its results have been drafted and are understood by everyone, provide equal opportunity and fully stimulate initiative and labor and social activeness.

There is virtually no plant, kolkhoz or construction project in our country untouched by the vivifying breath of the socialist competition; currently individual workers, brigades, enterprises, cities, regions, oblasts, krays and republics are competing with one another. Communist convictions, collectivism and the comradely mutual aid among Soviet people are embodied in real accomplishments in the process of the labor competition. The people's feeling of being the masters of the production process and the country becomes strengthened and energized. Everywhere we find leading shock workers and communist labor collectives, consisting of party members mainly, who set models for work and examples of truly party-minded and statesmanlike attitudes toward the work. The competition is increasingly influencing the education of the new man and the development of socialist production and all social relations.

It is mainly in the labor collective that a person has the opportunity to display his capabilities and gifts and his consciousness and skill. "It is

precisely at work and only at work that man is great," Maksim Gor'kiy wrote, "and the more he loves labor the greater he himself becomes...."

"If we want to develop the competition," A. Stakhanov said, "we must begin with ourselves. We must try to work in such a way that others develop the desire to follow."

That is precisely how the socialist competition frontrankers have acted and are acting. V. Golubeva, N. Maksyachkina and A. Sukhova, weavers at the Order of Lenin Ivanovo Worsted Combine imeni V. I. Lenin, fulfilled four individual annual assignments in 8 months. Each one of them is servicing 32 looms instead of 6 as normed. In congratulating the weavers for their labor victory, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that these successes became possible thanks to their high professional skill, creative attitude toward the work and high feeling of responsibility.

Having entered the competition for the extraction of 1,000 or more tons of coal per day per mechanized mine face, on the initiative of frontranking mining brigades, a mining brigade at the Mayskaya Mine, headed by M. Chikh, extracted more than 1 million tons in 1981. How was this success accomplished? It was due to the efficient organization of the work, the high skill of the miners, strong discipline and reciprocal backing and aid. The same could be said of Donbass miners N. Kholostykh and V. Zhilin, who achieved the highest labor productivity in the sector and fulfilled their assignments for the first 2 years of the five-year plan last August.

Here is a statement by a brigade of fitters and installation workers at the Gomel Measuring Equipment Plant: "We request a revision of the time norms for fitting and installation operations in assembling sets of printed circuit boards; we also request that payment per set be lowered by 15 kopeks." The document was signed by all 24 workers, headed by Brigade Leader M. Perova. This is not a one-of-a-kind statement. Thousands of norms at this plant have been increased on the request of the workers themselves; today many production collectives throughout the country are applying the so-called Aksayskiy norm revision method.

At first glance this may appear illogical: on the one hand, the worker assumes a heavier burden, while on the other, he may have his wages lowered. However, the strength of our society is found precisely in the fact that under the influence of the labor collective and the socialist way of life, the following rule becomes part of the awareness and custom of increasingly broader masses: "We are the masters of the production process, and its further development depends on us." The working people call for a revision of norms as dictated by their conscience, for their minds and hearts understand the importance of their work for the common good. Understandably, being truly honest working people, the members of M. Perova's brigade could not be satisfied with work without the necessary stress and rational use of time and equipment. The revision of the norms contributed to better, more united and rhythmical work which has brought about perhaps not easy but real rather than imaginary victories.

Naturally, the personal interest of those working on the basis of properly substantiated norms is not restricted to moral satisfaction but includes the realm of material incentive as well. In the case of M. Perova's brigade,

combined with production rationalization and improved labor conditions and organization, these norms led to the fact that the workers began to put together a considerably higher number of printed circuits, as a result of which they compensated for their lowered price. Their bonus amount was raised, for the bonus system is so structured that, thanks to the new norms, one-half of the funds saved go to the workers. Consequently, in this case the social, collective and individual interests and moral and material incentives were combined most successfully.

These are merely individual examples which prove that the socialist way of life gives birth to real patriots who set examples of selfless toil, dedication to communist ideals and high morality. Such people have appeared by the millions in the course of the competition. They have mastered their skill, the new equipment and progressive technology to perfection. Their experience is a priceless resource and a clear example of creative and constructive efforts; by adopting the means and methods of their work, others as well achieve major production successes. The Soviet people develop a greater desire to acquire new knowledge, to master the achievements of frontrankers and to grow professionally and culturally. That is why it is so important to do everything possible today for the levels reached by frontrankers to become the norm for the greatest possible number of competitors. To increase interest in the work and labor rivalry among those who are today "in the middle" means to resolve a major socioeconomic and political problem.

The efforts being made in the country to ensure the further dissemination of the experience and labor initiative of competition leaders, in accordance with the characteristic features of one or another type of output, are of great importance. The slogan "No One Must Lag Behind," the competition based on individual and brigade plans for upgrading labor productivity and the competition for economy and thrift with individual effectiveness accounts have gained truly nationwide support. As we know, the CC CPSU approved the Yaroslavl' initiative of mounting a competition for increasing in the 11th Five-Year Plan industrial output without increasing the number of workers, the Muscovite initiative of ensuring the extensive use of the achievements of science and technology with a view to the conservation of labor, material and energy resources, the initiative of the enterprises in Rostovskaya Oblast on the long-term development of plant capacities, of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Krasnodarskiy Krai and Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast on improving the quality of agricultural output and the practical experience of the labor collectives of the Urals and the Kuzbass on the conservation of metal and fuel and energy resources.

The party and trade union organizations are also deservedly supporting competition methods which rally the efforts of collectives which are related technologically or through labor cooperation. The Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990 particularly emphasized the need to improve the organization of the competition among enterprises supplying raw materials, materials and complementing goods and related plants and factories producing finished products. As frontranking experience confirms, it is precisely thus that live, firm and permanent relations are established among them, effective methods for the sharing of experience are set up, high results are achieved and firm production schedules are observed.

Movements such as "Let Us Shift Manual Labor to Machines!", "Use the Equipment at Full Capacity!" and "Engineering Support for Workers Initiative" are gathering strength. These and many other initiatives, which are consistent with the requirements of the 11th Five-Year Plan, are becoming an important component of the socialist pledges of labor collectives. They make it possible to increase the pace of output and make more effective use of working time and of labor, material and energy resources.

However, consistency, purposefulness and a specific system which includes mainly the attentive study and selection of the achievements of practical experience, science and technology, and the precise determination of the area of their application and of measures which contribute to the competent and organized specific implementation of plans are not always practiced in the dissemination of progressive experience and the experience in organizing the competition. In order to disseminate progressive experience, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said, we must abandon obsolete canons. We must review and amend individual management principles and production organization methods. This requirement is still not being met everywhere today. Frequently all the necessary measures for the technical-economic, organizational and ideological support of applied innovations are not taken on time. We must admit that in this area we are suffering substantial losses in economic and educational areas.

In answering the question of why his method is being disseminated sluggishly, Hero of Socialist Labor N. A. Zlobin, one of the initiators of the brigade contracting method, said: "The new gets along poorly with the old approach to the work. Before applying the contracting method, model order must be introduced everywhere, along all parts of the construction conveyor belt. This is frequently forgotten and...the result is failure..." According to Nikolay Anatol'yevich, the golden age of brigade cost effectiveness has not come yet. It has only come out of its swaddling, although it is more than 10 years old. It must be developed in breadth and in depth. "I have already heard," N. A. Zlobin emphasized, "that the slogan 'Let Us Convert All Brigades to the Contracting Method in the 11th Five-Year Plan!' has been raised in some rayons. Let me say, therefore, that this, Comrades, is not the main thing. The main thing is not the number of cost effectiveness brigades but the quality of their work."

No halfway measures are allowed in the dissemination and mastering of the achievement of science and progressive experience. Incompetence, a formalistic approach, idling in the face of difficulties and all kinds of obstacles could doom even the best "application" plans. That is why it is important to entrust the dissemination of progressive experience to the best-trained and initiative-minded comrades, to those who can interest and rally the people and who can ensure the proper support of economic and party organs; the possibilities of voluntary bureaus and departments must be made greater use of in this matter; specialized application brigade groups must be created, consisting of workers (kolkhoz members), engineering and technical personnel, designers and scientists. Practical experience has confirmed that this contributes to the successful solution of programs and has a beneficial social purpose. It strengthens the ties between science and practice and creative cooperation among people practicing different skills and belonging to different social classes and strata.

In this area the party committees of enterprises and associations play a major role. It is important not only to approve one initiative or another or a suggestion on improving the organization of labor and production, but to assume close control over such matters and to consider them as the basis of the entire organization of the party's management of the competition and party control of administrative activities. Unfortunately, some economic managers are unwilling to undertake any kind of change. They are unwilling to take a risk, justifying themselves with so-called "objective" reasons. This cannot be tolerated. With increasing frequency the party members are most firmly rebuffing conservatism and red tape. It is equally important to see to it that the people are properly prepared for accepting and applying a new development. The clear and convincing description of its advantages and of its benefits to production and the workers, and the way it can enrich the content of the work and the competition, while taking suggestions into consideration, means to secure the understanding and active support of the working people.

The educational role of the competition depends greatly on the way its content reflects the requirements of economic development and the tasks facing society. All economic decisions have specific social and moral aspects. The competition slogan of the 11th Five-Year Plan "Do Effective and Quality Work!" reflects the party's stipulation regarding production intensification. It is also a deeply social and moral slogan.

The practical implementation of this slogan calls for a close study of everything valuable already acquired through competition and, naturally, a certain elimination of existing organizational forms, obsolete or unjustified "traditions" in the organization of the competition, and the formulation of competition conditions and incentive methods aimed at achieving the best possible results. Today such conditions and methods do not always and everywhere encourage the collectives to lower outlays, upgrade production quality and ensure the technical advancement of the production process. The percentage of implementation of the plan for the volume of output is still frequently the decisive if not the only criterion in determining the winner.

Two brigades--respectively led by F. Skomorokhin and F. Goldobin--operate the same paper-making machine at the Kama Cellulose-Paper combine. The first overfulfilled its monthly paper production plan; 87 percent of its output was of superior quality; the weight per square meter of paper was reduced by 0.08 grams, as a result of which an additional 20,000 square meters of paper sheets were produced from the same raw material quantities. The second produced approximately the same amount of superior quality goods but was unable to fulfill the plan by a fraction of a percent. However, it worked with minimum tolerance and was able to produce from saved raw materials an additional 150,000 square meters of paper. In the first case, material resources worth 202 rubles were saved; in the second, 1,500.

How was their work assessed? Skomorokhin's brigade received a bonus for overfulfilling the plan and saving on materials. Goldobin's brigade received no bonus at all: according to the combine's rule, no thrift bonus is paid if the "gross" production assignment is not fulfilled. This situation is typical not only of that enterprise. The notorious "gross" is still hindering the initiative of the people for reaching high-quality indicators. It does not combine the interests of the worker, the enterprise and the state in the struggle for thrift and for lowering production costs. Naturally, this



diminishes the educational role of the competition and its influence on the inclusion of various items as part of the socialist pledges (or on their implementation, if already adopted).

The internal coordination within the system of value indicators of the work of the competitors is one of the important prerequisites for the further enhancement of production effectiveness. Let us take the following fact as an example: it has been frequently emphasized that the main task facing clothing and shoe manufacturing workers today is to meet the orders of the trade network related to quality and variety and to take fashion and customer opinion more fully into consideration. However, to this day their activities are essentially related to the increased volume of output, as a result of which some of the high amount of good produced is not in demand. Under such circumstances, what type of moral coloring does the competition assume? Unfortunately, this is not an isolated example. In an effort to fulfill their marketing plans, economic managers frequently neglect problems of renovation and quality improvements. They compromise with their consciences for the sake of immediate advantages which soon afterwards turn into substantial material and moral losses to the state and to society.

However, the steps taken by the party to improve the economic mechanism consist precisely of creating conditions under which all production collectives, having received a plan drafted with their direct participation, on the basis of economic and engineering computations, become fully interested, both morally and materially, in its fulfillment and overfulfillment, in doing high-quality rhythmical work and producing only goods consistent with the increased requirements of the national economy and the demands of the mass consumer. Wherever this approach has been adopted and competition "shortcuts" eliminated, the main efforts of the competitors are concentrated on upgrading production quality, ensuring the better utilization of productive capital and economy.

One of our tasks in improving the economic mechanism is to convert mainly to the brigade organization of labor. Experience proves that this enables us to make better use of the workers and the equipment. It contributes to the accelerated growth of labor productivity and production quality. It creates objective prerequisites for upgrading the effectiveness of the socialist competition and the moral and material incentive of the competitors for better end results. The full use of the opportunities and advantages offered by the brigade organization and brigade contracting, with a view to encouraging mass initiative and enterprise, is a vital requirement today. To accomplish this thoughtfully, based on the already acquired valuable experience and the recommendations of economists and sociologists, means to ensure in the best possible way the interrelationship between the struggle for quality and effectiveness and the initiative of the working people and to mobilize new opportunities for developing among them a collectivistic feeling of comradely support and production management habits.

In turn, this will help the competition among cost effectiveness brigades which, as a rule, is based on comprehensive brigade plans for upgrading labor effectiveness and quality. Such competition develops within the brigade as well. The question is sometimes asked: If the brigade is a single organism working on the basis of a single order, is it necessary to promote competition within it? Unquestionably, yes. Naturally, the majority of the workers wish

the collective success. However, they would not like to be lost in the mass but deem it important and mandatory to compare their contribution to that of others. Such workers, finding themselves among the competition frontrunners, will try to consolidate their success. It is also assumed that those who have fallen behind will not want to remain at the tail end and will begin to work better. That precisely is what happens in collectives in which the competition has been properly organized, in which its economic and moral results are regularly studied and in which winners are given not only material but moral incentives, and in which comradely aid is given to those who have fallen behind.

Currently, many enterprises have regulations according to which the same worker may receive a great variety of bonuses: for saving on materials, for production quality, for being best in one's profession, for being a member of a leading brigade, etc. Naturally, each such incentive could perform a specific role but their multiplicity and the fact that they are frequently not inter-related and, above all, are not tied to end results rarely encourages collectives and individual workers to apply additional efforts to upgrade effectiveness and quality. On the other hand, the various bonuses based on good labor results are poorly linked to bonuses based on competition results. Frequently such incentives are unjustifiably small. Here is an example: at the Nikolayevskiy Okean Shipyards, based on the results of their monthly work, third-category workers at the assembly-welding shop are paid bonuses of 60 to 70 rubles, whereas the bonuses they receive for winning the competition, as engineer L. Pinchuk writes, "are 30 times lower," i.e., 2-3 rubles. The result is that the overall earnings of competition winners are virtually identical to the earning of laggards.

The purpose of an incentive is to mobilize, to inspire the people to engage in work and creativity, and to educate. Everyone wants to know the specific reason for the bonus and its components; everyone wants to be confident that such incentive is just and that it could not be otherwise. Some enterprises try to award bonuses to the largest possible number of people on an equalizing basis. This kind of approach deserves most stern criticism.

Disparities in the bonus systems must be eliminated. A uniform system must be created relating the bonuses to the end results of the competitors and to the specific contribution of the individual worker. This would create the confident feeling that conscientious work, initiative and creativity will always be recognized and encouraged.

The collective of the Metallurgical Combine imeni V. I. Lenin in Magnitogorsk achieved excellent results during the past five-year plan. It increased its pig iron, steel and rolled metal output by 1 million tons without the installation of new capacities. Its labor productivity is far superior to that of similar Soviet metallurgical enterprises: in the course of the competition major successes were achieved in upgrading production quality and saving on metal and energy. A close study of the combine's activities shows what a great deal depends on the specific situation in production, on the organization of the work and on the concern shown for the individuals whose initiatives are encouraged and whose feelings of ownership are promoted. Speaking of this at the 26th CPSU Congress, Hero of Socialist Labor V. Naumkin, senior blast furnace shop attendant, emphasized that the daily assessment of the work of each individual worker has become a good tradition at the combine.

In summing up competition results, individual contributions are assessed regardless of whether the person is an engineer, a foreman or a worker. This has put an end to anonymity. It has enhanced in people a feeling of responsibility and professional pride. It has increased their desire to equal the best workers and to show their abilities better.

In his "Vospominaniya" [Reminiscences], Comrade L. I. Brezhnev depicts quite vividly the ennobling power of creative labor and the tremendous importance of the collective in developing real character, industriousness and social activeness.

Disagreements and misunderstandings arise in enterprises in which the potential of the workers is not fully used. This adversely affects production results. Cadre personnel at the Rybinsk Hydraulic Mechanization Plant, such as milling machine operators, turners and fitters-assemblers, have been leaving the plant not because they are "drifters" or because they failed to receive good housing or there was no place for their children in the kindergarten and, as a rule, not for the sake of higher wages. No, they have been leaving because of the lack of a proper organization of production and labor and for the fact that they are forced to idle for hours and, sometimes, days on end. As is inherent in the Soviet working person, however, they would like to have a clear idea of their position in the workers' ranks, make use of their labor skills, knowledge and experience and gain satisfaction from their specific individual contribution to public production.

Although work remains mainly a means of support, with increasing frequency the people are seeking in it not only a source of earnings but of the satisfaction it provides through its nature, conditions and atmosphere in the collective, which offers scope for initiative and enriches the personality. Asked "what do you consider to be the greatest incentive for your inventions?" V. Karasev, the famous Leningrad worker-innovator answered that "a monetary reward is a good thing...However, as we were developing a new milling machine I was not thinking about money. The main thing is to feel, to see that one is of use to the collective, to the people." Today the need for meaningful, creative, productive and efficiently organized labor is assuming increasing priority among man's other material and spiritual requirements.

To rely on the increased effectiveness of the competition and its educational functions means, above all, to improve the organization of labor and production and the selection and training of cadres. It means to work on the development of a good sociopsychological climate in the collective purposefully. It is self-evident that this also means to surmount elements of formalism and hardening in the organization of the competition itself. "...In practice, and why conceal it," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said, "sometimes socialist pledges are 'dropped from above,' or issued by the superior authorities instead of being formulated from below. This harms the very spirit of the labor competition. This competition must be based on counterplans and other similar initiatives 'from the bottom up:' worker, brigade, enterprise, sector. Only then must such initiatives be 'coupled' with the state plan. This is consistent with both the nature of the socialist competition and the planned character of our economy."

Unfortunately, there are still cases in which the competitors do not know who they are competing against and the parameters and conditions of the competition.

For example, here is the statement of N. Kavetskaya, a grinding worker at the Yaroslavl' Heating Equipment Plant:

"At the beginning of the year the shift foreman comes to me and tells me reproachfully: 'Why are you letting me down? Write up your individual plan and your annual obligation. It does not take long and five lines would suffice....' He asks the others to do the same. Some of the answers are: 'Write it yourself. You know what is required. I will sign it during lunch break.'"

It is precisely thus that identical obligations, resembling each other like two drops of water, appear, assumed without any serious consideration of actual reserves and possibilities. Why do people accept this when they understand that production experience, assignments, conditions and the nature of the work can be very different?

"Both the foreman and every one of us," she goes on to say, "know that we are writing not because we mean it but in case we are checked, for the sake of it. Hence the indifferent attitude toward obligations and their implementation. No one except the foreman and the trade union group organizer is aware of the obligations. They are not discussed at brigade meetings or publicized."

The essentially bureaucratic wish to contain the organization of the competition within a strict framework is very harmful. Things have gone so far that at some enterprises all obligations and indicators have been standardized. So-called "standards" have been drafted which define not only the methods for accounting and accountability but also the nature and content of the obligations. For example, it is stipulated that all obligations or personal plans must be presented in identical form. Naturally, this does not encourage the competitors to introduce something personal, original or new. It turns off the people and triggers indifference.

Excessive concern with organization dulls the creative principle in any type of work. One of the reasons for the slow dissemination of the Shchekino method is that the large number of instructions present the collective with conditions in which, although working more intensively than others, it may receive the same or even a lesser bonus than a collective which conceals reserves "with foresight."

The increased role of the socialist competition in the education of the new man is related to improvements in our entire ideological and political-educational work. The party's assignment is to concentrate such work on promoting the norms of communist morality, strengthening discipline and organization, and creating a healthy, efficient and creative atmosphere everywhere; to make the content and organization forms of ideological activities consistent with the requirements of developed socialism and the higher standards of the general educational and political training of the party members and all Soviet people. The further improvement of party education requires a more profound mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory and the interpretation of the topical problems which are being resolved at the contemporary stage of the building of communism. The knowledge which the individual acquires must become a conviction. It must become a manual for action and become materialized in specific accomplishments.

The various types of economic training are very useful as well. They help the people to handle productive capital and working time more knowledgeably and thriftily and to struggle for quality, effectiveness and economy more successfully. Such training contributes to the better mobilization of all available reserves in the formulation, discussion and public defense of individual and collective socialist pledges and counterplans and, subsequently, their implementation. Naturally all of this can be achieved with the mandatory stipulation that training classes must be interesting. They must encourage the students to discuss topical problems willingly and in a lively manner and to learn how to combine closely theory with practice and with their specific work assignments.

It is also important for workers, employees and kolkhoz members to be properly informed of the state of affairs in their shop, enterprise and sector and to know the reason for the success of the best collectives--competition winners. In the final account, the purposefulness and persistence in the labor competition depend on the extent to which the individual worker conceives of the real possibilities of developing the production process and the extent to which he is aware of his individual role and responsibility for the implementation of state plans and socialist pledges. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has pointed out that the good, the truly frontranking worker should not be merely industrious and disciplined. He must also show active and lively interest and concern for the common project and aspiration to make everything increasingly better in the brigade, the shop and the enterprise.

The educational role of the competition is manifested particularly vividly in the movement for a communist attitude toward labor. This movement, which we justifiably consider the highest form of competition, must be the subject of greater attention than is being paid to it today. Its best experience and tremendous opportunities and prospects should be analyzed separately. Let us merely point out here that it combines most closely the struggle for highly productive and high-quality work with the education of a comprehensively developed and socially active individual who can more effectively influence the development of communist principles within socialist production and all other social relations and set an example of the type of work and behavior which lead the people to ideological and moral enrichment and mobilize them to wage an irreconcilable struggle against shortcomings and vestiges in the minds and against anything which hinders a more successful progress toward our objectives.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/8

## PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL PLANNING AND EDUCATIONAL WORK

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 47-56

[Article by the journal SOTSIOLOGICHESKIYE ISSLEDOVANIYA acting as a KOMMUNIST collective correspondent]

[Text] The growing dynamism of social processes, the scale of the tasks involved in the building of communism, the objective requirement of organically combining the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system and the shaping of the communist man make developing the problems of the social and cultural development of our society particularly topical. One such problem is the further discovery and maximally effective utilization of the tremendous opportunities of the developed socialist society in the interest of its further material and spiritual progress. These possibilities are implemented through the conscious activities of the masses headed by the communist party, and considerably helped by the social sciences.

The identification of bottlenecks, the reasons which restrain the pressure of the historical creativity of the masses and the obstacles which hinder the even further strengthening of the alliance between creative thinking and creative labor and the discovery of new resources and possibilities in various areas of social life, the development of the strategy and tactics of their realization, the substantiation of social experimentation programs, the search for optimal means and methods for upgrading the labor activeness of the citizens and improvements in the organization and management of the production process are the components of sociological research.

The scientific interpretation of all events and the summation of phenomena in reality are needed for the creative development of the theory on the basis of which the party refines its strategy and tactics and specifies the ways and time needed for the implementation of its programmatic objectives. That is precisely why the 26th CPSU Congress reasserted the importance of intensifying the practical effectiveness of scientific developments, pointing out that by far not everything is satisfactory in the social sciences. "The tendency to engage in scholastic theorizing, which was discussed at the 25th congress as well, has not been surmounted," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said. "...Greater attention must be paid to the social consequences of the scientific and technical revolution. Phenomena in the political life of society must be analyzed more profoundly and boldly. Public opinion is still being insufficiently studied. These are merely some of the problems to be dealt with."

The more we rely on science, the greater the responsibility of the scientist becomes.

In recent years, the party and economic workers have turned with increasing frequency to sociological methods of gathering and summing empirical data and to the results of sociological studies, justifiably considering them as one of the means for upgrading the effectiveness of organizational-managerial and ideological activities. The creation of sociological research centers and laboratories directly under republic, kray, oblast, city and rayon party committees, ministries and enterprises was the answer to practical demand. The importance of methodological and coordination work done by professional sociological institutions, the enhancement of the skill of sociological cadres and the dissemination of the most timely and practically important Soviet and foreign studies has increased sharply. The journal SOTSIOLOGICHESKIYE ISSLEDOVANIYA, which publishes materials on a wide range of theoretical and social problems and specific sociological studies conducted in various parts of the country, has been called upon to play an active role in this work.

The aim of social planning is to strengthen material and spiritual foundations of the socialist way of life and to shape the new man. Its immediate task is the comprehensive study of the factors governing socioeconomic and cultural progress, to forecast its prospects, to find additional reserves within it and to recommend the ways and means for their realization. Social planning is oriented above all toward socially useful human activities and must contribute to their rationalization and improvement. Both within the labor collectives and the framework of departments and entire regions, this work is guided by the party organs. Its end purpose is to improve all social relations in society.

The labor collectives are the main target of social planning. In order to be truly effective, such planning must take into consideration all their direct and indirect internal and external relations and all aspects of human life and activities.

This type of understanding of social planning and its role in the building of communism is based on the conclusions of the 26th CPSU Congress, where it was said that in the period of developed socialism the reorganization of all social relations on the collectivistic principles inherent in the new system is completed. "This reorganization," as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out, "covers both the material and spiritual areas, our entire way of life."

Our society is a society of working people. The communist party and the Soviet state have always dedicated a great deal of effort to making labor not only more productive but more meaningful, interesting and creative, and to making the leisure time happy and rich from the viewpoint of the maximum satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs favoring the further all-round development of the individual. This precisely is the objective of social planning. Comprehensive research aimed at substantiating its applicability to one or another specific set of conditions is the target of the daily efforts of the sociologists.

The Leninist principle of unity among ideological-theoretical, political-educational, organizational and economic work and the indivisibility between words and actions is the most important methodological postulate of social planning. This principle is clearly manifested in the documents adopted

at all party congresses and embodied in the practical activities of the party and the social sciences. The CPSU calls for establishing the closest possible ties with life. "Scholastic theorizing can only hinder our progress. Only ties with practice can enhance the effectiveness of science, which is one of the main problems today" (L. I. Brezhnev).

As a target of social planning, educational work precisely needs the implementation of this principle. The scientific requirements governing the shaping of an active life stance by the individual must be mandatorily linked with all aspects of the individual's practical activities. Such activities do not consist of excited public speeches but, above all, of practical aid to the development of production, consolidation of labor successes, correction of shortcomings, support of good initiatives and prevention of antisocial actions. Educational work must ensure the type of internal civic position of the individual in which at work, at home, at rest and in informal contacts with other people man would be able to pursue and defend the public interest as his own.

The results of empirical studies conducted by sociologists in recent years directly indicate the origins of economic and moral production costs. They are found in the violation of the unity between words and actions, the disparity between actual behavior and proclaimed principles, the adoption of a passive attitude toward shortcomings and even flagrant evil and indifference toward phenomena which do not directly affect strictly private interests. In many such cases the connection between causes and consequences is indirectly provided by moral-psychological factors, economic-administrative confusions, weakening of party exigency, reduced level of ideological-educational work, incompetent management, etc. Thus, a study of the reasons for labor discipline violations determined that 62 percent of construction workers directly relate such violations to the inadequate level of organization of their work, particularly to delays in the delivery of construction materials, structures and mechanisms. After forced idling, the administration mobilizes the brigades for overtime work. According to 25 percent of the surveyed workers, this as well disturbs the people and creates irresponsibility and lack of discipline.

Shortcomings in the management system, particularly in the primary units, have an extremely adverse effect on the labor process and the moral climate in the collectives. It is abnormal for 60-70 percent of the time of shop chiefs to be spent on resolving individual problems within the range of competence of their subordinates. One of the reasons for this is the imperfection of official instructions which usually regulate 20 to 30 types of obligations. However, 10 to 15 of them are repeated at all levels from the foreman to the shop chief. Foremen lose 20 to 30 percent of their working time in performing uncharacteristic procurement functions; from 30 to 50 percent of their time is spent on resolving problems which should be resolved by shop managers. It is natural, therefore, for the initiative of the people to become paralyzed as a result. However, this also lowers the feeling of responsibility and gives grounds for a variety of conflicts. Hence a feeling of dissatisfaction in reciprocal relations between managers and subordinates.

Comrade M. A. Suslov, CC CPSU Politburo member and CC CPSU secretary, emphasized at the all-union conference of heads of chairs of social sciences, which was held in October 1981, the need to energize comprehensive studies and, particularly, to engage in the all-round study of the effect of the main principle



"From Each According to His Capabilities and To Each According to His Work" at the developed socialist stage. This requires the formulation of a set of social, economic, legal and other measures aimed at increasing control over the amount of labor and consumption and the stricter observance of the principle of unity of social, collective and individual interests.

The nature of wages substantially influences production discipline and the attitude of the people toward their jobs, productivity and quality. It is precisely here that economics and ethics become closely interwoven. Many materials published by our journal have drawn attention to the economic and moral harm which is caused by the still practiced "stretching out" of wages, regardless of labor intensiveness and quality, to meet the average enterprise level. This is achieved by giving additional payments to some and restricting payments for norm overfulfillments to others. Such increases and reductions may be as high as 30 to 40 percent of wages. Under such conditions, to be a frontranker means to work more without earning more, for the frontranker earns less per unit of labor effort than a laggard or an average worker.

The practice of receiving bonuses through several unrelated channels is a similar phenomenon. As a result of it, collectives and individual workers are frequently given bonuses for meeting secondary indicators while basic planned assignments remain unfulfilled.

To think that the amount of a bonus is the complete solution is naive. No, a positive effect is achieved only by relating material incentive to the quantity and quality of labor and to its results. Unjustified wage and bonus increases lower the mobilizing role of economic incentives.

The artificial elimination of differences between higher and lower wage levels within a single profession or specialty and the promotion of equalization undermine the foundations of socialist competition, which is a lever for the development of production under socialism and an important means for the education of the toiling masses. The inability organically to relate the movement of patriotic thrust, creativity, innovation and initiative to the socialist principle of distribution according to labor leads to formalism, which is extremely harmful to all labor. Practical experience acquired through social experimentation proves that competition based on an objective comparison among labor results of "rivals" encourages them to work more intensively and to develop better organization and self-discipline.

In order to resolve the problems of social planning it is essential to resolve the problem of scientific support of material incentives and their proper correlation with moral incentives. We should not fall into extremes or juxtapose one type of incentive with another. Some scientific and even economic workers erroneously believe that weakening the role of wages in labor incentive is allegedly a law of developed socialism. Reality calls for increasing the role of wages as an incentive. "...In order to achieve this, always and everywhere we must establish a direct correlation between the size of the wage and actual labor results," Comrade M. A. Suslov said at the same conference. "The properly considered approach to this problem will enable us to formulate scientific recommendations for the taking of effective steps which would exclude and block violations of the just socialist principle and would plug all cracks and loopholes leading to unearned income enjoyed by parasites and amateurs of easy profit."

The close unity between material and moral incentives is consistent with the unity of personal and social interests inherent in socialism. The violation of this principle is fraught with undesirable consequences both in terms of production and education. This equally applies to individual labor collectives, entire associations and national economic sectors. Conversely, the accurate and optimal correlation among different incentives helps to develop in the people a communist attitude toward labor and ideological and moral uplift. It has a beneficial influence on utilizing the advantages of mature socialism and improving the socialist way of life.

Specific sociological studies prove the groundlessness of the simplistic idea of the reasons for the choice of one or another profession whose prestigious nature is linked with its allegedly specific (more than any other) creative nature of labor. There is no professional area in which creativity has no place. Furthermore, the criteria for determining the "creative nature" frequently prove to be insufficient (they frequently include "work variety" and "need to make independent decisions," which in itself does not guarantee creativity). Scientific publications have already pointed out that the problem of the creative principle in labor cannot be resolved independently of man as the subject of labor activity and his inclinations and capabilities. Empirical data summed up in the journal SOTSIOLOGICHESKIYE ISSLEDOVANIYA prove that "creativity criteria" are not always correlated with labor effectiveness indicators. However, unquestionably the worker considers skill and labor conditions (level of physical stress, variety of operations, job comfort) extremely important. In this connection, we find of interest the following data of a study of a large number of production workers regarding the level of their satisfaction with their jobs: dissatisfaction with working conditions accounted for 53.7 percent, whereas level of autonomy in the work accounted for 7.7 percent and extent and variety of activities for 17.2 percent.

The desire of everyone to engage in creative work is unquestionable. However, creative work means more than anything else the expedient activity of the specific individual involving all of his characteristics (personal characteristics, behavioral motives, ethical and esthetic attitudes toward the job, etc), which can be applied with maximal effectiveness. The consideration of such characteristics in terms of vocational orientation, job choice and cadre deployment is of great importance in terms of social planning in production and the improvement of educational work. Social experiments currently under way in many enterprises on broadening the functions of cadre departments and including in their obligations the duty to help people who have not as yet found their place in the labor process and the study of their capabilities and possibilities, are of great interest. Naturally, this will require major changes in the structure and level of professional training of cadre department personnel. Such cadre officials must learn the elements of science and research skills. The voluntary cadre bureaus organized by enterprise sociological services are of great help. A survey of resigning workers at the Kirovskiy Road Association in Leningrad revealed that 40 percent of them would have remained at the enterprise, had they been able to change jobs. Many of them accepted the alternatives suggested by the voluntary cadre bureau, as a result of which cadre turnover dropped from 12.9 to 9.8 percent and, in the leading shops, to 8.8 percent.

Labor activeness is an essential quality of the individual, manifested in purposeful and conscious socially useful work. Some individuals may

skillfully imitate it through actions which only appear to be useful or are motivated by selfish, conformist or other reasons. Finally, it may also happen that proportions are violated in the structure of socially useful activities. For example, some of their components may be wrongly replaced by others. Thus, according to a selective study conducted at enterprises in a number of cities in the Urals and Siberia, about 60 percent of the workers and 80 percent of the engineering and technical personnel systematically carried out social assignments during working time. The Latvian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics has estimated that losses caused by the participation of working people in various social measures total 7,100 man/days in the meat industry and 23,100 man/days in the timber processing industry per year. Working time is frequently used for training before sports events and amateur performance rehearsals. All of this not only disorganizes the production process but weakens the educational function of the labor collectives as it emphasizes the clear gap between words and actions.

Intensification and increased standards of any type of labor (including scientific) begin with the ability to value the working minute and with the strict implementation of requirements, so that working time is the time for work and wages are the payment for the work. In collectives in which this requirement stops being the firm law governing production activities, the socialist competition and the struggle for improving the moral and psychological climate lose their educational power. It is precisely this requirement which must determine the very spirit of social planning, for ideological and educational work in labor collectives and in their production activity and management are essentially one and the same.

The socialist management system presumes the increased participation of the direct producers of material goods. This involves, for example, participation in using the opportunity of influencing the affairs of the collective and contributing to their improvement. However, a study conducted by the CC CPSU Academy of Social Sciences jointly with the Gor'kovskaya Oblast Party Committee and Gor'kiy Higher Party School in March 1980 proved that a certain disparity might be found between the actual participation of a person in social affairs and the person's awareness of his influence on such affairs. Asked "do you think that you can influence the solution of problems related to the development of your collective?" 16.4 percent of the workers answered "yes;" 19.7 percent answered "not always;" 16.5 percent answered "practically never;" and 47.4 percent "found giving an answer difficult." The same study shows that 76.1 percent of production managers (on the scale of enterprises and shops) and party, trade union and Komsomol organizations admitted that "the production activity of their collectives does not sufficiently ensure the reaching of educational objectives."

These data indicate that the amount of political-educational work which could help the working people to realize their social role, including the right guaranteed by article 48 of the USSR Constitution, is inadequate in the production collectives which were surveyed; obviously, equally imperfect are some features of the local sociomoral climate, the improvement of which should be helped by social planning. Unfortunately, the data provided by these studies did not include a proper analysis of the facts (which might have required additional surveys) as well as corresponding conclusions and recommendations. Sociological studies are not facts to be collected but the determination

of facts while simultaneously determining the objective relations both among them and between them and many other circumstances. Let us recall Lenin's instruction that "in the area of social phenomena there is no more widespread and more groundless method than that of clutching at individual facts and examples. The choice of general examples is extremely easy. However, they are of no importance whatever or else their importance is purely negative, for the entire matter lies in the historically specific circumstances surrounding individual cases. Facts, if taken as a whole, in their inter-relationship, are not only a 'stubborn' but unquestionably proven matter. Petty facts, if taken out of context, if taken separately or arbitrarily, are no more than a toy or something even worse" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 30, p 350).

As an example of the opposite, let us point out (based on numerous studies, including some published in our journal) that the desire of production collectives to make their contribution to meeting their assignments is exceptionally great. As many as 90 percent of those surveyed at the KamAZ expressed their wish to participate in production management one way or another. This is the natural, basic stance of the Soviet working person. It is typical. It is the view of most KamAZ workers that available possibilities in this respect are insufficiently used. However, they are helped by the dissemination of the organization of labor based on the brigade contracting method, which must become basic in the 11th Five-Year Plan. It is true that the practical application of this progressive method occasionally encounters major difficulties. In brigades with individual payments in which reciprocal existence is insufficiently high, ideological-educational work is weak and organizational difficulties exist, the introduction of the brigade contracting method may somewhat disturb the moral atmosphere of the collective and weaken its unity. This makes the party's intervention necessary in order to normalize the situation in the brigade and to strengthen it on the basis of the principles of socialist collectivism.

Good results are quickly achieved if the collective has been trained to work according to the new method. This has been noted by the workers themselves. In the view of 73.8 percent of those surveyed, mutual aid increases; 46.2 percent indicate greater interest in increasing labor productivity. On the other hand, 26.2 percent stated that this form of labor organization is not suitable in all brigades; in some collectives this view was shared by 50 percent of those surveyed.

As a result of planning targets (and, respectively, topics of sociological studies) of independent organizational and economic activities and ideological-educational work are not only closely interrelated but are also related to problems arising from the scientific and technical revolution and urbanization. The effect of the latter on shaping the individual and the activities of collectives makes the tasks of sociologists considerably more difficult. Taking into consideration the multiplicity of interacting factors, the sum total of such problems considered jointly represents a very complex research topic which requires an overall systemic approach. In this light and at all levels of the social structure, social planning is a comprehensive problem. The factors which must be included in it are family and school upbringing and the influence which elements of daily life, recreation and "informal" contacts have on the mentality of the people. Not only sociologists but specialists

In a number of fields, philosophers, educators, psychologists and physicians mainly, have been asked to undertake the study of these factors. The journal systematically invites them to discuss problems jointly. This helped to reveal, for example, that school training based on making maximum use of the memory of the students, does not stipulate an equally intensive satisfaction of their hearts and souls. However, no specialized knowledge can take the place of moral value and ethical and esthetic ideals. The school must not only provide a certain volume of "Information" but shape the minds in accordance with the principles of scientific communism.

In a sociological study secondary school, vocational and technical school, technical school and VUZ students and workers and kolkhoz members of different age groups were asked which of the factors mentioned above they considered most significant in the course of the educational process. Regardless of age, sex, level of education or profession, all of them placed the family first and the school second. The family and the school make the maximal contribution to shaping the individual during the period when he is most receptive to social influence. Therefore, social planning in ideological and educational work must mandatorily include measures to improve it not only in the labor collective but also beyond it.

Which are the educational problems indirectly related to the activities of labor collectives which draw the attention of the sociologists?

We shall consider a few of them.

The most conflicting and difficult period in the shaping of the individual is the so-called transitional period of adolescence. Family trouble, weakened social control as a result of the urbanized way of life, migration intensification and imperfect organization of the leisure time are the most dangerous at that age. Our journal raised the question of the need for the local soviets and the Komsomol to pay greater attention to "informal" contacts with adolescents under urban conditions, i.e., contacts unrelated to the implementation of school, labor or social obligations. Sociological studies confirm that "informal" groups exert a strong, varied influence on adolescents. They greatly determine the attitude toward school, labor and social activities, vocational guidance, assessment of current events, works of art and literature, television and radio broadcasts, choice of friends and sexual behavior. The weaker the influence of the family (because of parental conflict, drunkenness or pedagogical illiteracy of the parents), and the less the school and society become involved in problems of moral and esthetic education and in organizing the leisure time of the students, the more important the element of "informal" groups becomes in the activities of the adolescent and in his development. This is particularly typical of vocational-technical school students.

The purpose of social planning is, on the one hand, to contemplate specific measures with which to strengthen the positions of the family, the school and the public in the system of influences which determine the behavior and development of adolescents and, on the other, to ensure maximal control of their "informal" contacts, above all through public opinion (by increasing public facilities for cultural recreation, for example).

Sociological and sociopsychological studies have confirmed the tremendous importance of moral and esthetic motivations for youthful behavior. However,

their development is most frequently spontaneous. Esthetic taste is a great influence on the spiritual features of the young. This particularly applies to their perception of art, fashion and many aspects of life and work. This remains a rather weak aspect of school education. The mass information media as well approach the solution of this problem sporadically, without a program, "blindly." This ascribes even greater responsibility to social planning, according to which the enhancement of the moral and esthetic standards of the Soviet people must be achieved in unison with their labor upbringing.

Here is another important feature: daily contacts with consumer services leave profound traces in the minds of the people. Such contacts are broadening also as a result of progressive changes in the areas of economics and culture. Unfortunately, however, some of them do not assist but harm a positive upbringing. The lagging of public service standards behind the growing requirements of the people is reflected in their moral conditions, moods, emotional reactions, moral views, quality of labor, interpersonal relations and the education of the young generation. In this area, the time has come to convert from general theoretical speculations to decisive practical action.

The improvement of consumer services can contribute to the comprehensive development of the social and domestic infrastructure of cities and regions. Its indicators include increasing the availability of population housing and the completion of housing facilities per capita over the past 10 years; the increase within the residential area of available modern communal facilities; the increased volume of sales per capita in the trade and public catering systems; the improved structure of needs (separately for comestible and durable goods); the expansion of trading areas; the increased number of public catering institutions; the increased capacity of daytime schools per 1,000 students, etc. We must add to this indicators on the state of health care, transportation, communications, available recreational facilities, etc. Such characteristics of the social development of cities and areas are closely related to the steady progress of the economy which they, in turn, influence. All of this is also a factor which contributes to the spiritual upsurge of the Soviet people, the growth of their consciousness, the strengthening of their moral spirit and the improvement of the moral climate.

Let sociologists never lose track of the sociological processes developing within our society. SOTSIOLOGICHESKIYE ISSLEDOVANIYA pays particularly close attention to them and to the practical experience of the party organizations in the republic, krays and oblasts, in which voluntary sociological research councils are functioning, consisting of scientific, soviet, trade union, Communist and economic workers, with the help of the party aktiv and members of the public. We find interesting the experience acquired in using the results of sociological studies in the activities of the Georgian party organization, which has set up a republic council on the study of public opinion; and the Estonian party organization, which has set up a network of sociological laboratories coordinated by a council on specific sociological research under the name KRAVKOM.

In addition to the systematic study and summation of the experience in the practical utilization of sociological studies in ideological and political-educational work, the editors are experimentally conducting a sociological survey at the Lenkoran City Party Committee, Communist Party of Azerbaijan,

the purpose of which is to ensure a comprehensive approach to political-educational work on the basis of the study of the needs of various population categories. In the course of this experiment, the structure of the city party committee council on sociological research is optimized, the system of indicators reflecting the end results of political and educational work, such as labor and social activeness of the population, its value orientations, time budgeting, and so on, is refined. The experiment also calls for testing the effectiveness of recommendations aimed at steadily increasing the number of people who violate the norms of socialist law and order and the development of a system for efficiently summing up the critical remarks and practical suggestions of the working people.

Currently the activeness of propaganda and educational work is frequently measured and rated quantitatively in terms of the number of "measures" and participants, editions and amount of printed publications, etc. However, even this qualitative aspect is frequently incomplete. Thus, when pamphlet editions are mentioned, the number of publications sold is not given; information submitted on the number of people engaged in any given athletic activity rarely draws the attention of the superior organizations to the percentage of people systematically practicing in sports stadiums and halls and the number of people who took part in the annual mass cross-country race only. As a result, we frequently find contradictions between impressive quantitative indicators and very modest results (i.e., in the final account, the low effectiveness of working time, manpower, equipment, scarce paper and other outlays).

A more effective system must be applied in assessing mass work. Sociological institutions pay little attention to this problem.

Several years ago, our journal printed a summing up theoretical article on age categories in sociology. Unfortunately, this was the only material of its kind published throughout the journal's entire history. This reflects a major gap in the scientific research plans of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research and Institute of Psychology and other scientific centers engaged in social and sociopsychological problems. Generally speaking, the social data provided on the characteristics of the various social groups as objects of ideological-educational influence are scant. Without them, however, the comprehensive approach to social planning will remain on the level of generalities.

The social sciences have done and are doing a great deal in the study of the prevention of delinquencies and immoral behavior. Based on acquired sociological experience, three levels on which the struggle with such deviations can be included in the general system of managing the social development of a city or region may be singled out:

Gathering and summation of social data in the development of optimal parameters of urban or regional development;

Recommending and implementing measures aimed at restricting or eliminating influences which contribute to the commission of one or another delinquency;

Development and implementation of measures for the prevention and elimination of crimes, prevention of recurrences and reeducation of delinquents on the part of the legal and other specialized organs.

The journal published an article on a social experiment in the prevention of crime by minors conducted by the Leninskiy Rayon Party Committee in Moscow and the USSR MVD Academy. Its completion will unquestionably provide interesting results not only in terms of waging a direct struggle against delinquency but resolving the very important practical science problem of organically including measures for the prevention of social deviations in the social planning system.

The further development of the entire system of sociological studies, the planning of educational work closely linked with economic-organizational activities and the inclusion in social development plans of a maximal number of factors which affect the life of labor collectives and the conscientiousness and social activeness of the individual are prerequisites for successful work by Soviet sociologists in implementing the instructions of the 26th CPSU Congress on improving the socialist way of life and eliminating anything which may hinder the shaping of the new man.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/8



LOFTY CALLING; ON THE OCCASION OF THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CC CPSU DECREE  
'ON LITERARY-ARTISTIC CRITICISM'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 57-64

[Article by I. Dzeverin, Ukrainian SSR Academy of Science corresponding member]

[Text] Soviet literature and art are the loyal assistants of the party in the communist education of the working people. They are both loyal and irreplaceable. It is universally known that addressing itself not only to the mind but to the feelings of man and touching all strings of his soul, art has a particularly strong emotional and psychological influence, "clutches life," as V. I. Lenin said. It is natural that the party considers the considerable creative successes of our multinational artistic culture of recent years one of the most important factors in the new upsurge of social spiritual life and the further ideological, moral and esthetic development of the masses. "...The fact that the spiritual life of Soviet society is becoming increasingly varied and rich," the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress emphasized, "is the unquestionable merit of our cultural workers, of our literature and art." At the same time, again and again, emphasizing the exceptional importance of the ideological-educational functions of literature and art, the party calls upon the masters of culture to go forth, leading them to new accomplishments worthy of the age of the communist reorganization of man and the world.

It is precisely this that defines the increased role of Soviet literary-artistic criticism at the current historical stage. It is self-evident that as an indivisible component of the process of the creation of esthetic values of socialist realism, it is also purposefully influencing this process, as a result of which, together with literature and art and allied with them, it is actively struggling for the molding of the new type of personality.

The decree "On Literary-Artistic Criticism" was passed by the CC CPSU 10 years ago, in January 1972. It provided a comprehensive analysis of the state of affairs in one of the most important areas of social thought and formulated its vital tasks. This party document is imbued with the spirit of true Leninist concern for the progress of socialist artistic culture. It armed the Soviet critics and literary and art experts with a clear understanding of their social duty. It was a powerful incentive for energizing their creative efforts. As was pointed out in the accountability report submitted by the board of the USSR Union of Writers at the Seventh Congress of Soviet Writers, and read by G. M. Markov, "criticism became more active and more

influential not only in literature but in other areas of spiritual life. The position of criticism and its status as a component of literature grew and strengthened and its role in all artistic creativity increased. The increased scientific opportunities of criticism and its activeness and professional skill are also confirmed by the fact that the USSR Lenin and State Prizes, republic prizes and prizes offered by the USSR Academy of Sciences and Union of Writers were awarded to several masters of literary criticism." In this connection, many names and new books and articles were cited at the writers congress, particularly in the report submitted by V. M. Ozerov, who discussed problems related to the development of literary criticism.

In a word, major positive changes have taken place in Soviet literary and artistic criticism. Naturally, however, to claim that our "moving esthetics" is always progressing today in step with the requirements of the time, particularly if we bear in mind that such requirements are growing steadily, would be an obvious exaggeration. That is why, as we note the 10th anniversary of the adoption of the Central Committee decree "On Literary-Artistic Criticism," it would be useful to consider once again its content and the meaning of its stipulations which define the development of contemporary Soviet artistic culture, which we find in other party documents as well, in the historical resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress above all.

Literary and artistic criticism can fulfill its lofty social mission only by standing on the positions of Marxism-Leninism firmly and only if it is systematically guided by the principle of communist party-mindedness. This means the conscious, open and active defense of the basic interests of the working class and the entire people.

As we know, the nature of this general conceptual principle in Marxist ideology, as it applies to literature and art, was revealed by Lenin most completely and accurately in his article "Party Organization and Party Literature," which was published during the development of the first Russian revolution. "Literature must become part of the general proletarian cause," he pointed out. "It must become the 'wheel and screw' of the single great social democratic mechanism which is brought into motion by the entire conscious vanguard of the entire working class" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 12, pp 100-101). It was thus that the idea of the organic merging of the activities of the writer and the artist with the nationwide struggle for socialism and communism was formulated and substantiated. The great mobilizing power of this idea is clearly proved by the universally acknowledged creative accomplishments of the art of socialist realism, whose heart is communist party-mindedness.

In speaking of the literary work of the proletariat as part of its party work, it is entirely obvious that Lenin had in mind not only artistic literature but publicism and criticism as well. At this point we should recall that little more than two years after the article "Party Organization and Party Literature" was published, in his 7 February 1908 letter to A. M. Gor'kiy he suggested that literary criticism be included in PROLETARIY, the new bolshevik newspaper. "Oh, separate and long articles on literary criticism scattered among a variety of semiparty and nonparty journals are no good!" Vladimir Il'ich wrote. "It would be better for us to take a step away from this old

intellectual grand manner, i.e., to tie literary criticism more closely to party work and party leadership" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 47, p 134).

Lenin's thoughts retain their programmatic significance. It was on their basis that later on, after the victory of the October Revolution, the tasks of artistic criticism were defined in several party documents as tasks aimed at the implementation of the course of the political vanguard of the working class. Thus the resolution of the RKP(b) Central Committee "On the Party's Policy in the Field of Artistic Literature" (1925) noted that criticism is "one of the main educational tools in the party's hands." The 1940 decree of the VKP(b) Central Committee "On Literary Criticism and Bibliography" described it as a "major propaganda and communist education tool."

The need "to upgrade the ideological-theoretical standard of literary and artistic criticism and its activeness and principle-mindedness in the implementation of the party's line in artistic creativity" was also most clearly defined in the CC CPSU decree "On Literary-Artistic Criticism." It is clear that today, under mature socialist conditions, when the ideological support of each communist construction sector is becoming increasingly important, the struggle for party-mindedness in criticism must be particularly persistent and energetic.

How is the ideological, the party position of criticism specifically manifested? Above all in the type of methodology used in the study of artistic phenomena, which presumes their conscious socioclass evaluation.

Unlike the bourgeois theoreticians, who classify the sociological method in the science of literature and art (including literary-artistic criticism) as "underproductive" or who reject it completely and consider artistic works as part of an immanent exclusive structure, the Marxist estheticians ascribe a leading role to this method. Let us recall that it has nothing in common with the primitive one-sided interpretation of works of art in a spirit of vulgar sociology, which reduces the function of art to a simple illustration of social processes and political concepts. It is a question of something entirely different: the study of art from the viewpoint of the influence which social factors exert on it and its own influence on social life.

In this respect Marxist-Leninist criticism is the direct descendant of revolutionary-democratic criticism. Without ignoring the esthetic specifics of art in the least, Belinskiy, Chernyshevskiy, Dobrolyubov, Pisarev and Franko always proceeded from an understanding of the mandatory and important nature of the sociohistorical characterization of works of art. They were not only fine connoisseurs and interpreters of beauty but profound philosophers and passionate publicists. That is the reason for the tremendous social response to the works of revolutionary democratic critics, which had a revolutionizing influence on the readers. In describing his impressions on reading Dobrolyubov's article on Turgenev's novel "On the Eve" and Goncharov's "Oblomov," Lenin recalled that "these two articles...struck like lightning. Naturally, I had already read 'On the Eve,' but that was at an early age, and I had reacted to it like a child. Dobrolyubov cured me of this approach. I reread that work as well as 'Oblomov,' one may say, with Dobrolyubov's underlined remarks. He turned the criticism of 'Oblomov' into a sounding call,

an appeal to will, activeness and revolutionary struggle; his analysis of 'On the Eve' is a real revolutionary proclamation which cannot be forgotten to this day. That is how one must write!" ("V. I. Lenin o Literature i Iskusstve" [V. I. Lenin on Literature and Art], Moscow, 1979, p 650).

The full experience of domestic and worldwide criticism proves that the authoritativeness of its outstanding representatives was based to a decisive extent on their ability to discuss art and life without limiting themselves to artistic creativity as such, and to see reality in its typical manifestations behind characters and paintings, and to use the facts suggested by art as a basis for a consideration of the main problems of their time and for active involvement in contemporary affairs.

It is precisely the sociological-publicistic nature of the activities of the true critic that explains the mandatory presence in his views on the specific artistic material he analyzes of judgments related to the vital ideological problems of a specific social group, class or party. Successful criticism is based precisely on the social forces toward which the critic directs himself or, in other words, the extent to which his conceptual views are progressive.

Soviet literary-artistic criticism achieves its aspiration "to correlate artistic phenomena with life" with the help of Marxism-Leninism--the outlook of the working class and its party, which reflects the requirements of all working people and which is based on knowledge of the true laws governing the development of nature and society. That is precisely why the communist party-mindedness of our criticism is a manifestation of its extreme scientific objectivity. The Leninist conclusion to the effect that the proper assessment of Tolstoy "is possible only from the viewpoint of the social democratic proletariat" has an extremely important meaning from the methodological viewpoint ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 20, p 22).

The entire success of our criticism in the study of the artistic movements of our time directly depends on the extent to which it has mastered the principle of communist party-mindedness. This equally applies to the classical heritage with which Soviet literature and art is linked by powerful traditions. The strict observance of this principle by our scientists and critics has enabled them to prove convincingly that both the future and the past, to use Lenin's words, are found precisely in the artistic culture of the presocialist epoch. It is true that to this day the authors of some works of criticism deem it unnecessary to apply clear sociohistorical criteria in discussing the legacy of the classics, supporting that which history itself has rejected and which is inconsistent with the ideological convictions of people living in a socialist society. Also related to this are attempts to cultivate the ideas of national exclusivity which may be found in some of the most recent publications. Our sociopolitical and literary press justifiably considers such trends to be in violation of the principle of party-mindedness and a deviation from Marxist historicism.

As far as studies of the contemporary artistic process are concerned, the party-mindedness of criticism means above all its readiness and ability to stimulate the development of the type of truly popular, truly party-oriented

art which was quite expressively described by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 26th CPSU Congress: the type of art which shares the interests of the people and their happiness and sadness, which asserts the truth of life and our humanistic ideals and which is an active participant in the building of communism.

The party-mindedness of criticism is also expressed in the fact that it helps the readers, viewers and listeners to become aware of our age and their place in it, educating the people in the spirit of loyalty to the ideals of communism through the historically specific interpretation of life and our times, viewed through the lens of artistic phenomena.

Finally, the party-mindedness of our criticism means its uncompromising struggle against bourgeois party-mindedness and its intolerant attitude toward alien ideas and toward all manifestations of lack of ideas and conceptual lack of discrimination.

The acknowledgement of the ideological nature of artistic activities does not deprive them of their qualitative originality in the least. In "Party Organization and Party Literature," Lenin particularly emphasized that the literary work of the proletariat cannot routinely be identified with other parts of its work.

Art must remain art above all. It must be the expression of one or another idea, as Belinskiy and his followers proved. In other words, the author's idea becomes the idea in a work which can influence human emotions only if embodied in specific-sensory images. Only then can art fulfill its purpose precisely as art. To an equal extent, the requirement of high idea-mindedness in works of literature and art is indivisible from the requirement of high artistic quality in terms of the esthetic Marxist-Leninist program. F. Engels believed that art must aspire to reach a complete merger "between great ideological depth and conscious historical content" and "liveliness and richness of action" (K. Marks i F. Engel's ob Iskusstve" [K. Marx and F. Engels on Art], in 2 volumes. Vol 1, Moscow, 1976, p 23). Lenin was convinced that what matters in a literary-artistic work is not the "bare idea" but the truthful and vivid depiction of life to which the reader will react "with all his nerves." That is precisely why the party-mindedness of art is an esthetic rather than merely sociopolitical category, manifested in the entire fabric and structure of the artist's work.

Hence the basically important task formulated in the CC CPSU decree "On Literary-Artistic Criticism:" "In developing the traditions of Marxist-Leninist esthetics, Soviet literary-artistic criticism must combine the accuracy of ideological assessments and depth of social analysis with esthetic exigency and a concerned attitude toward talent and fruitful creative searching." True criticism can achieve its objective, which is to exert a real influence on the artistic process and on social consciousness, precisely thanks to the organic combination, blend and synthesis of the social and the esthetic aspects in assessing works of art.

The fact that, to begin with, in some cases, the researcher may emphasize different features is another matter. Thus, in Lenin's articles on Tolstoy, that unsurpassed model of Marxist literary criticism, the writer's legacy

is analyzed mainly from the political viewpoint. Nevertheless, Lenin also carefully considered the specific way in which Tolstoy's conceptual views were manifested in his artistic works, political articles and philosophical works. According to Lenin, Tolstoy's universal importance "as an artist and his worldwide fame as a philosopher and preacher reflect in their own ways the global significance of the Russian revolution" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 20, p 19).

Secondly, as was pointed out at the 25th CPSU Congress, while concerned with the level of its esthetic requirements, criticism cannot ignore the fact that the main criterion in assessing the social significance of a work of art is its ideological purposefulness. The 26th congress emphasized as well that the party has neither been nor could be indifferent to the ideological purpose of our art. This is a truly Leninist formulation of the problem. Consequently, Lenin's statement that "the political viewpoint on the contribution which a literary worker makes to the workers press means judging it not from the viewpoint of style, wit or popularizing talent of a given writer but the point of view of his overall direction, the point of view of what he contributes to the workers masses through his theories" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 24, p 339) unquestionably applies in principle to the work of the artist as well. Naturally, however, this is not to say that the artist has the right to neglect the form of his work, nor can a critic ignore the degree of mastery of the artist. Let us repeat once again that the idea contained in a work is not something outside its manner of depiction. Incidentally, as N. K. Krupskaya recalls, Lenin himself always "blended the social approach with the artistic depiction of reality. He did not separate one from the other...." ("V. I. Lenin o Literature i Iskusstve," p 628).

The combined study of the social and ideological content and artistic form of the work is not merely one of the methods which a critic may choose. Such an analysis characterizes the very essence of criticism, whose subject is creativity "according to the laws of beauty" (K. Marx). A critic who neglects the indivisibility of the ideological and the esthetic qualities of a work and who limits himself to pointing out the importance of its content, ignoring the artistic presentation of this content, is unable to define the true value of such a work of art. In this connection, we consider quite essential the remark expressed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his report to the 26th party congress on the importance of "seeing to it that the topical nature of a subject is not used to conceal indifferent and artistically squalid things."

However, the facts prove that in assessing the works of contemporary writers and painters, our critics frequently emphasize precisely the topical nature of the subject or the social urgency of the problems contained in their works; as a result, their criticism acquires a type of complementary nature which was sharply condemned in the CC CPSU decree "On Literary-Artistic Criticism." Something else becomes noticeable: in analyzing truly significant phenomena in present-day literature and art, the critics almost never compare them with the best artistic accomplishments of mankind. This too harms objective judgments and sober assessments.

"...The reason for the helplessness of contemporary criticism," Chernyshevskiy insisted, "is that it has become too conciliatory, indiscriminate and

undemanding. It is satisfied with works which are decisively pitiful and admires works which are barely tolerable....It is below the public taste. Such criticism could satisfy writers whose poor works it praises while the public is as happy with it as it is with the poetry, plays and novels which it recommends to the attention of the readers in its tender critiques" (N. G. Chernyshevskiy, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol II, Moscow, 1949, p 382). This statement, which was made in the middle of the 19th century, sounds topical today as well. We live under the conditions of an entirely different age, under the rule of essentially new criteria in assessing the results of artistic creativity. However, such "tender critiques," which are the result not only of friendships and group predilections but of esthetic lack of discrimination as well, are extremely abundant in today's artistic criticism.

In a letter to F. Lassalle, which included an extensive scientific-critical comment on his tragedy "Franz von Sickingen," Engels emphasized that "...I apply exceptionally strict, even the strictest requirements toward your work from both the esthetic and historical viewpoints..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 29, p 495). This is an instructive lesson for any student of literature and the arts!

The further enhancement of the scientific-theoretical standard of our criticism assumes prime significance in the light of the CC CPSU decree "On Literary-Artistic Criticism."

It is clear that what is meant here is not in the least that which may be described as false academism or scholastic philosophizing, the "scientific nature" of which is reduced to style: the harder to understand the better. Let us be honest--sometimes our critics write only for other critics rather than for the readership at large, thus displaying their attachment to a kind of elitism (the Central Committee decree equally pointed out the insufficient clarity of critical materials). The indicator of truly scientific criticism is reliance on esthetics as the general theory of art and the conclusions based on literary and artistic studies and related disciplines, along with the ideological and conceptual maturity of the critic. As accurately defined by Belinskiy, criticism should mean "a consideration of a work of art on the basis of the science of elegance" (V. G. Belinskiy, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol VI, Moscow, 1955, p 513). It is noteworthy that even the most zealous supporters of the quite widespread (although, we believe, unconvincing) view regarding "mobile esthetics," according to which it belongs more to the area of art than research, it is one of the artistic genres, and so on--even they do not deny the need for scientific substantiation of the critic's ideological and esthetic judgment, for to deny this means to lead criticism along the way of amateurish views deprived of a solid conceptual foundation or toward rhetorical-emotional impressions which allow us to judge something on the basis of the personal esthetic taste of the critic.

"It is the work of literary critics and art experts," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th congress, "to pass professional judgments." However, can such judgments always be considered truly professional? Are those who make them always highly skilled specialists? Unfortunately, they are not.

That is why today priority is given in particular to the need for a more active and deeper development of the theoretical problems of socialist realism. The critic who studies phenomena in art and is guided by the new creative method must have a perfectly clear idea of the nature of this method and its basic principles--party-mindedness, nationality and historicism.

We must point out that after a recent animation in this area of scientific research (particularly in terms of substantiating the thesis of the most extensive ideological and esthetic opportunities offered by socialist realism), a certain decline can be noted today. In any case, it is rare to encounter in the new works on socialist realism new ideas which would expand our knowledge. This is explained mainly by the greater or lesser degree of alienation between esthetic theory and creative practice or, rather, the current practical experience in Soviet literature and art and the artistic cultures of other socialist countries. How could we not remember here the statement contained in the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress, which entirely applies to literary critics and art experts: "The inclination toward scholastic theorizing has not been surmounted yet....Quite frequently the philosophers prefer to prove what has been proved rather than to interpret the new phenomena in life."

Let us consider just the problem of the positive character--one of the central problems in Marxist-Leninist esthetics. A great many accurate statements have been made to the effect that our art, as it depicts the lives of its characters in a variety of ways, recreates the unique spiritual aspect of each individual. However, occasionally something equally important is forgotten: all Soviet people are united by something basic, something determining, something which was born as a result of the influence of the new socialist way of life and, above all, by their joint collective efforts to build communism. The same applies to the national mentality of the Soviet people. In all talented works of literature and art the positive characters--the representatives of the different nations--are depicted in their national characteristics. However, these are national characteristics of a historically new type, the specific characteristics of the Soviet people who have grown up under socialism, people who, regardless of nationality, are united by a great patriotic feeling which is inherent in our entire nation--the nationwide pride representing Soviet society. "We are against trends aimed at the artificial elimination of national characteristics," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress. "However, we consider their artificial exaggeration equally inadmissible. It is the sacred duty of the party to raise the people in a spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism and a feeling of pride in belonging to the single great Soviet homeland."

Incidentally, the question of the dialectics of the international and the national in our literature and art in general has received a primarily theoretical interpretation in our criticism. In asserting the thought of the richness of national coloring in the artistic culture which is developing under the conditions of a dominant socialist culture and the rule of socialist social relations, we usually limit ourselves to purely declarative statements without undertaking the specific study of the numerous facts which clearly confirm the accuracy of this idea. Yes, Soviet artistic culture is far more than the simple sum of national artistic cultures. It is a single organism, an integral



system which is the result of common ideological-political views and the esthetic program of the artists--the socialist realists. However, the individual representatives of national cultures also make their unique contribution to the general Soviet art culture, the depiction of which is exceptionally important.

The listing of other topical problems in the theory of socialist realism which require energized research would present no difficulty. What is obvious is that without the solution of such problems on the basis of the summation of artistic practice there could not even be a question of having a scientifically normed Soviet criticism. This would also strengthen its position in the struggle against our ideological opponents.

Criticism is still insufficiently active and consistent, the 1972 CC CPSU decree stated, when it struggles against various non-Marxist views on literature and art or revisionist esthetic concepts. In recent years a number of scientific critical works, which expose hostile ideology and display unquestionable party militance, have come out. However, the successes of our critics would have been greater had they combined exposure with the positive elaboration of problems of Marxist-Leninist esthetics. Let us recall "Materialism and Empiriocriticism." This is a truly polemical work (whose subtitle is "Critical Remarks Concerning a Reactionary Philosophy"). However, the content of this classic Leninist work is not reduced merely to criticism. It substantiates and creatively develops a number of basic principles and concepts of dialectical and historical materialism. We criticize and expose but show little concern for countering reactionary scientific concepts with our own views and bringing to light the full contribution which Soviet literature and art has made to the artistic treasury of mankind.

In the initial post-October Revolution years, Lenin expressed the confidence that "a truly new, great communist art" would grow in the new soil. Such an art is growing under our very eyes. The primary duty of contemporary Soviet literary-artistic criticism is to contribute comprehensively to its establishment and development.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/8

LIFE AND DESTINY OF THE ARTS; PAGES OF PHILOSOPHY AND HISTORY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 65-73

[Review by A. Vishnevskiy of the following books: Mikh. Lifshits, "Mifologiya Drevnyaya i Sovremennaya: [Ancient and Modern Mythology], Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1980, 582 pp; Ibid., "Iskusstvo i Sovremennyy Mir," [Art and the Modern World], Izobrazitel'noye Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1978, 382 pp; F. Ovsyannikov, "Iskusstvo i Kapitalizm" [Art and Capitalism], Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1979, 343 pp; Galvano della Volpe, "Kritika Vkusa" [Critique of Taste], translated from the Italian, foreword and general editing by K.M. Dolgov, Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1979, 351 pp.]

[Text] "Even the greatest genius would not go far if he tried to do everything by himself," said the aged Goethe once to his chronicler, Eckermann. "...If there is anything good in us, it is the power and ability to use the resources of the external world and make them serve our highest goals." The great German poet's invincible confidence in the objective source of poetry and art can be classified among the productive, brilliantly materialistic insights which so enrich the profoundest thinking of the past, regardless of the conventional form in which they are expressed. "Indeed," exclaimed Goethe, "how insignificant is that which we might call, in the true sense of the word, our property!" As if the external world does not take root in us at every turn, does not shape us in its own way! The creative ability, it seems, does not depend on the artist's personality, but comes to him from the external world. Following ancient tradition, Goethe called this creative force in the artist "demonic", when, spilling over the bounds of the achieved and the understood, it surpasses the ordinary human scale and brings to life a productivity of higher order, which is not subject to the formal constraints of intellect. The demonic creative force, Goethe suggested, is also a kind of objective force. It compels the artist to give himself up to it completely and unconsciously. Its influence is irresistible, and that is why it makes so great an impression in art, conferring perfection on the works of genius.

Even among such intellects as Goethe, explanations of the "miracles of art" are shrouded in similar primordial ideological mists. Nevertheless, it is possible to discern in them the hidden link with the most important, vital problems which even today have not lost their

significance for the study of art. If art is nourished from the springs of realism, then what are the dialectics by which the classical stages of art of a world receded into the past remain undiminished in substance both for the modern world and for coming generations, and why do they continue to appeal to the future? These questions are found at the center of investigations and controversies in the Marxist literature of the 30s; an understanding of them was worked out in the struggle with "vulgar sociology" and other kinds of bourgeois influences on Soviet literature and artistic criticism. The beneficial results of the rebuff given to them had already come to light by then, but the sum of the problems was exceptionally great, and their solutions did not immediately present themselves in the sharp clash of opinions. Public consciousness turned then to the theory of realism in art stemming from the revolutionary materialistic dialectics of K. Marx and F. Engels and the Leninist theory of reflection. The laws of preservation and replacement of artistic forms sorted themselves out in the vicissitudes of the class struggle, in the merciless conflicts of the history of culture. The contradictions of thought and creation, of the dialectics of the conscious and unconscious in art showed their true contours. The achievement did not win recognition immediately; its development suffered stumblings and losses, but the gains of theoretical thought grew in the very same direction, and measure for measure, with the growth of public consciousness. They were extended and developed in the works of succeeding decades, as the pages of the books under review here show.

The originally chosen Marxist direction of research has been developed in the works of philosophy and esthetics of M. Lifshits, famous since the 30s as the author of the first profound study of Marx's esthetic views and as the compiler of the anthology, "K. Marks i F. Engel's ob Iskusstve" [K. Marx and F. Engels On Art], which is still reprinted today. Lifshits is also known as an active participant in critical debate against "vulgar sociology." In his subsequent works, some of which are collected in the books reviewed here, M. Lifshits invariably comes out in defense of realism interpreted as a reflection of objective truth of content and form in art. The representation of objective reality, given in the form of feelings, creates a foundation of the worldwide artistic process. But humanity's artistic development, including the history of realism in art, is a contradictory process; in it there are definite, qualitative stages, gains and losses. Therefore, the school of dialectical thinking teaches one to demand a flexibility that rules out the one-sidedness of the abstract truth of realism. It does not follow from this, however, that the unevenness of development erases every boundary between progress and decline in art, between truth and falsehood, between an approximation of the fullness of reality and the supremacy of subjective arbitrariness.

In the works under investigation, a fundamental boundary is drawn, separating the great and the intransient in the history of culture, even when it appears in contradictory and perverse forms from the

paltry and insignificant, even if it beckons with mirages of "progressiveness." In "Ancient and Modern Mythology," M. Lifshits writes that it is not dogmatic abstraction and not narrow-minded eclectics to which "the secrets are revealed which reside in the infinitely distinct forms of the history of spiritual culture, which were amassed by it and are not always accessible to its own formal self-awareness. They are revealed only to materialistic dialectics...and its ability to link opposites, to follow their capricious but absolutely real transitions and at the same time to see a definite world line passing through all these identities of extremes" (p 160). This book is one of those works in which the phenomenology public consciousness (so the author defines his subject) is indeed translated into the language of Marxist-Leninist dialectics, losing nothing in the fullness of its development. In it, there are pages which lead close to a solution of the birth of forms of art from the stuff of reality. How are thought and emotion, the truth of content and form, combined in those moments of creative power which Goethe called "demonic" and which we today, with him, are willing to consider the magical sources of the artistic miracle?

The role of thought, of conscious beginning in art's victories over the stuff of the external world, embodies a kind of dialectics. To follow it is to allow the reader, under certain conditions, to experience pleasure not only from the artist's work, but also from critical immersion into its nature, as in the present case. Among the conditions indispensable for this, is the critic's adequate philosophical and esthetic erudition, fortified by publicistic qualities of language and style.

"In the course of the history of art, the elemental reflection of the real world becomes its conscious representation," writes M. Lifshits in one passage where he chooses for analysis the hunting scene from "War and Peace," which V.I. Lenin, according to his own admission, so wanted to reread just when he was visited by M. Gor'kiy, who recalls the episode in his well-known sketch of Vladimir Il'ich. The author's arguments immediately penetrate to the very essence of his subject. In the hunting scene, a miracle of art has unquestionably been accomplished, and it is inseparable from Tolstoy's social ideas, for his mighty artist's brush is infused with profound thought just as it is with the paints necessary for matchless depiction of events, scenery, conversation, and the behavior of the characters. Without Tolstoy's "peasant voice", the entire scene would be devoid of the basic source of his poetic charm. We are delighted by it, the author stresses, precisely because this voice gets through to us. The hunting episode forms a focus in which all the rays come together to illuminate it as a whole. It makes it possible to set before the moral court of peasant morality and popular assessment, the landowners, serfs, and even the picture of nature brought to the stage by Tolstoy--all the real links between things and human relationships, rooted in the objective content of the event.

That is what the poetic justice in the hunting scene is driving at, the author concludes. Try to disturb it, and the entire charm of the miracle melts away like smoke. Every emotion aroused on reading this scene is deeply rooted in the author's entire direction of thought. Just like his creation, Natasha Rostova in the Russian dance episode which crowns the hunting scene, Tolstoy submits to that strange power which has always belonged to the oppressed masses of the Russian populace. The gentry were the ruling class, the peasants were the basic body of the nation. And the gentry involuntarily acknowledged this fact "in those finest, or conversely, most frightening minutes when life, as it were, overflows, so that even the solid buttresses thrown up by official society cannot hold it back" (p 186). Tolstoy was deeply stirred by these moments in human life and national history. Such times also include the instant depicted in the hunting scene, that truth-filled picture totally infused with the brilliant writer's general conscious view of life, that he poured into it his "muzhik's intuition," his peasant social thinking.

The miracle of art is inseparable from the artist's thought, but a great artist is great also because the pictures of life he creates repudiate his own too-narrow social views. Does this mean that creativity is to some degree unconscious? Is there in art some irrational origin, inaccessible to conscious analysis, not translatable into the language of thought, not subject to the criteria of truth and error? In the history of ideas such a concept has not been unconditionally rejected; it has matched long-predominating opinions; outstanding minds since the time of Plato have shared it, including Goethe, to whom we have already referred. The unconscious and the fantastic are characteristic of art at various stages of its development. And always, M. Lifshits emphasizes, esthetic substance can be translated into the language of thought, the language of social science. This complex task can be solved in the light of the world-view of scientific socialism. To an unprecedented degree, Marxist doctrine has enhanced ability to understand the real contradictions embodied here. Marxist-Leninist dialectics has given the investigator a fine instrument, which shows that it is not a matter of the degree of relative unconsciousness as such. It is the degree of genuine content which the artist derives from the world around him.

Contact with reality is the source of the artist's strength, the author remarks, but to draw from this source is not so simple, although it is there for all to see. The degree of reality--that is, of truth in art--increases when the artistic form and true social idea of the artist form a unity. Truth in art can also triumph whenever the artist's genius conquers his personal errors. But art is powerless when false views gain the upper hand over the objective logic of reality, and then no formal skill whatsoever can help.

The sources of these dialectics are revealed in all their significance in Lenin's famous articles about Tolstoy. From their theses, it follows that thought and art do not break up into two independent streams in the artist's creativity. As the author shows, for Lenin, the divide between the two

sides of this contradictory unity does not pass between thought and art, but along a different line--the difference between genuine creative content and its external, formal or abstract meaning. This precise distinction comprises the main thrust of Lenin's articles.

A formal approach to the ideas and works of Tolstoy does not lead beyond an acknowledgment of the obvious falsity and reactionary character of the writer's program. But Lenin takes a different approach to phenomena of this order. Comparing the content of Tolstoy's works with the Russian revolution, in particular such a feature as the elemental movement of millions of patriarchal peasants, he concludes that Tolstoy's program was only a reactionary form which embodied a democratic, revolutionary content. It took the penetrating force of Leninist thinking to see in the reactionary agrarian utopias of the Russian peasant only an extremely naive and backward form of expression, one of the most revolutionary ideas of bourgeois democracy--nationalization of the land. Naturally, this genuine content in Tolstoy's work is in contradiction to the form of its presentation, but all the same, it plays the decisive role. This is the source of the brilliant power characteristic of Tolstoy's works and his relentless criticism of bourgeois civilization. This is why Lenin called him a mirror of the Russian revolution. But, the contradictoriness of Tolstoy's position inevitably takes revenge on the thinker and the artist. An adherent of the patriarchal system, he was one step away from a breach with democratic thought. And indeed, when the patriarchal-reactionary point of view leads Tolstoy to the theory of non-resistance to evil, the author of "War and Peace" and "Resurrection" is on shakier ground, the ardent revolutionary content of his peasant view of life pales, and the great writer becomes, in Lenin's characterization, "a bourgeois ideologue" (Complete Collected Works, vol 12, p 320). The limited side serves as an unavoidable tribute to the historical position of the artist. False thinking cannot serve as the basis of high artistic achievements.

A brief recounting of the analysis of the scene in Tolstoy's novel and the main thinking in Lenin's articles about Tolstoy, as in the book under review, can, in our opinion, give an idea of the direction of the analysis of the ideological and artistic problems that the author focuses on. The fundamental feature of all the works included in the collection is their theoretical unity, their theme of the continuity between the heritage of the highest stages of preceding cultures and the requirements of the socialist era. One virtue of the book is one that is partly artistic in character: even the most complicated plots in it are not elaborated in the abstract-systematic form that is customary in scholarship; rather, the author deals with the most vital problems as if all of a sudden surprising the reader, prompted by contact with historically conditioned facts and ideas, and imperceptibly leads the thinking into the theoretical sphere revealed to the gains of Marxist-Leninist dialectics. The natural freedom of the form of exposition and the fluent language that goes with it do not hamper logical analysis, but do preserve simplicity and accessibility in the best sense of the word.

It is all the more interesting for the reader to trace how the contours of the main questions are drawn, not in the form of pure elucidation of doctrine, but in delimitation from the world of false ideas which reject the objective content of human consciousness and artistic creation. At the same time, all of the studies in the collection go back one way or another to the fundamental content of the book, its ideological focus. The book not only sheds light on the particularity of the reflection of reality in the mirror of the contradictions of the artist's thinking and creative endeavors, but also deals with the more general sphere encompassing the theory of realism as the objective truth in art.

The truth of content and the realism of form in art are subject, in essence, to just one genuine antithesis--rejection of the emotional form of reality, of the truth of its representation, replacement of the reflection of the real world by expression of the subjective will of the artist, denial of the representational principle in favor of arbitrary distortion of real forms. Two capital articles in the work--"From Cubism to Abstraction" and "The Phenomenology of the Tin Can"--use painting as an example to reveal the path of regressive evolution of modernist art from the beginning of this century to our own days.

M. Lifshits's earlier work, "Art and the Modern World," deals entirely with a study of the drama of this decline of the representational arts over the past century. In addition to the articles named, the book sketches the profound decline of the bourgeoisie in the imperialist era, which lost faith in the objective basis of spiritual life and poisoned the whole social condition through its ideological decay. The main current of reactionary ideas, the author points out, is now directed against the absolute content of human consciousness, against the belief that it reflects actual reality independently of us. Modern Western art has turned sharply away from positive esthetic values to negative ones, from beauty to ugliness, from realistic traditions to grimaces of despair, to deliberate savagery, to constant polemics against the perceptions of normal human beings. All this "innovation" has been offered in the glow of the innumerable "revolutions" in 20th-century art.

The book shows that the forms of social pathology that have been dubbed modernism are deeply rooted in the general spiritual condition of the era of imperialism with its retrograde intellectual movement, the soil of which provides scope for manipulations serving the interests of the ruling class. Underlying the disease itself, however, is something more basic than simple manipulation--the fragmented consciousness of the era of the decline of bourgeois civilization and the transition to new, as yet unknown, forms of social structure. In order to become free of the domination of false ideas, therefore, it is essential to understand them if possible, more deeply than they can be comprehended from within, from themselves alone, by the bearers of these ideas. These assertions of the author apply to the elucidation of the main thrust of the work under review here. It does not constitute a mere dethroning of modernism.

Modernism's sources and wanderings are presented, so to speak, in the rays of a spotlight, emitted by the true spiritual revolution of our time, the content of which is constituted by Marxism-Leninism and its theory of objective and absolute truth and its esthetics of realism. The aim of the critique of modernism in "Art and the Modern World," as in the work examined earlier, is invariably in defense of art, of objective esthetic truth. The author also defends them on the soil of 20th-century art and by no means sees in all the artists of this era only conveyers of diseased innovations or their victims. The triumph of realism, as Engels called this phenomenon, is possible in all times and under all conditions, even unfavorable ones. One example is the book's analysis of the works of two German artists of our century, Käthe Kollwitz and Ernst Barlach.

Kollwitz' graphics and Barlach's carvings are generally viewed through the prism of the art of German expressionism. Contrary to widespread opinion, however, Kollwitz' art has nothing to do with the "innovations" of that school. The works of this remarkable woman artist are distinguished by a severe realism--that is, a continuation of the best traditions of the art of the past without the disruption of the visible image, without the delight in the ugly, the mystic, the feigned madness, without the denial of contour, light and shadow, composition, and other elements of representational realism, such as characterize expressionism. As for Barlach, by his creative origins, he was truly close to this current. Here, Lifshits writes, we have a graphic example of the triumph of realism over the narrowness of the artists' original position. Barlach discovered for himself the ideal of the medieval master wood carver--the great tradition of German Gothic. This wellspring served as a healant to his art, and he freed himself from the neurasthenia of expressionism. The sculptor found the true path between the historical feeling that burdened the artist's fantasy with reminiscences of the forms of the old arts, and contemporary social drama. The works of the mature Barlach, infused with the tragic sublimity generic to the time in which he worked, are not oppressed by stylization, but tend toward simple lines and are alien to the ill-formed and the gross.

It would be wrong to think his works evidence no traces of expressionism whatever, the author concludes. "But one may state that where the real Barlach is, there is no expressionism; and where there is expressionism, it is not Barlach" (p 186). In short, "Barlach was not a product of expressionism--rather, expressionism was a surrogate of artistic discoveries of such people as Barlach" (p 189).

Strictly speaking, cliché labels of forms and trends, of all kinds of "isms" in which realism, romanticism, and classicism are equated with symbolism, expressionism, cubism, primitivism, abstractivism, and dozens of other such "visions", are mere external, provisional schemes derived by formal-logical means from historical forms that are not comparable in terms of ideas and esthetics, and adopted by certain schools of literary criticism which tend toward the so-called symbolist theory of art and recognize a multiplicity of esthetic truths.



For this modern theory, there is no common criterion of truth in art, no criterion of realism. In fact, truths are many and various--at least as many as there are points of view or subdivisions in any commonly accepted formal system. By this theory, the function and consciousness of the artist are reduced to a tool, a hieroglyph of the personality, a subjective will, structure or style, a symbol, mark, technique or what have you. This view, with its kit of abstractions and ancillary and auxiliary components of thought, is the antithesis of the materialist theory of expression, including the principle of the mirroring character of art, which since the time of the mimesis of the ancients (Aristotelian teachings about art imitating nature) explains the possibility of achieving the true content of reality in artistic form.

As for pernicious abstractions, M. Lifshits proposes to pressure them unmercifully, step by step on the path from the abstract to the concrete. And he obeys the same rule himself, for example, in his approach to the problem of form. Realism of the artistic form alone proves the presence of truth in art. Truth pertains not just to content alone. The artistic form itself has content. For all its necessary freedom, it is true only when it matches the real world and can be the vehicle of an image verifiable by the senses. The materialist world-view exalts the value of the artistic form: it ascribes importance not only to the overall ontological significance of reality, but also to its material character, accessible to our senses, its ability to "be reflected...in our senses, in our enjoyment, in our intellect."

From this viewpoint, the traditional poetry of forms and the formal discoveries of high art embody in their allegory, whole strata of historical life. The laws of form embody content, for they are not indifferent to the life of the human race, to good and evil, truth and falsehood, justice and oppression. The form to which a great poet or artist resorts is in conformity with the laws of reality; it is not purely a technique fit for the expression of just any idea. Each line drawn by a great artist, each detail of a form, serves to develop the truth of the artist's work. Here lies the secret of unfading fascination of the high art of the past and even its social significance--ultimately always revolutionary--whatever the form its liberating power takes under particular historical circumstances. The forms of this art, the author asserts, are linked by numerous ties to the ideas of modern democracy and socialism that are kin to them, even if the people who have created them were far from holding these ideas or interpreted them differently.

Reverence for the highest creations of mankind's genius is not only illuminated by the theory--it is a necessary condition for the self-awareness of a highly developed society. A belief in the superiority of the classical stages of art embodies profound philosophical and social sense. It is the communists who are acknowledged in the modern world as defenders of the unconditional values of the past, as standing guard over the best traditions of spiritual culture, which have always been based on the unity between

highly developed artistic thinking and the natural, healthy feelings of normal human beings.

Not too long ago, attitudes toward the heritage of previous eras were less mature than today. Today's reverence for the unsurpassed creations of the past has come to take root in the social consciousness of the socialist era as Lenin's great bequest--to assimilate and preserve our heritage--has become accessible to the mind and heart of every educated person, and of all our social institutions. The worldview of communism sees the achievements of classical art as the highest value. It rejects the destruction of art in the name of negative values--those products of the spiritual anarchy of a dying capitalism. It is a most honorable position, says M. Lifshits. It is comprehensible to most people and has become a true innovation of today. The triumph of socialist realism, he emphasizes--that is, of objective truth in art--is an essential condition for the health of all human culture in the future world.

There are two major studies in "Art and the Modern World"--"Art and Fascism in Italy" and "Art and Fascism in Germany"--which with a thoroughness that is unusual in the literature of art criticism explore the dark world of the retrograde ideas on which the garbage of fascist "esthetics" was based. These studies are not undertaken merely for the sake of historical interest. They repudiate the mythologizing of the contemporary heralds of decay who flood the world with lies to the effect that the high ideal of art as a mirror of the real world and refined representation pertains to, or at least is akin to, "totalitarianism" and fascism. Today as yesterday, this poisonous smokescreen serves the hostile ideological forces in their unending war against the esthetic ideal of communism.

It is no less important to defend the values of the classical stages of art against any and all attempts to downgrade them. The assault against the classical tradition, against everything lofty and fine, expresses the negative and anarchic side of the bourgeois consciousness; it is enclosed, despite deceptive appearances, within the limits of the spiritual horizon of the bourgeois world. To understand once and for all the significance of the great artistic eras of the past, the author states, it is not enough to turn one's glance backward. A very wise Greek myth teaches that the ancient Orpheus was not able to realize his ideal because on the way back from the kingdom of the shadows he looked behind him. The true path lies ahead of him who, without losing his firm orientation toward the world of ideas--communist party thought in philosophy and esthetics--looks forward, feels, thinks, and acts in the name of the higher historical reality.

The main object of M. Lifshits's research has always been the classical tradition in philosophy and esthetics--from Vico, Diderot, Winkelmann, Goethe and Hegel to Marx, Engels and Lenin--and the betrayal of this tradition by the bourgeois ideologues of decline. The first research he undertook in this regard, Marx's esthetic views as a component of his revolutionary theory, yielded much new material for the understanding of the

social-historical conditions of the world artistic process. The doctrine of the historically conditioned contradiction between art and society is just as essential an element of the Marxist interpretation of the artistic process as the doctrine that the spiritual work is transformed along with the material. The development of art is uneven with respect to the course of social progress. "With regard to art," Marx asserts, "it is well known that particular periods of its flourishing are by no means in conformity to the overall development of society--nor, consequently, to the development of the latter's material base, which forms a kind of skeleton of its organization. For example, the Greeks compared with today's peoples, also Shakespeare" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," Vol 12 p 736).

The answer as to the causes of the high upsurge of art in the past is not to be sought in the relatively advanced level of development of particular parts of the world of those times (antiquity, the Gothic era, the Renaissance, the art centers of the 17th and 18th centuries, and so on). A much more important role on the world-historical plane in those far-off times was played by the general lack of development of social contradictions and class struggle, a situation unmatched in later stages and providing conditions that favored the flourishing of particular kinds and genres of art.

This lack of development came to be replaced by its antithesis--the capitalist method of production with its material progress which leveled out human relations and was inimical to everything unique and original that nourished the soul of the people and the wellsprings of art. At this new historical stage, under conditions of the worsening of social antagonisms, the development of productive forces came into conflict with the spiritual endeavors of the people. "Thus," Marx points out, "capitalist production is hostile to certain branches of spiritual endeavor, for example, art and poetry" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," Vol 26 Part I, p 280). Thus, we see how the progress of bourgeois civilization becomes the cause of a decline in artistic creativity. Gradually, this process, for all its unevenness, comes to be increasingly pronounced and irreversible.

Marxism teaches, however, that capitalism carries in itself more than the conditions of its destruction. In its own body, it generates immense revolutionary forces, in the form of the proletariat and its allies, which manage to turn history toward socialism. Hence, the direct link between Marx's ideas concerning the unevenness of the artistic process and the decline of art under capitalism, and his theory of social revolution. The vast extent of social disharmony and decay stemming from the decline of capitalism is not the last word in the spiritual development of mankind. The socialist revolution creates the conditions for a new upsurge of creative artistic force. It not only eliminates the exploitation of the toiling majority; it is also essential for the salvation of the world's culture and for the further continuous development of human powers, unrestricted by any narrow and transient measure.

Only when an understanding of these successive stages of the social process, which are clearly manifested in the philosophy of the history of Marxism,

becomes accessible to esthetic theory, M. Lifshits reminds us, can the theory earn the right to be called Marxist. Only such a theory, arising on the basis of the classical philosophical tradition, as interpreted and refined by the genius of the founders of Marxism, enables one to perceive the destiny of art in the real, undistorted light of the contradictions of social progress. "Art and Capitalism" by M.F. Ovsyannikov, the well-known author of numerous works on problems of the theory of esthetics and the history of esthetic thought, is devoted entirely to these problems. The scholar's new work is a kind of summation of his thinking about the problem of the rise and fall of artistic culture and esthetic thought when antagonistic social forces clash, a subject which has always interested him.

The author sees the final stage of the decay of bourgeois art of the 20th century as the extreme stage of the crisis of capitalist culture, with its atmosphere of spiritual discord, licentiousness, self-delusion, and self-accusation. Consciousness of the decline of art under conditions of general decline, which has come to a head in the 20th century, has for many bourgeois ideologues now acquired the character of an idee fixe about "the death of art"--the coming (or already arrived) total downfall of art. Some of the modern prophets of doom do not conceal their satisfaction with regard to this, but rather welcome mankind's liberation from the centuries-old "lie" of esthetic appearances. M.F. Ovsyannikov suggests that for the capitalist world, prophecies and conclusions of this sort undoubtedly have a real basis. The destruction of art, which has become the program of various "avant-gardists," has borne fruit: the latest modernist art has arrived at zero. Even recent advocates of it, many critics of the bourgeois world order in the bourgeois camp, proclaim as much. It is not surprising that their philosophers and estheticians, not wishing to know other spiritual horizons, fall into the temptation of identifying the historical decline of capitalism with the downfall of mankind, the inevitable collapse of all the successive "avant-gardes" in poetry, prose, music, and the depictive arts with the death of art and civilization as a whole. It is clear, however, that this whole position, which should be viewed merely as an unhealthy sign of the times, embodies a gross lie stemming from identification of the fate of capitalism with the fate of humanity.

In reality, however, it is a matter of historical laws, the character of which is not the fatalistic doom of art, but rather a deepening and increasingly extreme hostility of bourgeois society toward artistic creativity. Marx's and Engels's doctrine of the hostility of the capitalist system of production to art and poetry rests not only on the analysis of economic, social, and ideological relations under capitalism, which they developed into revolutionary conclusions; it also derives from a definite esthetic tradition personified by the major thinkers and artists of the 18th and 19th centuries. Consciousness of the problematic position of art under the bourgeois system was awakened along with the birth of the foundation of the new order in the 18th century. Still rather vague in Diderot and Rousseau, it attained clarity after the Great French Revolution. The

thinking and creativity of Goethe and Schiller, contemporaries of the enthronement of bourgeois relations, are infused with a profound uneasiness over the state of man and art in the modern world. A penetrating analysis of bourgeois social relations is to be found in classical German philosophy and in the first romantics.

The historical boundaries of the work under review here extend from the Enlightenment to the mid-19th century, when the classical tradition of bourgeois thought came to be replaced by Marxism, which assimilated and refashioned its heritage. Since that time, bourgeois ideology has acquired a vulgar character, increasingly analogous to capitalist relations, a direct or disguised defense of them, which in the 20th century increasingly takes on the deceptive appearance of fashionable criticism of the bourgeoisie or else anarchic-extremist revolt.

The essence of the work under review involves more than mere fidelity to the Marxist viewpoint on the historical dialectics of the problems dealt with. The author also deserves credit for the way he utilizes the materials he adduces. The ideas of the great minds of the past, above all Hegel, are elucidated with such intensive attention to the original text and the nuances of the thinking that the reader feels himself immersed in the world of ideas of the best thinkers of mankind. Far from being apologetic, the author clearly sees the superiority of the views of the classics of philosophy and art, which are infinitely higher than the level of bourgeois thinking of subsequent times and especially that of today, and which are one way or another connected by thousands of strands to the rise of Marxism and its revolutionary dialectics.

In the ideas of Hegel, the author sees the main spiritual crossroads of the pre-Marxian eras of theoretical thinking which discovered the laws of the position of art in the world of history. The author also has much that is vital and essential to say about such a central problem as Hegelian "reconciliation"--the dramatic acceptance by the great thinkers, in the spirit of fearlessness and renunciation, of bourgeois civilization as an inevitable consequence of progress in its perverted, dehumanized forms. The idea of "reconciliation" embodies the conservation side, but also the great truth that the world is contradictory but not insane, that its development obeys laws and is not a tangle of happenstance. From the contradictions of progress, Hegel draws another vital conclusion that is of consequence to the whole history of the development of esthetic thinking. It concerns the inevitable decline of artistic form and content from the time of antiquity and Shakespeare--deemed by the philosopher a great tragedy of the spirit, the final act of which is played out simultaneously with the end of "the period of art," in the contemporary "kingdom of need and reason," under conditions of "the spiritual animal kingdom" (Hegel's expression, borrowed by Marx and reapplied to the society of capitalist oppression). For all its one-sidedness, Hegel's idea of the decline of art is also not devoid of profound content. It presages the tendencies of development of bourgeois artistic culture with its formalization of

the spiritual content and its perversion of the subjective form. Nevertheless, with brilliant inconsistency, Hegel fails to follow through on his own idea, dictated by a rigid framework, about the inevitable twilight and disintegration of art. Hegel's conception, M.F. Ovsyannikov remarks, is in conflict with the reality of the artistic process. Music, in fact, and especially literature, did not obey the Hegelian law (and not just they). So we see in Hegel not the logical development of a melancholy pattern of the death of art, but the birth, divergent from this pattern, of "free art," in which the vanished artistic forms are present once more in reduced form; the old epos comes to be replaced by the "bourgeois epic," and from the profound dialectics of thought arises the brilliant theory of the novel--the speculative basis of the leading genre of a new art. The artist becomes "the historian of private lives." Hegel now sees that the only path for him is in depicting the struggle of the individual with prose and the everyday routine of real relationships.

On his views, Hegel stands more or less midway between the "period of art" and the triumph of critical realism.

With great boldness, Balzac depicts the tragic struggle of the individual against the essence of capitalist society, which is hostile to man. He is no longer constrained by consciousness of the problematic character and unsatisfactory esthetics of bourgeois content, but presents with merciless power the perversion of all spiritual values into objects of crime and shameless commerce, the drama of the alienation of all man's qualities and abilities. The power of money has shaken all social relations, perverted moral principles, displaced all ideas. Natural, rational relations have been turned upside down. There are no fixed truths, everything is ambiguous, relative, deceptive. For Balzac, the principle of "veracity" came first. He gazed fearlessly in the face of "insane" reality, reflecting with the devices of art the contemporary world in all its contradictions, which are the truth. Nevertheless, while portraying the grime and ugliness of bourgeois reality, the artist himself was not infected by it, but remained "of a truly human nature." These words are Schiller's, who says in one of his esthetic studies that a poet may also portray evil in nature "as long as he himself, at least in the moment of creativity, is of a truly human nature; it is then unimportant what he portrays, but only such an artist is capable of making a faithful portrayal of reality tolerable for us." This immensely vital reservation, adduced so profoundly by the author, sheds additional light on the main conclusion of his book, acquiring the significance of a general formulation of the ethical ideal of any art worthy of the name. The author concludes that a critical attitude to capitalism serves as an inexhaustible source of artistic creation. Such a conclusion, which is correct with regard to the flourishing of artistic realism in the 19th and 20th centuries, holds true under conditions of the capitulation of recent bourgeois art pressured by the dehumanized forms of capitalist reality, in which the substance of art is becoming increasingly banal, ugly, and grimy, and the

decline of artistic form lays bare the nothingness of the decadent content, infecting the consciousness of the artist and making art itself impure, however refined it may appear on the formal plane.

If the history of art makes sense, that sense is in the repudiation of the doom and destruction of high realistic and critical tradition despite the sentence handed down by the multilingual choir of the philosophers and estheticians of decline. Under the circumstances of the social-historical transformations and upheavals of the 20th century, the rise of objective truth in the art of socialist realism opens new prospects for an artistic upsurge. Consciousness of these prospects, along with the ideas of communism, has taken hold of the minds of the better part of humanity's thinkers in many countries of the world. Evidence of this tendency is amply manifested in the philosophical literature of our times. One such work is that of the Italian Marxist philosopher, Galvano della Volpe, "Critique of Taste," which has been published in Russian translation.

Coming to communism from a milieu of bourgeois intellectuals at the end of World War Two, Galvano della Volpe (1895-1968) combined his new frame of mind with a thorough study of the works of Marx and Engels, from which he derived in his own words, "sociological-materialist consciousness." For many years, the scholar was concerned with the problem of the general gnoseological basis of science and poetry in combination with the critique of various forms of perverted (idealistic and vulgar-materialistic) awareness. Difficult and tireless philosophical effort was necessary to comprehend the concrete-historical, dialectical-materialist logic of Marxism. The scholar approached an understanding of the content and the class character of the unified science--logic, dialectics, and epistemology of Marxism-Leninism as the logical result of the development of all philosophy and human cognition. In his Foreword to the translation of "Critique of Taste" and in his other works on the philosophy of Galvano della Volpe, K. Dolgov comments on the Italian esthetician's striving to keep strictly to a "historical logic" which, while "expressing the world-view of the proletariat, would reflect the fundamental interests of all the working people in transforming the world and at the same time, would be closely linked to the progressive content and tendencies of all culture of the past and present" (pp 8-9).

In "Critique of Taste," della Volpe defends the rationalist line in esthetics, originating in the Aristotelian theory of "imitation" (mimesis) and "verisimilitude." Arguing the gnoseological function of art, the author directs the thrust of his critique against the irrationalist--"romantic," in his terminology--esthetic concepts which view the conceptual element as somehow nonesthetic and the esthetic and artistic as standing outside logic and cognition. For him, the artistic image is merged as one with the concept--they are inseparable. At the same time, however, the Italian philosopher places enjoyment at the very heart of a work of art. Its source is in the concrete-rational kernel of the "image-concept" which bears "that particular vital deposition, that humus of history, whose organic presence

THE "QUESTIONS OF THE MATERIALIST AND DIALECTICALLY "SOCIAL DEMOCRATS"  
OF 1902.

... about Balzer's "Critique and Social Democracy" (1902) ...  
... "The Mirror of the Russian Revolution" are viewed as the ...  
... answer to the "questions of questions" ...  
... "gather there is to be an estimate ...  
... "best realized" (p. 260). The "questions of questions," ...  
... the present ... ideas in art ...  
... "truthfulness" ... revealed ...  
... "truthfulness" is not more than merely ...  
... "truthfulness" in people's practical ...  
... "truthfulness" ...  
... "truthfulness" does not contradict, but ...  
... "truthfulness" ...  
... "truthfulness" ...  
... "truthfulness" ...  
... "truthfulness" ...  
... "truthfulness" ...  
... "truthfulness" ...

... the ...  
... "truthfulness" ...  
... "truthfulness" ...  
... "truthfulness" ...  
... "truthfulness" ...  
... "truthfulness" ...  
... "truthfulness" ...



Kafka--for all the significance of their works, provide in essence only a "negative" lesson concerning the crisis of their time. Rising far above them is the "socialist and democratic poetry" of Mayakovskiy and Brecht, which in the author's eyes merges with the socialist literary-esthetic ideal of our days, which he cherishes and has experienced so keenly.

The philosophical foundations of the esthetic views of Galvano della Volpe are not, however, set forth with indisputable clarity. Their exposition is methodologically complicated by his scientific instrumentarium, borrowed from modern linguistics, semantics, and semiotics. To materialist dialectics, the Italian philosopher attempts to add the formal semantics of "text," the criteria of modern structural linguistics. Such borrowings create a methodological and theoretical dislocation in his works; analysis of them, naturally, would go beyond the bounds of the theme of this review.

For our purpose, it is sufficient that the aberrations of method, stemming from the general state of the social sciences in the West, have not eclipsed for the Italian scholar the main historical line of artistic development and the ideal of socialist realism that inspires him. He is convinced that the modernist art of the 20th century, which styles itself avant-garde, is not in opposition to capitalist civilization, but is itself a byproduct of it. "...The term and concept avant-garde no longer suits us Marxist materialists," he writes (p 269), thoroughly infused as they are with "the de-humanized nature of the character of formalism." In the struggle for a new poetics, they must be replaced by a concept of the humanitarianism of art, which is capable of restoring the fullness of art itself and of sustaining, finally, the "lean toward the classics", that is proper to its true manifestations.

"All these are problems of the poetics of socialist realism, for it is built (it could not be otherwise) on the philosophical basis of an esthetics of realism," which the Italian critic finds in Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

003  
CSO: 1802/8

## THE PARTY IN THE STRUGGLE FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PROGRESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 74-80

[Article by Hans Modrow, SED Central Committee member and first secretary of the Dresden District SED Committee]

[Text] The full use of the considerable scientific and technical potential of our country plays a particularly important role in the struggle waged by the party members and all working people in the GDR for the implementation of the resolutions of the 10th SED Congress, aimed at the well-being of the people, the strengthening of socialism and the securing of peace. As Comrade Erich Honecker, SED Central Committee general secretary, emphasized at the congress, the highest achievement of science and technology, the more substantial creative results of scientific research and experimental design and their rapid and extensive application are the key problems in the implementation of the party's economic strategy. It is only by following this path in the more difficult conditions of the 1980's that the GDR can reach high economic development indicators, accomplishing this, as the party noted, virtually without any or with very insignificant increases in energy, raw material and manpower resources. This course takes into consideration the basic experience of the Soviet Union and coincides with the strategic stipulation of the 26th CPSU Congress on the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and further public production intensification.

Today the party faces new, stricter requirements in management and ideological-political work, a substantial amount of which must be done by the Dresden District party organization, in which a considerable share of the GDR's industrial and scientific potential is concentrated. Scientific achievements in our district in some important areas, particularly nuclear physics, the study of materials, theoretical foundations of some electronic sectors, electrical engineering and machine building, determine the pace and level of development of the economy of the GDR and its contribution to cooperation with the USSR and the other CEMA-member countries to a considerable extent.

The district party committee focuses its attention on scientific and technical development with a view to upgrading production effectiveness and quality indicators. This raises above all the question of the place and responsibility of combines in which most of the production, scientific research and experimental design potential in our country's industry and construction are concentrated. It is precisely the combines that must formulate the specific

scientific and technical problems the solution of which will contribute to upgrading production effectiveness. It is precisely in the combines that the implementation of this task yields national economic results. This applies both to inventions and scientific and technical solutions which have been developed within the combines themselves and to the results of basic research conducted at the Academy of Sciences institutes, the universities, the higher educational institutions and other scientific establishments.

The experience acquired by the party organizations in managing the leading combines in Dresden District enables us to single out four basic aspects of political work aimed at accelerating the pace of scientific and technical progress.

First of all, the district and precinct party committees must see to it that each combine develops its scientific and technical strategy consistently and purposefully. We are deeply convinced that in principle it is impossible to achieve the highest possible accomplishments in areas the development of which is needed by the national economy on the basis of temporary measures alone and, on that same basis, to ensure a steady increase in the effectiveness of the entire combine. Along with leading combines such as Robotron in Dresden, the pipes manufacturing plant in Riesa and others, which are implementing the decisions of the 10th SED Congress in a model fashion in many respects, we have lagging combines largely as a result of the different levels of advancement of the scientific and technical strategy.

The "secret" of the combines which achieved the greatest successes, as a comparison among production indicators and exchange of experience clearly indicate, is mainly that they formulate their plans for science and technology today, but with a view to the future and with the economic requirements of the forthcoming period in mind. They are oriented not only toward familiar worldwide achievements but also toward the results which are expected in the future, at the time when the production of the new items and technologies has been mastered. This is the only approach consistent with the resolutions of the 10th SED Congress.

Thus, at the Robotron Combine, which is engaged primarily in the production of computers and calculators, as early as 1976, after lengthy preparations, the directions for the development of the enterprises and the variety of their output between 1981 and 1985 were defined. To this effect, the most important criteria governing the combine's activities were formulated. For example, the task was set of entirely renovating production variety over the next 3 to 5 years. This was to be achieved mainly through the use of microelectronics. The plan also called for reducing labor outlays in the production of new goods by 30 to 80 percent compared with the old variety, while increasing their consumer value. As a result, at the beginning of the extensive discussion of the 1981-1985 plan, the combine had a draft plan which called for an almost tenfold production increase compared with the 1978 planned figures governing the same period, but with a considerable decrease in the number of personnel.

Naturally, it would be difficult today to come across a party secretary or combine director who would be unable to explain the importance of a substantiated scientific and technical strategy. Unfortunately, words and actions,

the existence of good will and systematic efforts to implement a scientific and technical strategy are not always combined in real life. This makes even more urgent the need for the party organizations not to allow any violation of decisions made in this area, to expose reasons for shortcomings and to criticize all cases of unconscientious attitude toward the formulation of scientific and technical development concepts.

From the ideological-political viewpoint, the basic problem here, as was clearly revealed in discussions held in a number of our combines, is the party-minded militant approach to achieving the highest possible scientific and technical and economic results and the readiness to set strict goals, above all for oneself. Every manager and working person and all labor collectives must properly realize that today there is no alternative, there is no other way leading to the necessary production growth with high-quality indicators.

It is still difficult for some people to surmount stereotyped thinking and to part with the old ways, when raw materials and power were considerably less expensive and scientific and technical progress throughout the world had not reached its current pace. However, developments in recent years, the requirements of our time and a realistic view of the future most clearly indicate that an entirely new situation prevails today. Requirements governing the scientific and technical standard and quality of output have sharply increased under our circumstances as well. It is particularly necessary for the GDR to participate in the international division of labor effectively, since it is a relatively small country. This also presumes the implementation of qualitatively greater assignments. This applies above all to our close fraternal cooperation with CEMA-member countries, the Soviet Union above all. This requires the highest possible labor results, for he who expects a great deal of his partner must give a great deal himself. We all know the growing sharpness of the competitive struggle in trade with the capitalist countries and the way the policy of confrontation with the socialist countries is manifested in this connection. Under such circumstances, we can earn the foreign exchange we need only essentially when producing goods whose quality meets world standards.

The most important obligation of the party organizations and managements of combines and scientific and technical centers is to gain a clear understanding of all such problems. In implementing the resolutions of the 10th SED Congress, they must systematically struggle against still-existing views that it is possible to demand a great deal of others while setting quite modest goals for oneself, citing the frequently truly strict requirements of current plans, and to avoid defining future plans.

Naturally, the formulation of a scientific and technical strategy is a creative process which is implemented differently at each combine in accordance with production specifics. However, its basic requirements and principles remain the same. For this reason, the district party committee pays great attention to the sharing of and summing up of the best experience. The district SED committee sponsors special conferences at which basic problems of combine development strategy, intensification of scientific research, application of modern technology such as microelectronics and industrial robots, full utilization of social labor resources and strategy in commodity marketing and exports are discussed.

A particular problem considered by the party organizations is how to make the fullest possible use of the opportunities which cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other CEMA-member countries offers and how to organize even more effectively cooperation in scientific research and experimental design among combines and scientific institutions in our country and corresponding enterprises and organizations in the other socialist countries. Not even the most progressive combine can reach the highest possible scientific and technical level by itself. Practical experience indicates that good results in areas such as microelectronics, computers and the production of high-grade metals can be achieved not in the least place as a result of the close and planned cooperation with our Soviet partners.

In the area of electrical machine building, cooperation between our two countries is rising to a new level in the course of the joint reorganization of the production of medium-sized and large units at the Saxonwerk enterprise in Dresden. The reconstruction plan is based on the use of the latest technology, without additional manpower, resulting in the type of production increase which will enable us to satisfy the needs of our two countries for the respective types of electric motors. The project is progressing and developing faster as a result of the extensive socialist competition between its participants in Leningrad and Dresden.

The further development of cooperation in our country along the entire chain from basic research to production and marketing offers great opportunities as well. For example, the comprehensive contracts concluded between Dresden's Technological University and four district combines, on the one hand, and the Dresden Scientific Research and Technological Microelectronics Center, on the other, have proved their great usefulness. Here it is a question not merely of resolving individual scientific research problems but of extensive interaction in the development and implementation of important scientific and technical concepts ranging from basic research to production.

We are encouraging the participation of the social scientists in this work and are training and upgrading the skills of cadres. Here again we are profiting from the experience of our close cooperation with Leningrad's VUZs and enterprises, with which we are familiar thanks to the partnership between Dresden and Leningrad and the great support of the comrades from the oblast CPSU committee of the city-hero on the Neva.

The growing rapprochement between institutions engaged in basic research, universities and institutes and combines and enterprises is a comprehensive process. It requires a new type of understanding of the circumstances and the new management and planning methods. For example, only a few years ago, it was frequently said at Dresden's Technological University that one should not become so closely involved with production, for this might damage the basic tasks of the higher school, the training process and basic scientific research conducted without any specific target in mind. For the sake of justice, let us point out that some enterprises as well failed to understand the need for systematic interaction with science. This was quite apparent in the view that the higher school was something like a fire department which could be quickly summoned should an urgent design or technological problem arise.

... place in the ... the party's ... course of a continued ... and aggressive ... in the course of ... creative discussions on the ... of the ... of the ... system ... today it is already customary for entire groups ... to meet with the personnel of combine enterprises ... researchers are ... in the ... with combine workers ... at enterprises. Higher school professors assume the ... long-term problems and the implementation of important tasks ... while experienced practical workers ... to work in higher educational institutions, which has ... the beginnings of fruitful cadre exchange

... to the creation of scientific and technical labor ... which the VUZs undertake the solution of ... design problems of specifically practical value ... in 1987 at the ... technological university ... activities with ... and ... center and will do research in a specific ... of microelectronic circuits which will find

... a proper ... of ... to ... research and experimental ... scientific and technological ... the ... of ... who ...

... the ... the ... of ... the ... of ... the ... of ... the ... of ... the ... of ...

... the ... of ... the ... of ... the ... of ... the ... of ... the ... of ...

This range of problems includes that of capital investments. The consistent course charted by our party toward expanding intensive reproduction and the general conditions governing the further development of the national economy of the GDR require the pursuit of a particularly thoughtful policy in this area. Intensification calls for the struggle for reaching the highest possible technological and production levels. At the printing press plant capital investments are channeled above all into production rationalization. It is thus that the use of 146 industrial robots and the application of various rationalization facilities make it possible to operate production sectors with minimum personnel. The plans call for reducing outlays per million marks of marketable output from 5,000 to 2,500 work hours. The plant's party organization is mobilizing all working people for the solution of these problems. It is applying comprehensive party control over the main stages of their implementation on the basis of a thoroughly formulated program.

The third very important factor in achieving high results in the development of science and technology is the purposeful activity of the party organizations aimed at developing a creative atmosphere in the collectives contributing to progress. Here again a great deal depends on the managers and on the training, selection and proper placement of leading cadres. For example, the Electrical Machine Building Combine and the Robotron Combine in Dresden have many scientific research collectives which are headed by people possessing a high feeling of personal responsibility and the curiosity of researchers. They are struggling creatively and persistently for the implementation of assignments. By dedicating all their efforts to the work, they lead the collective. The correct understanding of the decisions of the 10th SED Congress means in their case not only to be properly familiar with them but to carry out the consequent assignments at their work sectors.

Naturally, a creative labor atmosphere is the result of a number of sometimes conflicting factors. Frequently it is difficult to assess one's own work impartially and to compare its results with global achievements. Sometimes expectations are not met and unforeseen difficulties appear. It may happen that above-plan competition targets included in the socialist pledges are not reached. However, those who follow untrodden paths must bear in mind that not every step leads straight to the target. Does any blame attach itself here? Naturally, bonuses and prizes are awarded only for results. Work shortcomings and insufficient participation in the work must be opposed even more firmly than in the past, including, if necessary, the use of material measures. On the other hand, readiness to undertake a sensible risk, even if the result is a failure, despite our best efforts, should be supported. Such a readiness is one of the prerequisites for creative activities. It must be developed and supported and coordinated with strict management and a high degree of responsibility.

One of the important tasks which the party organizations of combines and scientific institutions must set themselves with particular exigency is work with institute graduates and young technicians, engineers and scientists. Experience indicates that the initial period of practical work is particularly important in shaping the qualities which characterize the true socialist individual, the fighter. The speed with which young people undertake the independent fulfillment of complex assignments greatly depends on the thirst for activity, revolutionary upsurge and the application of knowledge acquired at school.

that is why the party organizations must persistently oppose occasional cases in which young specialists are not allowed to participate in the solution of important scientific and production assignments under the pretext that allegedly the "novices" must adapt themselves, look around and adjust. The party members should see to it that the young scientists and engineers undergo their "baptism by fire" at the decisive sectors of the struggle for scientific and technical progress faster. There are many projects in Dresden District in which young people have assumed full responsibility for the solution of such problems. Thus, the district's youth project on the development of microelectronics has been entrusted with an important assignment, from the development of individual types of microprocessors and their testing and manufacture to the use of microelectronics in the production of consumer goods, in machine building and in automation facilities, including the manufacture of important parts for microelectronic requirements. The correctness of this method is confirmed not by positive scientific and economic results alone. Young cadres who display a high degree of activeness and daring in carrying out complex assignments, who improve their skills in scientific work and management steadily and who display mature communist positions develop rapidly.

Third, the fourth important aspect in the activities of the party organizations is the skilled political guidance in all areas and processes of the struggle for new accomplishments in science and technology. The high level of division of labor, which characterizes the work of the combines, makes the ability for a general survey and for understanding the entire situation quite important. This quality helps the individual worker to become more profoundly aware of his individual responsibility and, consequently, to cope with his own specific assignment better. The national economic results, contribution to the national income and improved ratio of outputs to profits not only in the industrial sector but in the entire combine and the entire national economy provide decisive criteria in assessing any idea, every and any patent.

In this connection the special party activists at the Electrical Machine Building combine have proved their usefulness. These activists, which bring together the representatives of related sectors, initiate after comprehensive discussions a "policy" of promoting political activities and ensuring the purposeful character of the work of all participants for the sake of fulfilling one or another specific production assignment. This form of work has been successful in the use of microelectronics in machine building and in the development and production of small motors.

The work of youth secretaries are an important method of ensuring the implementation of the efforts of the primary party organizations at combine and enterprise level in different districts. The youth keeps in mind the entire cycle of the work, ranging from scientific research and development to production, marketing and service trade.

The district youth committee always works in close cooperation with the relevant Party committee and is consulted at the same time. The important tasks of the youth are systematically and comprehensively discussed at the Party committee plenums, which resolutions formulate the specific tasks of the youth, set the goals and strategies and identify institutions and structures for action for all Party organizations.



As a whole, all of our efforts toward the acceleration of scientific and technical progress are aimed at making even more effective use of the great opportunities offered to us by the socialist system in the GDR and the fraternal cooperation among socialist countries. The considerable scientific and technical potential, high cultural standard of the working people and the combines, which have become centers of economic power, are the foundations for accelerating the pace in this area, as required by the resolutions of the 10th SED Congress, and for extensively combining the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism for the benefit of the people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/8

## THE PRAGUE MEETING OF COMMUNISTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 81-93

[Article by A. Kozlov, B. Likhachev]

[Text] The most consistent fighters for man's liberation from all oppression and for the building of a just, truly humane society and boundlessly devoted to the interests of the people of labor, the communists have everywhere earned respect and authority among the multimillion-strong masses of the working people and the burning hatred of the forces of reaction. It is at the communists that their strikes are aimed primarily, acts of subversion are incessant and persistent and subtle use is made of the weapon of division and slander. But the communist movement is alive and strengthening, its ranks are multiplying, it is being joined by new parties, the content of its own activity is becoming more profound and the forms of the communists' cooperation with other progressive forces are becoming more diverse.

Most recent testimony to this was the Prague conference of representatives of 90 parties--81 communist and 9 revolutionary-democratic--to discuss the activity of the journal PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM.

Such meetings have been convened six times now in the journal's 23-year history, but there was never before such a broad representation of the parties participating therein. And the delegations to the Prague meeting were headed here, as a rule, by members of the highest party authorities, many of them by party chairmen and general or first secretaries.

It is perfectly natural that discussion of the work of the journal, which is the fruit of the joint efforts and common concern of the communists, is "the common property of the revolutionary movement and the sole experience of its kind," in the words of the Colombian delegate, A. Imosquera, and affords a concrete and fruitful opportunity to ascertain the growth of centripetal tendencies in the communist movement and to contribute to their consolidation. Taken together, the journal's publications are, after all, not only a kind of mirror of the life and activity of the international communist movement; they are an important, directly international area thereof where the principles incorporated in the communist movement of parties--their scientific world outlook and their internationalism, equality and mutual respect--are

realized daily. The meeting showed the communist movement's current concerns, on which questions its collective thought is concentrated and which tasks it considers paramount.

Close attention was paid to the most varied aspects of the collective international journal, including the democratic foundations of its work and its "collectivist communist style," as A. Khavari, member of the Iran People's Party [Sic] Politburo and Secretariat, said. The notion of the topicality and importance of this publication, the benefits it provides and the school of practical, effective internationalism which its daily activity represents was substantiated comprehensively in the speeches. "Its very existence and regular publication express the parties' awareness of the need for the unity of our movement and the unity which really exists," A. Lilov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, said.

A distinguishing feature of the Prague meeting is linked to the fact that the discussion of the journal dealing with the content and very essence of its work developed into a comprehensive analysis of the current international situation and the problems which it presents for the fraternal parties.

The leitmotiv of the meeting was the idea that the communists' responsibility for the fate of the peoples demands that they do everything to achieve lasting peace and raise the masses to the repulse of imperialism's aggressive actions. Such is the paramount common goal and interest of the communist movement.

As the CPSU Central Committee document on its results point out, the Prague conference "concentrated its attention on the main international problem-- counteracting the aggressive policy of imperialism, eliminating the military danger and preventing a thermonuclear war." Such was the communists' response to the most urgent demands dictated by the world situation which has evolved.

The Prague meeting was held in an extremely critical period--perhaps the most critical since the war. Its participants proceeded from the fact that there is a new political situation in the world arena which differs appreciably from the situation in the 1970's and the time of the development and progress of international detente. Evaluating the current international situation, they emphasized primarily the serious threat to the cause of peace and the fate of the peoples entailed in the intensification of the aggressive militarist policy of American imperialism and NATO. They described in detailed and multifaceted manner the United States' current foreign policy as an attempt at a kind of "social revenge" and made an in-depth and pointed class analysis of the motives, goals and aggressive methods of the R. Reagan administration. The deterioration in the international situation, A. Denes, secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Central Committee, observed, has been brought about primarily by the endeavor of the U.S. ruling circles to disturb the evolved equilibrium, achieve military superiority and frustrate the detente process. Having despaired of attempts to surmount the economic crisis and halt the unswerving buildup of the struggle of the peoples, the U.S. Administration

wishes to bring mankind to the brink of war, N. Sirit, member of the Venezuelan Communist Party Politburo, said.

Together with this, the conferees' speeches contained clear warnings against undue dramatization of the current world situation, an underestimation of the possibilities of the forces opposed to the military danger and against the demobilizing sentiments of pessimism and hopelessness. The objective deep-lying factors which in the past determined the turnabout toward detente and served as a source of its dynamism continue to operate in the world. It is a question of the approximate equivalence of the forces of the two opposing military-political groupings, the vital concern of all mankind and each people for the prevention of a thermonuclear catastrophe and of the mutual benefit from peaceful cooperation for countries with different social systems. As E. Rodriguez, member of the Executive Committee and secretary of the Central Committee of the Uruguayan Communist Party emphasized, the idea that war is not a fatal inevitability remains valid now also. Without belittling the military danger emanating from imperialism, C. Aboim Ingles, member of the Portuguese Communist Party Central Committee, declared, we can say with confidence that the forces of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism predominate over the forces of war and reaction. These propositions were supported at the conference.

Developing them, the participants in the discussion cogently showed the decisive role of world socialism and the Soviet Union in the championing of peace and the repulse of the intrigues of aggressive and reactionary forces. The economic and defense might of the socialist community countries and their enterprising peace-loving foreign policy were evaluated as the principal factor of peace.

The Prague meeting coincided with the visit to the FRG of L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium--a peace mission in the fullest and highest sense. The new antiwar initiatives which he put forward naturally evoked exceptional interest on the part of the representatives of the fraternal parties and stimulated debate on questions of the antiwar struggle. The political significance of the visit, which goes far beyond the framework of Soviet-West German relations and the European framework, was comprehensively revealed by B.N. Ponomarev, candidate of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who set forth our party's position on the main international issues. The new Soviet initiatives, he said, "are graphic proof of a realistic, businesslike and not verbal-propaganda approach to the solution of problems of nuclear arms in Europe. The USSR is oriented here toward the prospect of all Europe being made a nuclear-free zone."

Many speakers emphasized that by its realistic proposals, the Soviet Union had created a constructive basis for negotiations with the United States on

nuclear missiles in Europe and, in a broader plane, had provided new evidence of the humanistic essence and moral superiority of the Soviet peace policy. "Not only the communists, but also people who are far removed from us," O. Mil'yas, member of the Chilean Communist Party Central Committee Political Commission and Secretariat, declared, "are becoming aware of the significance of the peace policy being pursued with unparalleled staunchness by the Soviet party's Leninist Central Committee and its general secretary, Comrade Brezhnev."

The participants in the meeting observed--we will quote here the words of H. Winston, national chairman of the Communist Party of the United States--that the bold and all-encompassing program of the strengthening of peace put forward by L.I. Brezhnev has emphasized in the eyes of the world, the vanity of President Reagan's efforts to confuse the world public with respect to the essence of the U.S. Administration's foreign policy.

The results of L.I. Brezhnev's visit to the FRG create for the communists new conditions for the stimulation of their efforts in the struggle for peace--such was the practical conclusion drawn by the participants in the discussion.

"Under different circumstances, it would be superfluous to point particularly to the Soviet Union's role as the bulwark of peace in this world," J. Bergstein, member of the Argentine Communist Party Central Committee, said, "but today, we consider it essential to repeat this truth once again. What would have become of the world now without the might of the socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union? What would have happened to the countries which gained their independence in recent decades? Can a person who considers himself a Marxist-Leninist believe that imperialism is capable of coming to terms with the peoples' right to self-determination? By virtue of all this, we believe that the subjects connected with questions of peace and the role of the socialist countries in the international arena should remain the focus of the journal's particular attention."

In this connection the speakers emphasized the tremendous significance for the cause of peace of the unity of the socialist states and the need for an emphatic rebuff of the attempts of imperialism and internal antisocialist forces to weaken the socialist community and shake loose this link or the other. Support for, and fraternal solidarity with, the peoples of Cuba, Vietnam and the Mongolian People's Republic, which are courageously resisting the provocations of imperialism and the forces forming a bloc with them, and with the communists and all patriots of Poland, who have prevented the counterrevolution from usurping power and liquidating the gains of socialism in the country were expressed.

The inseparable connection between socialism and peace and the indivisibility of the one and the other--the participants in the Prague meeting assigned a key place in the analysis of the world situation to this, for communists, undisputed truth. Their speeches substantiated the idea that

socialism is the bulwark of peace for the reason that it acts as the bulwark of social progress in all its main directions and all its main forms.

The various aspects of this interconnection, which were touched on in the speeches of the overwhelming majority of the meeting's participants, were illustrated in concretized form in the speech of B.N. Ponomarev. He stressed primarily, the ideological-theoretical and practical significance of the concept of developed socialism, which has afforded an opportunity for concretizing the paths and specified times of the achievement of the socialist community's program goals and determining socioeconomic strategy over the long term. The historically doomed capitalist system lacks such a prospect, and this is a principal reason behind its attempts to turn back the course or world events at any price, even aggressive adventures. And, conversely, such a truly historic prospect predetermines the peace-loving nature of socialism and its endeavor to secure peaceful conditions for creative activity.

Socialism has proven its capacity for accomplishing historically unprecedented socioeconomic transformations; it is sufficient to recall with what historical rapidity the socialist community has become the mighty and most dynamic industrial center of the world. And socialism has now placed on the agenda even bigger and more complex tasks, primarily in the economic sphere. And it is tackling them, having high-mindedly rejected the path on which capitalism is attempting to resolve its economic difficulties--the path of increased exploitation, plunder of the peoples and monopolist expansion and diktat and, as a consequence, the militarization of the economy and policy. Relying on the advantages of the socialist production mode and combining them with the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution, socialism is channeling all its material and spiritual resources into surpassing capitalism in the qualitative indicators of production and labor productivity.

In tackling their creative tasks, the socialist states attach increasingly great weight to the tasks of international economic cooperation and the problems of socialist economic integration, in whose channel relations of equality, comradeship and mutual interest are strengthening and the national distinctive features of this country or the others are in no way blunted. Thus, as opposed to the ineradicable discord of capitalist interests, in the sphere of international economic interaction, socialism also asserts democratic principles which are peaceful in nature and correspond to the peoples' interests.

The fate of socialism and, consequently, social progress as a whole, is inseparably connected with the responsibility for them borne by the communists and with the fact that the Marxist-Leninist party has not only called itself the vanguard, but also operated as the vanguard, and proven in practice, B.N. Ponomarev emphasized, what this means under contemporary conditions. The events in Poland have once again given

us a strong reminder of the communists' international duty, the impermissibility of yielding positions to antisocialist forces, and the need for the defense and development of socialism, and finally, to convey the truth about socialism to the masses.

Many speeches stressed particularly the theme of the rebuff of anti-Sovietism. The seriousness and urgency of this task, the comrades emphasized, is determined not only by a natural desire to pay tribute to the Soviet Union and all the socialist community countries for their inestimable contribution to the struggle for peace and social progress, but also by the most immediate vital interests of the peoples, the working class and all strata of working people. The point being, the participants in the meeting said, that anti-Sovietism has become the main political and propaganda weapon in the arsenal of imperialist reaction, and for this reason, its exposure is an arena of struggle in which the fate of war and peace is settled. "Anti-Sovietism," R. Urbani, chairman of the Luxembourg Communist Party, emphasized, "is being used to justify the dangerous speeding up of the arms race being undertaken by the United States and NATO. Anti-Sovietism is set in motion to prevent the working people in the capitalist countries, which are riven by crisis, seeing the real prospects of socialism and paralyze their fighting spirit. Anti-Sovietism is also a most important weapon of division of the working class and the prevention of the joint actions of communists, socialists and other progressive forces."

This question took a polemical turn in the course of the meeting following the speech of T. Nishizawa, deputy chairman of the Japanese Communist Party Central Committee Presidium, who declared that the call for struggle against anti-Sovietism was a hangover of the outmoded idea of a "center" in the communist movement. This statement was criticized. We refer to the speech of G. Deumlich, member of the Presidium and secretary of the Board of the German Communist Party. The special significance which the imperialist forces attach to anti-Sovietism, he said, "clearly expresses the fact, which is well known to the imperialists also, that, as the economically, politically and militarily most powerful country, the Soviet Union performs a special role in the development of the world revolutionary process. Such is our experience, and there is no reason to conceal it. If some people believe that such conclusions represent a one-sided eulogy, we cannot understand why the statement of an objective fact is interpreted in such a subjectivist manner." "Ignoring the central, determining significance of the Soviet Union in the international class struggle and the struggle for peace would be the purest voluntarism," E. Scharf, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the Austrian Communist Party, declared.

"It is true that the CPSU and the USSR are not leading center of the international communist and workers' movement," A. Lilov, leader of the Bulgarian Communist Party delegation, observed. "This question was

clarified and closed long since. No one, however, has yet disputed the historical fact that since the Great October Socialist Revolution, the CPSU and the USSR have been and remain at the center and in the vanguard of contemporary social progress in the world, the contemporary revolutionary process and the contemporary struggle for peace and disarmament. Imperialism is well aware of this, and it is for this very reason that it deploys its main attack against the USSR. The journal of the international communist and workers' movement is correct in waging a struggle against anti-Sovietism--a principal direction of imperialist propaganda and ideology--and should continue this struggle."

Sharp objections were prompted by the attempts of the Japanese Communist Party representative to portray the Soviet Union's policy of ensuring military equilibrium as a "departure" from the fundamental propositions of Soviet foreign policy and, specifically, from the demands for a dissolution of military blocs and general and complete disarmament. These statements were evaluated as a distortion of the CPSU's foreign policy and its Peace Program, which contains, as is known, both a proposal for the simultaneous annulment of the defensive Warsaw Pact and North Atlantic alliance and the idea of complete nuclear disarmament. "In view of the United States' aspiration to military superiority," H. Axen, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany said, "the path to the dissolution of military blocs today leads through military equilibrium and through steps to limit and reduce armaments." Without military equilibrium, many speakers emphasized, imperialism would already have unleashed WWII. This is why, the conferees observed, a principal task of the communists in the current situation is to convincingly show the groundlessness and hostility to the cause of peace of the concept of the "equal responsibility" of the United States and the USSR for the exacerbation of international tension, thoroughly expose the notorious "Soviet military threat" myth and explain who really is responsible for the arms race and where the source of military danger is located. "We cannot permit," a representative of the Guatemalan Labor Party declared, "the forces of aggression and the forces of peace to be put on the same footing. Clarity in this question is of tremendous significance."

In the general context of an analysis of the international situation, the representatives of many fraternal parties sharply criticized the international policy of the Chinese leadership, which is linking up with the reactionary and aggressive policy of imperialism in the world arena. "A situation has been created wherein the struggle against imperialism and reaction is



inconceivable without condemnation of the behavior of the Beijing leadership outside of the country," the Venezuelan delegate emphasized. The conviction was expressed that exposure of this policy must by no means be a "prohibited zone" for the journal. This would signify, many parties believed, abandonment of a Marxist-Leninist position.

The speeches of the delegates of dozens of countries painted a broad picture of the unprecedentedly active and representative--truly popular and distinctive--antiwar movement. It was emphasized that life itself is contributing to mutual understanding among the various currents of the peace supporters, despite the political and world-outlook differences among them. In particular, there was discussion of the possibilities of closer interaction with the socialist and social democratic parties in the struggle for peace and the solution of other global problems of mankind. The fact that Marxist-Leninists can make a most in-depth analysis of these issues, I. Norlund, member of the Danish Communist Party Central Committee Executive Committee and Secretariat, said, is a most convincing argument in favor of scientific socialism.

It is the communists' task to contribute in every possible way to the development of the antiwar movement, and for this, many speakers observed, it is essential to expose the propaganda diversions of imperialism aimed at the disorientation and fragmentation of the peace supporters.

The struggle against the military danger concerns the fate of each people, however far away from the direct centers of conflict it may be. The antiwar movement cannot be limited to the framework of this region or continent or the other, for nuclear war cannot be "limited"--such was the thinking of W. Goodluck, deputy chairman of the Nigerian Socialist Workers' Party Central Committee, which essentially expressed the general opinion.

It was not only Europeans who spoke of the threat hanging over Europe; the participants in the meeting expressed a common concern, pointing to centers of tension and military conflicts in the most varied regions of the world. And this is natural. Bearing in mind, the most urgent, practical tasks of the struggle, the communists are keeping a constant watch on imperialism's entire global strategy and all its components. In this connection, they invariably pay paramount attention to the need to liquidate the centers of tension and conflicts.

In maintaining and creating such "flashpoints", imperialism has always pursued the interconnected goals of whipping up the threat of war and suppressing the liberation struggle of the peoples as a whole. Today, however, the imperialist practice of "provoking crises" has not only assumed expanded proportions, but is also manifesting a tendency to spread to all the main regions of the world.

This characteristic, and to a certain extent, new singularity of the world situation was the subject of the close attention of the participants in

the Prague meeting. Their speeches clearly showed, first, the communists' complete realization of the significance of this change and, second, their firm conviction that to this danger, it is necessary and possible to counterpose the force of anti-imperialist solidarity. "We require a strengthening of international solidarity in order," an Egyptian communist said, "to confront the threat of universal annihilation."

These issues occupied a key place in the Prague discussion, both because inter alia, the problems of anti-imperialist solidarity are an organic area of the journal's work and because vanguard revolutionary-democratic parties appeared as equal participants in the meeting itself.

It was they who emphasized the danger and harm of attempts, albeit ultimately hopeless, to separate the national liberation movement from the general struggle for peace and international security. The fraudulent ideas that detente is virtually the narrow mercenary concern of the "great powers" and will in no way go beyond the framework of the relations of the confrontational blocs are encountering a rebuff in the ranks of this movement itself, primarily on the part of its progressive vanguard forces and the revolutionary-democratic parties.

A striking corroboration of this fighting internationalist position was the October 1980 Berlin conference initiated by the SED and PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM. It testified to an emphatic shift in the national liberation movement's position in favor of detente and a new step along the path of the stimulation of its participation in the world struggle for peace and social progress and the solution of the questions determining the fate of all mankind. The conviction was expressed at the Berlin conference that peace and the policy of detente are conducive to the struggle for the vital interests of all peoples. This is indicated graphically by the very experience of the national liberation movement of the 1970's and its historic conquests. And at the same time, it is precisely the national liberation movement, the Berlin conference observed, that has experienced particularly keenly, the imperative logic of the interconnection of the struggle for peace and social progress, which demands the emphatic and consistent repulse of the aggressive and neo-colonialist propensities of imperialism.

The speeches of the participants in the Prague meeting also enable us to see how far the process of the strengthening of the anti-imperialist front's solidarity has advanced and to what extent the world-international nature of their interaction has expanded and the social, political and ideological foundations of relations between the communists and revolutionary democrats have deepened.

The call for effective, combat and immediate solidarity with the peoples currently under direct attack from imperialism and its accomplices in Central America and the Caribbean, in the Near and Middle East, in

southern Africa and in the Horn of Africa and in South and Southeast Asia was heard in full voice at the Prague meeting. The fact that this position was specified in detail by an exposition of the practical measures and steps which are already being implemented and taken in support of these peoples is very important. A number of speeches provided serious political and ideological-theoretical justification for the solidarity with them and presented it as a conclusion from an in-depth analysis of the situation in the country, region and the international arena as a whole.

It was primarily a question of the fact that the immediate, direct goal of imperialism's antisocialist strategy is to prevent a single people from achieving national or social liberation. Imperialism has put all resources accessible to it at the service of this antipopular goal, but recently has once again placed special hopes in force or, more precisely, forcible methods, including armed intervention, threats, provocations and terror even. It is no longer content solely to weaken the progressive, liberation movements by the burden of militarism which it is persistently imposing. After all, for the vast majority of countries, and the young developing countries particularly, this increasing burden signifies not only a brake on economic development; its political effect means a threat to national sovereignty, the kindling of discord between countries and internecine conflicts and a general increase in dependence on imperialism and, within the country, the suppression of democratic trends and the implantation of repressive regimes.

The burden of militarism means ultimately the preservation of the social backwardness of the emergent countries and those fighting for freedom and, sometimes, their regression even; it means an onslaught against the social gains of the working class and all working people in the capitalist world. This is why, inter alia, anti-imperialist solidarity today is also irreversibly acquiring a clear-cut antiwar nature.

Revealing the connection between the liberation struggle and the struggle for peace, the participants in the meeting showed that this connection has deep social roots. It is manifested most clearly and fully in the policy of world socialism. It is appearing increasingly strikingly in the struggle of the working class of the developed capitalist countries. And this also applies fully to the national liberation movement, which is manifesting its anticapitalist content increasingly distinctly.

The circle of questions, which represent, as M. Rahman, secretary of the Bangladesh Communist Party Central Committee, put it, "new pages in the theory of scientific socialism," was the subject of many speakers' detailed discussion. Tracing the dialectics of social progress in the developing countries, they spoke of the difficulties and contradictions and objective and subjective difficulties on this path, the pressure of imperialism and petit bourgeois vacillation, an expression of which is the essentially national-reformist ideology and the practice of so-called "third worldism."

But despite all this, there exists an overall, historically conditioned thrust of the struggle for national liberation and its ultimate goal is socialism. Dao Duy Tung, member of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee, and delegation leader, termed this organic connection a "present-day truth". And this conclusion, he observed, is based not only on Vietnam's victorious experience: "the question of the correlation of national independence and socialism has found its solution in a dozen revolutions." The collation of such experience, he concluded, in PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM also would be a considerable contribution to the peoples' revolutionary struggle.

Developing the idea of anti-imperialist solidarity, the participants in the meeting imparted special significance to ensuring that the objective processes at the basis thereof be strengthened and accelerated by the effect of the subjective factor, that is, primarily by the activity of the revolutionary parties themselves and their capacity for leading the liberation struggle in their countries and organically linking it with common, international anti-imperialist tasks. The Prague meeting expressed a profound belief in the force of solidarity and a conviction that the paths of a solution of the problems of the struggle against imperialism and for peace, democracy and socialism cannot run in opposite and mutually exclusive directions.

Antiwar solidarity is an objective command of our historical era which ensues from the laws of the class struggle and world social development. Antiwar solidarity is today the ideological platform which is recognized and accepted by the broadest masses of fighters. Antiwar solidarity is an urgent political demand of the day dictated by imperialism's actions, which are a threat to mankind.

"The communists have always been the defenders of the interests of the working class and all working people and their vanguard," B.N. Ponomarev said. "They remain such. But in our day, the communists are also fighters for the salvation of all mankind from nuclear catastrophe. And they are actively performing this historic mission."

"The firm resolve to rebuff the policy of imperialism and the confidence that it can be defeated have been heard in the speeches," D. Naame, member of the Syrian Communist Party Politburo, who chaired the final session, summed up the discussion. "The meeting has confirmed that for us communists, there is no more important question than that of how to preserve peace and prevent the destruction of our planet. We have expressed an unbending will to strengthen the cause of peace with joint efforts and march in the vanguard of the fighters therefor."

The idea that in the question of war and peace, the communists are obliged in the present dangerous situation to operate responsibly and cohesively

and to wage an unflagging purposeful struggle for the consolidation of the unity of the communist movement was heard as forcefully as could be at the meeting.

Everyone who holds man's happiness dear should clearly understand, it was said in Prague, that peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism will have no future if the communists fail to consistently defend the unity of the international communist movement. Strengthening its cohesion is a duty to the working people and the oppressed masses throughout the world. Strictly speaking, if it is possible to express in literally two words, the entire wealth of considerations and recommendations shared by the representatives of the fraternal parties, these words are, of course, "peace" and "unity".

The speeches heard at the Prague forum painted a broad and exceptionally striking picture of the life and struggle of the international communist movement. It is precisely here that the extraordinary scale, complexity and diversity of the present-day world revolutionary process are most vividly reflected. "Geographically", it embraces practically all countries. Socially, it embraces the most diverse class and political forces and the broadest people's masses. In the sphere of the forms and methods of struggle it is demonstrating an unprecedented diversity of national specifics.

Objectively analyzing relations among the fraternal parties, the speakers pointed to the considerable differences in the conditions of their work, in the actual situation and political possibilities and in the immediate tasks confronting them. It was observed that these differences sometimes also give rise to a nonconcurrence of evaluations and approaches to this question or the other and divergence of viewpoint and prompt debate between parties.

"Under the extremely diverse and complex conditions in which the communists have to work in various countries," S.G. Sardesai, member of the Indian Communist Party National Council, said, "it is natural that differences of opinion arise. Up to a certain limit, this reflects the fact that our movement is full of health and vitality and that it is taking deep root in the popular milieu. But at the same time, disagreements should be overcome....While defending its own viewpoint, each party should remember that unity of action is essential for the achievement of our goal....We must always endeavor to reach common solutions by way of mutual comradely concessions....This also means striving for harmony. History will not forgive us if we identify harmony with obstructionism and intolerance."

The need to comprehend the complex and rapidly changing world situation and discuss the urgent tasks of the struggle for peace and social progress, the participants in the meeting observed, is prompting the fraternal parties to collective efforts, the active comparison of views and the development of common positions.

"Of course," B.N. Ponomarev said, "this needs to be done on a high-minded, comradely basis. And matters must not be portrayed such that criticism in one direction is a manifestation of independence, a creative approach and innovation, while criticism elsewhere, in a reverse direction, so to speak, is a manifestation of dogmatism, bigotry and interference in others' affairs. Such a portrayal is hardly compatible with the generally accepted standards of relations between parties and hardly contributes to their interaction."

The new--numerous and complex--problems of the modern world, particularly problems connected with the quest for paths and forms of the struggle for socialism under the conditions of the most varied capitalist societies, cannot be solved without theoretical boldness, without innovation and without "experiments" even. But "experiments" in the sphere of theory and political strategy may be successful only on a high-minded basis of scientific socialism. Otherwise not only will they not achieve the set goals, but will produce a negative effect. The encroachments on the principle of proletarian internationalism, which went as far as to counterpose the working class of the capitalist countries to the socialist countries, fell into the category of such "costs," in particular. Many speakers stressed that the emphasis of disagreements with the Soviet Union and, even less, attacks on real socialism are not a suitable method of demonstrating the independence of one's positions. We categorically reject the assertion, A. Dansoko, deputy secretary general of Senegal's Party of Independence and Labor Central Committee, declared, that a party is independent only when its viewpoint is not shared by others.

It is a generally known fact that imperialist propaganda accentuates, exaggerates and distorts the nature of disagreements between communists in every possible way and attempts to influence the course of debates in the communist movement. Everything is done here to veil the main reason for which the debate is being held--consolidation of cohesion and unity of action. The proposals that the journal assign the main place to the differences in views among the parties was not supported for this reason. The journal is a platform of the struggle against imperialism and for peace and socialism and an instrument of the unity and not of the mutual criticism of the communist parties and the kindling of disagreements. Such was the common denominator of the opinions on this score.

The communists have to rally their ranks universally when imperialism is spreading aggressive intrigues throughout the world and actively coordinating its efforts at the interstate, interparty, propaganda and other levels. In this connection, the representatives of many fraternal parties raised the question of the expediency of the convening of a new international conference of communist and workers' parties with the agenda of the communists' role in defense of peace.

This question was illustrated thoroughly in the speech of V. Bilak, member of the Presidium and secretary of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak

Communist Party. The struggle for peace, he said, is the acknowledged concern of the entire communist movement. The significance of the coordination of the fraternal parties' actions on these questions, particularly of the joint struggle against imperialism and for peace and social progress, was emphasized in the recent period by a whole number of regional meetings of the fraternal parties.

As M. Ozhekhovskiy, secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party Central Committee, declared, Polish communists support the idea of the convening of a new conference, being convinced that it could contribute to the strengthening of the fraternal parties' international unity and the accomplishment of common tasks of the struggle for peace and social progress.

S. Walsh, member of the Canadian Communist Party Central Executive Committee and chairman of the Quebec Communist Party, recalled the appeal of the Canadian Communist Party Central Committee for the convening of an international conference which was sent to the fraternal parties in June 1981. The appeal says that the communist parties must coordinate their efforts in the struggle to prevent nuclear war and win a just and lasting peace. Such coordination, the Canadian comrades believe, should be concentrated around the following demands: save peace, save detente, prevent a nuclear catastrophe!

The participants in the Prague meeting said that the convening of a conference is a matter of comradely understanding based on bilateral and multilateral consultations among the fraternal parties and that participation therein is a matter of the voluntary decision of each of them. It would hardly be possible for anyone to claim a "right to veto" here. It was also said that the consent of absolutely all parties would evidently not be required for the convening of a conference, although, of course, as broad a representation thereof as possible would be desirable.

The participants in the Prague meeting observed that the idea of the convening of a communist conference can in no way be counterposed to this form or the other of communists' contacts and cooperation with other political and public forces, particularly to meetings and cooperation of a different kind on a broader basis and of a broader political composition. The one is not only compatible, but also preferable, together with the other.

Today's tasks of the struggle for peace and the communists' role therein and questions of the cohesion of the communists' ranks and antiwar anti-imperialist solidarity were examined at the Prague meeting, as mentioned at the outset, through the prism of the work of the journal PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM. It was primarily a question of the fact that the journal is a spokesman for and effective weapon of the communists in the struggle for peace and against the aggressive and exploitationist policy

of imperialism. Many comrades spoke in this connection of the need for a cogent and convincing explanation of whence the danger of war emanates and what needs to be done to avert it and a demonstration in greater depth of the significance of the Soviet Peace Program for the 1980's and the peace initiatives of the socialist community countries. The task of fully revealing the international significance of the historic achievements of real socialism and comprehensively illustrating the complex problems of the building and refinement of the developed socialist society is inseparably connected with this field of work.

In illustrating these issues, the journal is called on to continue to perform its honorable role--serving the cause of communist, revolutionary-liberation and anti-imperialist unity. The participants in the Prague meeting pointed out that the journal's significance is palpably manifested in the contribution which it is making to the ideological struggle, concentrating on burning issues and not avoiding new and complex ideological-political phenomena. They noted the journal's endeavor to afford authors from as large a circle of parties as possible conditions for raising and illustrating pertinent theoretical questions and propaganda of the ideas of scientific communism with reference to the current stage of world development in their concrete juxtaposition with the relevant experience of the class struggle under way in the world taken in the richest diversity of its concrete conditions. Thanks to the enormous amount of systematic and reliable information on the burning issues of international life, many participants in the conference said, the journal serves as a valuable instrument of the exchange of experience and its collation at the national, regional and international levels.

It was not a question of praise, of course. The participants in the discussion endeavored to reveal and enhance the journal's concrete efficacy in the life of the communist movement. And every practical detail and even the smallest particles of real experience are important here.

In confirmation of this, we will cite just a few examples. Thus, the representative of the German Communist Party, which operates, as is known, in a citadel of modern capitalism, emphasized that "the journal is enjoying an increasingly big response primarily because it is a joint journal of the communist and workers' parties reflecting the experience of the communist movement and also the three main revolutionary streams and, in addition, the world movement of fighters for peace, disarmament and detente." The representative of the Argentine Communist Party drew attention to the fact that "for countries so far away as ours, the journal is of fundamental significance for it enables us to be and feel ourselves an integral part of the world communist movement." This thought was shared by many of the speakers. Mention was also made of the journal's special significance for small parties, whose participation in its work emphasizes the international meaning and scale of their activity, for parties operating underground, for parties which lack their own press



and essentially, for every party inasmuch as the journal serves at times as an irreplaceable source of information on the theoretical and practical activity of the fraternal parties and a voice of truth about events in their own countries, a voice which is heard in spite of the domination of the bourgeois propaganda media. It frequently performs, as a Haitian communist, in particular, emphasized, the role of a tribune from which the call for solidarity with the revolutionary fighters of this specific country or the other is heard. The idea of the journal's growing responsibility for the content and range of coverage of events and the intelligibility of exposition in connection with the fact that its readership is not confined to communist activists and that it is increasingly incorporating broad nonparty circles, fighters for national liberation and participants in diverse democratic movements and the antiwar movement with the entire gamut of interests and forces represented therein calls attention to itself. The journal must find its place in winning the "man in the street" over to the side of the progressive fighters and take account of his understanding of urgent current problems.

The journal should, the participants in the meeting believe, constantly involve itself with problems the development of which is needed in the parties' day-to-day work, contributing to the advancement of the communists' general international cause.

The Prague meeting confirmed the right direction of the journal's work and outlined its concrete reference points with respect to the current moment. It testified to the parties' broad harmony on the question of the journal's tasks and the opinion that it is performing them successfully, as a whole. Having discussed the results of the conference, many parties adopted special decrees in support of this international publication, intending to contribute to an improvement in the journal and stimulate their participation in it. The collective opinion of the parties is that the critical remarks, wishes and evaluations expressed in the course of the meeting impart new impetus to the journal for an improvement in all its activity.

Major, fundamental problems of world politics were touched on in the course of the meeting. It reflected the tremendous political and ideological-theoretical potential of the communist movement and demonstrated the even closer rapprochement therewith of the revolutionary-democratic parties--the leading force of the national liberation struggle.

"The Prague conference," the CPSU Central Committee document says, "confirmed communists' understanding of the significance of their active joint struggle for peace, social progress and socialism."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

CSO: 1802/8

ON A SLIPPERY ROAD; CONCERNING RECENT STATEMENTS BY THE LEADERSHIP  
OF THE ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 94-103

[Text] Humanity is today witness to frenzied attacks by imperialism against the forces of peace and socialism, the national liberation movement and the communist and workers' parties. Trying to take social revenge for the numerous defeats it has suffered in recent years, imperialism, and primarily American imperialism, is bent on building up its military strength and upsetting the military-strategic balance between the Soviet Union and the United States and between the defensive Warsaw Pact and NATO. Military headquarters of NATO powers are hatching war plans against the socialist countries, entire regions of the world are proclaimed spheres of U. S. "vital interests," and threats are levelled at Cuba, Nicaragua, Libya, Angola and other countries that have broken with the capitalist system. Ever new rounds are mounted in the arms race, spending on which has reached astronomic proportions. Suffice it to say that the military budget of the United States alone for the coming year exceeds \$200 billion. All this leads to unprecedented aggravation of the already complicated international situation.

Challenge after challenge is hurled at the most elementary standards of international law and interstate relations. Attempts are made to exert crude pressure on the socialist countries, to interfere in their affairs, and open threats combined with blackmail and economic pressure are resorted to. This aggravates the world situation still more.

The present international situation is causing grave concern among millions of people. Many representatives of the most widely different sections of the population that formerly held aloof from international politics today realize whence the threat to peace emanates. Actions in defense of peace and against policies projected at the arms race, at a confrontation that could lead to a world nuclear catastrophe, are steadily growing in breadth and impact.

Not long ago the world was the witness of unprecedented mass demonstrations of hundreds of thousands of people in West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Britain, Portugal and other West European countries who came out into the streets to declare a resolute No to the adventurist policy of imperialism fraught with the danger of nuclear war.

In the vanguard of the struggle for peace, for the reduction of international tension, for the settlement of disputed issues through negotiation are, as always, the communists. No few examples could be cited of the resolute activity of the fraternal communist parties of Western Europe, Latin America and other continents to defend in their countries the noble cause of peace and international security of the peoples. They offer conclusive evidence of the decisive significance for the cause of peace of the peaceable foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, of the outstanding contribution made by the CPSU, its Central Committee, and its general secretary and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Comrade Leonid Brezhnev, who have put forward numerous exceptionally important foreign policy initiatives aimed at improving the international climate.

A sharply discordant note in this context has been struck by some pronouncements of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party. Not long ago it published a statement in connection with the events in Poland and then convened a special plenary meeting of the party's Central Committee which heard a report presented by Comrade Berlinguer. A number of articles in the same key have been published in L'UNITA.

At the CC plenum the world situation and the domestic and foreign policy of the CPSU were presented as if in a crooked mirror. ICP leaders had repeatedly declared that the paramount issue of the time, the precondition of the further advance of humanity, is the preservation and strengthening of peace. But now they issue documents that belittle real, existing socialism, the socialist community, which is the principal material and political bulwark of world peace, the most important bastion standing in the way of imperialist machinations, of all attempts to halt and reverse social progress everywhere in the world.

Although the ICP leaders drop a phrase or two to the effect that they are far from ignoring the international role of the USSR, they promptly go on to declare that "in other respects" the policy of the USSR runs counter to the interests of the peoples. The newspaper L'UNITA, the central organ of the ICP, in an editorial published on 15 December 1981, directly counterposed the Soviet Union's security interests to the interests of the peoples of the socialist countries of Eastern Europe, and Comrade Berlinguer in his report at the plenum linked the retardation of detente and its limitations with nothing more nor less than the Soviet Union's striving to "protect its spheres of influence."

Such a stand, remote from an objective and communist, class assessment of events, and even more so from proletarian internationalism, has a sad history. The point is that for some time now the leaders of the ICP have, in defiance of the facts and contrary to the traditional assessments and analyses of the Italian Communist Party itself, viewed and assessed the foreign policy of the USSR and world politics in general, through the totally false prism of "bloc politics." This formula in effect places on the same plane NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union and the United States, ascribing to them identical intentions and an identical policy. This approach ignores the most important thing-- the content and class essence of the foreign policy of the states, including the peace-loving and progressive character of the activity of the socialist countries in the international arena.

Such an approach does the ICP leaders a poor service. In words they declare that social and political changes in the life of peoples must not be sacrificed to "bloc interests." At the same time they have the temerity to come out against actions of the USSR which serve, and always have served, as a guarantee against the export of counterrevolution, against the crude attempts of the imperialist bloc to upset the world balance of force in their own favor and to reverse the process of social and political change in the life of the peoples.

No, world politics do not fit into the abstract "supraclass" pattern of such disquisitions. This fiction essentially rules out objective, fair assessments of the international role of the Soviet Union and the entire community of socialist states. In pursuing its policy in the world arena the Soviet Union closely cooperates with other socialist countries. The socialist community jointly resolves problems relating to their own security and defense of world peace, proceeding, as in all other cases, from the principles of equality, mutual assistance and cooperation--principles of which the substance is socialist internationalism. And the fraternal countries and our friends everywhere in the world emphasize the fact that the Soviet Union bears the main burden of safeguarding the security of the entire socialist community against the imperialist threat, is for all freedom-loving peoples the mainstay of their achievements and the source of inspiration in their advance along the highroad of freedom and progress.

It is doubtful that the ICP leadership was unaware of this or did not understand it. It is clear not only to the communists, but to many other progressive and democratic circles that today's imperialist bourgeoisie would inevitably carry the class struggle to the point of universal rampage of the most barbarous reaction were there no such "counterweight" to imperialism as the Soviet Union and its socialist allies. As sad as it is, the fact remains that by its "non-bloc" approach to international affairs the leadership of the ICP in effect brings grist to the mill of one bloc--the imperialist bloc.

In the latest statements of the ICP leadership and also at the plenum the overall attitude towards the countries of the socialist community and the Soviet Union as a socialist country was subjected to revision. Things went so far that comrades Napolitano, Ingrao and other members of the ICP leadership actually questioned the existence of socialism in the USSR.

The pretext chosen for this was the events in Poland. But irrespective of the Polish events the leadership of the Italian Communist Party has long steered a course away from Marxism-Leninism and towards transition to positions alien and harmful to the cause of socialism and peace. Now, on the pretext of evaluating the Polish crisis, the ICP Central Committee plenum brought to its culmination the tendency which could be discerned already in earlier documents and statements of the ICP leadership: to come out against the socialist countries to denigrate the great historical victories of the CPSU, the Soviet people and the peoples of other countries of the socialist community.

The authors of the statement of the leadership of the ICP, the main speaker at the Central Committee plenum, and even more so, some of the other speakers at

the plenum (Giorgio Napolitano, Pietro Ingrao, Emanuele Macaluso and others) made crude attacks on the USSR and other countries of the socialist community. To what lengths did they not go! Contrary to the facts and the opinion of the overwhelming majority of communists of all countries, these speakers alleged that socialism had lost its motive force and ceased to develop. ICP leaders went so far as to adopt the vocabulary used by the enemies of socialism and the Soviet Union and to talk about the "degeneration" of the countries of the socialist community.

In advancing such contentions, they, like so many anticommunists of every hue, refuse to see that it is precisely the system existing in these countries that first gave living embodiment to the ideas of the great theoreticians of socialism and the age-old dream of the working people.

Working people the world over know full well that it was precisely the victory of the socialist revolution in the USSR and later in a number of other countries that resulted in the establishment of a society free of exploitation, emancipated labor, and thereby ensured real freedom for the development of the individual. Can the same be said of Italy and other capitalist countries that vaunt their "democracy" if in them the exploitation of the millions of working people by the small upper crust of propertied classes battenning on other people's labor remains the foundation of the entire life of society?

Can it be denied that victorious socialism--and it alone gave man the most important things, the right to work, freedom from poverty and from unemployment--has ensured an unprecedented upswing of the vital forces and talents of the people, and protects man against the aggressive designs of imperialism?

Can it be denied that victorious socialism for the first time in history replaced the power of the exploiters with the power of working men, that is, the broadest democracy for the masses? Needless to say, this democracy, both as regards its essence and the forms in which it is manifested, goes far beyond the bounds and stereotypes of bourgeois democracy. It is precisely socialist democracy, its material fruits, all that it has given the working man, that have ushered in a new epoch in modern history!

And what of today? Today the countries of the socialist community are continuing their forward movement. This applies to the economy and to social and cultural life. And it naturally applies also to socialist democracy.

The forms and methods of the practical realization of democracy--the essence of which consists not in abstract criticism for the sake of criticism or in sterile play at opposition, but in ever wider participation of the working people in the day-to-day administration of the affairs of society and the state, in their genuine political and social freedom--are being constantly perfected in the socialist countries.

"There is not a single major issue of domestic or foreign policy in the discussion of which working people do not take the most active, direct part," Hero of Socialist Labor A. Y. Kolesnikov, a team leader at the Molodogvardelskaya

colliery of the Krasnodonugol association in Voroshilovgradskaya Oblast, said in his speech at the 26th CPSU Congress. "The working class has always played an important role in the administration of the affairs of the country and society. That role has grown especially since the adoption of the new constitution. In our sphere of endeavor, as in any other, tens of thousands of workers are elected to party committees, soviets of people's deputies, trade union and Komsomol, people's control and other public bodies. The steadily rising political and cultural level of the working class enables it to direct the affairs of society, to be the true master of the country."

It should be noted that in recent years there has indeed been a significant activation both of the entire system of Soviet representative democracy (that is, the organs of people's power exercised through representatives elected by the population) and of the system of direct democracy (that is, the direct participation of the masses in the exercise of one or another function of power). In recent years there have been in the Soviet Union, for instance, nationwide discussions of the drafts of the new constitution, the Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development in 1981-85 and Through 1990, a number of laws and plans for the further development of the economy. This is truly examination by the whole people of the policy of the party and the state and the prospects and avenues of building communism. A constant creative search goes on for more effective methods and forms of planning and management of the economy. Anti-social phenomena are subjected to sharp criticism in the mass media and in working collectives. All this is unquestionably a pledge of further progress, testimony to the broad participation of the masses in the administration of the state.

At the same time the socialist state of course does not propose to give a free hand to those who, ignoring and violating socialist legality, aided and abetted from without, seek to undermine the socialist system, that principal guarantee of the rights and freedoms of the popular masses. In doing so socialism does not violate the principles of democracy and human rights; on the contrary it ensures their genuine observance.

Difficulties and shortcomings too are encountered in socialist countries. This is understandable. For the problems and tasks facing them are those of the trail blazers of previously unexplored paths. Besides, not all "birthmarks" of capitalism have disappeared from the thinking and psychology of people. An adverse effect on the socialist economy is also had by the arms race being stepped up by imperialism and by its efforts to shift the burden of the crisis racking capitalist economy onto the shoulders of socialism. The difficulties and shortcomings in socialist countries are discussed openly at party congresses and day in and day out in the press, at meetings, etc. And, what is most important, this is being done to rectify the shortcomings and to overcome the difficulties. All this in the interests of the people. To make it appear as if these difficulties sprang from the very nature of the political and economic system of the socialist countries, as the leadership of the ICP does, is to turn things on their head. Bourgeois propaganda has long been doing this. Now representatives of the leadership of the ICP have taken the same path.

Nor should it be forgotten that one of the causes--and not the least important--of the difficulties in the life of some socialist countries is the active subversion conducted by the class enemy. It would of course be good if there were no such things as imperialist interference and constant subversive activity against socialism. It would be simpler if these forces did not cover up their activity with fine-sounding slogans calculated to appeal to certain individuals susceptible to propaganda of this order. But, regrettably, all this happens in real life. The class struggle goes on incessantly in the international arena. And this being so, not only every communist, but every sincere opponent of imperialism and war should clearly define his place in the struggle.

Regrettably, it must be noted that the ICP leadership is defining its place in a way that in effect puts it in the same camp with the forces fighting against socialism. This is indeed to be regretted.

Another shopworn accusation levelled against our party in diverse ways in documents of the ICP leadership is the allegation that the CPSU is imposing its "model" of socialism on others.

The CPSU resolutely rejects this thesis, as indeed the very concept of "models." There is no Soviet "model." There is Soviet experience which contains, as the entire communist movement holds, universal features and specific national features, just as does the experience of any other socialist country.

It is perfectly clear that all these countries--be it Hungary or Cuba, Yugoslavia or Mongolia, Vietnam or Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria or Poland--carried out their revolutions in their own specific forms. The national specifics were manifest also at the next stage--that of building and consolidating socialist society, the construction of socialism.

It will be recalled that the 26th CPSU Congress once again forcefully confirmed our party's conviction that every revolutionary party has an inalienable right to choose the avenues and forms of struggle for socialism and social construction at will. "Some time ago the leaderships of a few communist parties," Leonid Brezhnev said at the congress, "put up an energetic defense of the right to specifically national ways and forms of struggle for socialism, and of building socialism. But if you look at this without prejudice, you will see that no one is imposing any stereotypes or patterns that ignore the distinctions of any country." Yet the Italian comrades pretend not to be aware of this fundamental principle of the CPSU and are breaking through an open door with their call for "new solutions."

The leaders of the ICP say they want to build "their own socialism" which would be better and more perfect than that existing in other countries. Well, the Soviet communists, and surely many others, can only say that that is up to you, we wish you success. But they will never consider it right and proper to try, as the CPSU leaders do, to justify a future blueprint of socialism not by serious new thinking attuned to the specific features of Italy, but by abstract disquisitions about democracy and unsubstantiated contentions that the already existing socialist societies "have no future." Those societies are developing dynamically

and their historical experience and living practice to a tremendous extent determined and determine now the face of the present-day world.

The Italian comrades present in a false light also the practice of world socialism. Yet this practice is the building of a society unprecedented in history and the most fruitful source of the enrichment of the ideas of scientific socialism, the source of the unwaning vitality of these ideas. One must deliberately close one's eyes to the vast world represented by the concept of real socialism, to its wealth of practical experience, not to see the living, dialectical link with the Marxist-Leninist theory.

To all practical purposes the new unknown "model" of socialism which the leaders of the ICP obviously wish to impose on other communist parties and countries as well has been conceived for the sole purpose of denigrating and defaming the socialism that has actually existed for more than half a century. This conclusion follows from the position taken by the Italian leaders in regard to scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism, which was spoken of at the plenum with extreme disdain as of some collection of dogmatic, fossilized tenets.

Such statements and such unsubstantiated sallies against the scientific world outlook and theoretical weapon of the communists of the whole world can only disorient fighters for socialism. Such an approach distorts the role Marxist-Leninist theory, its ideas which have captured the minds of the millions and become the greatest revolutionizing force, have played, are playing now and are bound to play in the future in the revolutionary transformation of the world. Among the many other revolutionaries of our epoch who recognized this great revolutionizing force of Marxism-Leninism, Antonio Gramsci, the founder of the Italian Communist Party, wrote vividly and convincingly of this and proceeded from this in his revolutionary activity.

Lastly, it should be borne in mind that ideology is the concentrated expression of the class essence of one or another social practice, and hence any weakening of the communists' ideological positions means relinquishing their class positions.

It must also be frankly said that against the background of the persistent pronouncements of the Italian comrades concerning the alleged attempts made by the Soviet Union to impose a "single model" of socialism on other countries, a particularly strange note is struck by the claim they lay to the role of mentors prescribing for the parties building socialism the pattern they should follow; to the role of supreme judges of other people's experience, and to categorical judgements running counter to the assessments of the parties whose activities they judge; to the "right" to pin insulting labels and, above all, to impose on others in the final analysis their own concept (if you wish, "model") of socialism.

On what grounds? The well-nigh messianic ambitions of the leaders of the ICP essentially boil down to the old social-democratic idea of "Eurocentrism," which they have, moreover, confined to the framework of Western Europe. True, they repeatedly aver in their statements that socialism is an "open process," a



"historical movement which develops on worldwide scale," and so on. But the unprecedented multiformity, diversity, true universality and depth of the contemporary revolutionary process, and the inseverable link between its components, remain at best the background, something ancillary to the performance of the main mission ascribed by the ICP leaders to the West European "new socialism."

It remains to be added that even in the framework of such truncated "universality" of the revolutionary process they find no place for the countries that have already built socialism; according to this pattern it remains for the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community merely to adapt themselves to the "renewal" Western Europe will someday bring about.

It goes without saying that the CPSU, which has no intention of giving pointers to other parties, has resolutely rejected and rejects now all such designs, wherever they may originate.

Life does not tolerate either sterile schemata or speculative doctrinaire thinking. And if today the communist parties of a number of developed capitalist countries proceed from the perspective of socialist reconstruction by means of relatively peaceful and democratic political struggle, the opening of this possibility, as the communists of these countries, including the Italian communists, have repeatedly stressed, can be traced to the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, the socialist changes that have taken place in other countries, and the fact that in our time there already exists a firmly established socialist world. The indispensable international precondition of the realization of this possibility is the might of world socialism, the peaceable and internationalist foreign policy of the socialist countries.

The leaders of the ICP, to use their formulation, propose "to open a new phase in the struggle for peace and socialism." But implicit in their present concept is the serious danger that, under cover of this slogan, they will turn against those forces which in reality are waging a struggle for peace and socialism, and not against those from whom the threat to peace and the cause of social progress emanates. This is a very slippery path.

The erroneousness and harmfulness of the latest ICP documents are compounded by the fact that the party's leaders have published them, as has already been said above, at the height of a vicious political, economic and ideological campaign mounted by the aggressive quarters of imperialism headed by the United States precisely against real, existing socialism.

The aims of this campaign are plain to see.

The object is, first, to torpedo detente and revive the cold war, and in this climate, with the clamor about the "fight for freedom in Poland" as the cover, to halt the process of social change, put a brake on the liberation movement of the peoples, on their striving for independence and social progress, and restore and consolidate the former domination and unchallenged overlordship of imperialism everywhere in the world--in Africa, in Asia and in Latin America. Second, to

try to discredit and weaken the socialist world and the policy of the ruling communist parties, primarily the CPSU, and to depict communism and its ideology and practice as bankrupt. The same objective is pursued by the imperialists in their frenzied efforts to prevent the situation in Poland from being stabilized, to frustrate the efforts to overcome the crisis situation, and, if possible, to restore that situation.

It must also be noted that the clearer it becomes that people's Poland is more and more confidently overcoming the crisis phenomena, the sharper and more brazen this campaign becomes. As a result of the introduction of martial law, which was an action taken by the sovereign state authority of the Polish People's Republic, the situation in the country is returning to normal. This applies to the economy, which for the first time in a year and a half is beginning to regain its working rhythm. It applies to the sociopolitical atmosphere which is becoming more businesslike as it is rid of incessant confrontations. And it applies to the PZPR, which has become notably more active and the principled policy of which is winning ever greater support.

The class enemy is beside himself because the socialist state in Poland has begun consistently and firmly to perform its function of safeguarding the socialist gains of the Polish working people against the counterrevolutionary subversive activity of the internal and external enemies of socialism.

The leadership of the Italian Communist Party, however, apparently has not grasped these facts. The above-mentioned ICP documents make it plain that the leadership of the ICP is opposed to the steps taken by the Polish government, and primarily to the introduction of martial law; it has in effect sided with the opposition, antisocialist forces, which it has declared to be the leading forces in the "democratic renewal of socialism" in Poland.

Needless to say, we do not consider ourselves entitled, as the Italian comrades do, to tell the PZPR what conclusions it should draw from its own history and what it should do in order completely to overcome the present crisis. That is the internal affair of the Polish people and the Polish communists, and of them alone.

In mid-December 1981 the Polish communists and the Polish leadership arrived at the conclusion that there was no other way out but to proclaim martial law if the criminal counterrevolutionary anarchy was to be stopped and economic collapse and the threat of real hunger forestalled.

In an address to the Polish people Comrade Wojciech Jaruzelski said: "What was said in Radom and the session in Gdansk completely exposed the real intentions of the leading circles of Solidarity. Massive evidence of these intentions is provided by day-to-day practice, the growing aggressiveness of the extremists, the obvious striving totally to destroy Poland's socialist statehood.... The continuation of this state of affairs would lead to inevitable catastrophe, to total chaos, want and hunger.... In this situation inactivity would be a crime against the people.... The adventurers' hands must be tied before they impel the country into the abyss of fratricidal struggle."

The program adopted by the Gdansk congress of Solidarity was plainly a demonstration of strength before the state authorities and also before the socio-political organizations which had not subordinated themselves to Solidarity. For the first time the congress declared that Solidarity was not so much a trade union as a political opposition movement. This was followed by attacks on party bodies and attempts to oust them from the enterprises. Preparations began for the formation of armed detachments of Solidarity. The plan was for the "militants" to be brought out into the streets of Warsaw on December 17. And the extensive propaganda and ideological machine set up by Solidarity and its anti-socialist advisers with the strong support of Western well-wishers began vociferously to eulogize the policy of the Poland of the bourgeoisie and the landlords, including its fascist-minded dictator Pilsudski!

The antisocialist forces, plunging the country in chaos, intended to use Solidarity as a battering ram to destroy the political and economic structure of the Polish people's state. All these facts speak for themselves.

However, the class approach to the events in Poland is totally alien to the leadership of the ICP. It ignored the assessment of the situation given by the Polish leadership both before 13 December 1981, and after that date. The ICP leaders are unwilling to believe the lawfully elected leader of the PZPR and the Polish state and in effect are joining the transatlantic hawks in their lies and allegations.

Today it is nobody's secret (even the bourgeois press is full of comment on this score) that the West, and primarily the United States, has long and actively interfered in the internal affairs of Poland. It is common knowledge that the antisocialist forces in Poland have been given material assistance by Western sources, not to speak of the framing of the concept of "quiet" (and even not so quiet) counterrevolution itself, or of the concrete advice given as to how to give effect to it.

The ruling quarters of a number of capitalist countries, and first of all the United States, have cynically used their economic relations with the Polish People's Republic to exert political pressure on that country. In effect, the Reagan administration and those in other NATO countries who support its policy, have presented to the government of sovereign Poland an ultimatum: turn over power to the antisocialist forces, or we shall strangle you economically.

There is no doubt that the Polish counterrevolution acted in the interests of the imperialist reaction, as its direct stooge. Its purpose was to abolish the socialist state in Poland. The imperialist reactionaries associated with this hopes of being able to undermine the entire socialist community, to change the balance of strength in Europe and throughout the world. The threat these plans presented to the sovereignty of Poland, to world socialism, to the cause of peace, is obvious.

To create the necessary psychological climate and to deceive the public in their countries, the imperialist propaganda machine did its utmost to make it appear as if the Polish counterrevolution were a force upholding the ideals of

democracy, justice and civil liberties. And some people, including the leadership of the ICP, fell for the bait.

Both the statement of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party and the documents of the party's Central Committee plenum essentially ignore what really is taking place in Poland. The ICP leaders are opposed to the present measures to normalize the situation in that country and denounce the decision of the State Council of Poland which put an end to the counterrevolutionary threat. Facts relating to imperialist interference in the internal affairs of the Polish People's Republic are likewise totally ignored.

More, the ICP documents contain a highly dangerous thesis bordering on the renunciation of principles that are fundamental for communists--the thesis that the measures introduced by the government cannot be justified even by the necessity of saving the socialist system in the country. All this is said in the guise of defense of "democracy," but the call for democracy is only a cover for the actual renunciation of defense of socialist gains. How reminiscent this is of the advice given the Soviet communists by Kautsky and Co. in 1917-18!

In a form insulting to the Polish communists and patriots, the ICP leaders permit themselves peremptorily to criticize "violations of democracy" in Poland, although in reality democracy was violated a thousand times in the course of a year and a half by the extremist leadership of Solidarity. It is precisely the counterrevolutionary forces, the Solidarity ringleaders, whose antidemocratic actions led to the state of emergency. The ICP leadership is certainly familiar with the relevant facts. But it finds no place for them in its lengthy discourses on the Polish crisis, declaring that the crisis cannot be attributed to the maneuvers of reactionary forces hostile to socialism. On the contrary, the ICP leadership supports the line of the antiparty and antistate opposition in Poland and even "demands" complete freedom of action for it. Some "unjustified excesses" on the part of Solidarity were only mentioned in passing at the plenum. Systematic subversive actions of the counterrevolution are depicted as unimportant instances of immoderation, as "unrealistic demands." Moreover, in this case as well, in the face of all logic, the responsibility for the actions of the antisocialist forces is placed on the government and the PZPR.

But that is not all. Following the NATO leadership, the ICP leadership sees as the main "culprit" responsible for the Polish crisis none other than the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries.

Throughout the past 18 months bourgeois propaganda in the West has been persistently playing up the thesis of the threat of "outside interference" to Poland, having in mind the Soviet Union. One would think that the measures taken by the Polish leadership for normalizing the situation ought to have compelled all these "prophets" to keep quiet. But they contrive to present even this sovereign act of people's Poland as the result of some sort of "interference" on the part of the Soviet Union.

Amazing though it is, in casting aspersions on Soviet-Polish relations, leading figures in the ICP repeat almost word for word the inventions of Reagan, Weinberger, Haig, Brzezinski and other imperialist politicians.

It has to be stated that in holding forth on the theme of "pressure from without" on the Polish leadership, the ICP leaders have actually joined, in this respect as well, in the common stream of the West's antisocialist propaganda, which is doing grave harm to the cause of detente and the strengthening of peace.

If interference in Poland's internal affairs is to be spoken about at all, one can turn for examples to the materials of the plenum of the ICP Central Committee itself. Indeed, the "demands" for the release of the persons interned or arrested for resistance to the authorities, or pressure on a sovereign socialist state with the aim of forcing it to make concessions to the counter-revolutionary forces, can only be qualified as crude interference in the internal affairs of Poland. Incidentally, ICP leaders admitted at the plenum the fact of interference by the ICP and even boasted that the position of the ICP leadership on Poland was "more severe and uncompromising than the position of other, nonleft parties and governments." In a word, they have outdone some part of the bourgeoisie in exerting pressure on socialist Poland, and are proud of it!

One more circumstance. The ICP leaders seem to be not in the least concerned that by virtually egging on the antisocialist forces in Poland to new acts against public order in the country and against its foreign policy, they are helping to channel events in a direction which could lead to a tragic conflict in the center of Europe, with grievous consequences for the cause of universal peace.

Let the Italian communists themselves draw conclusions from all this. One thing is clear, namely, that in this question as well the position of the ICP leadership runs counter to the interests of both socialism and the strengthening of peace.

The document of the ICP leadership was published without any preliminary exchange of opinions with the CPSU or the PZPR--this despite the fact that for many years there existed between them and the Italian Communist Party normal comradely relations and numerous meetings took place in the course of which the Italian comrades had every opportunity to gain full clarity on everything that interested them, to familiarize themselves with the life of the socialist countries and their foreign policy, frankly to state their views and have a serious, unprejudiced discussion of outstanding questions without playing into the hands of imperialism. Only a little more than 2 years ago Comrade Berlinguer, in a communique on the meeting with the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke of the need for struggle against anti-Sovietism and anticommunism. And now a volte face. Yet the nature of the Soviet system, of the Soviet state has not changed. It is the same as it was 2 and many more years ago. This holds equally true for the foreign and home policy of the other countries of socialism. Consequently, the reasons for, let us put it bluntly, the unseemly turnabout executed by the ICP leaders should be sought not in objective reality, not in the external world, but somewhere in their own milieu, in the sphere of their calculations and ambitions. The Italian communists, of course, know best how exactly things stand in this respect.

At any rate, the class adversary lost no time in highly appraising this "qualitative shift in the policy of the ICP" (the words of the political secretary of the bourgeois Christian Democratic Party quoted in the newspaper IL POPOLO. Alarmed by the recalcitrance of Western Europe with regard to actions of the Reagan administration, official Washington saw a "ray of light" in the position of the ICP leadership (from a news release for congressmen, government officials and journalists).

The ICP is praised, as the bourgeois Italian paper LA REPUBBLICA put it, for a "felicitous heresy," for its "stern condemnation of real socialism" and the "denial of its ideological importance" (CORRIERE DELLA SERA), for a "big step forward" towards break with the USSR (STAMPA). The ICP is not only praised but also provoked and prodded to take further steps, and pressed to put an end to the "mythical ideas about the Soviet Union which, judging by everything, exist at grass roots level in the party--as distinct from the leadership" and to suppress the "resistance from that quarter" (MESSAGGERO).

By coming out against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, against the overwhelming majority of communist and workers' parties, as regards which the ICP declares itself to be free of any "ideological, political and organizational commitments," the ICP leaders are denying themselves the support of the powerful forces of socialism, peace and freedom.

Soviet communists are aware of the services of the Italian Communist Party in the struggle against fascism, for the interests of the working class and all the working people of Italy, for the common revolutionary cause.

It may be assumed the Italian communists, on their part, are aware of the role the CPSU, the Soviet state, the Soviet people played in the defeat of fascism in Europe, Italy included; they know about the CPSU's invariable solidarity with, and support for, the liberation struggle of the Italian working people and their communist party. In the course of many years communists spread the truth about the Soviet Union in Italy. And, we believe, in the present international situation this is of great positive significance also for the Italian people themselves and for their struggle against capitalist exploitation, against the war danger, for their vital interests. That is why the position which found expression at the ICP Central Committee plenum is so alien and harmful not only to the cause of peace and socialism in general, but also to the interests of the working people of Italy.

In the present international conditions greater importance than ever attaches to the rallying of all the peace-loving antiwar, anti-imperialist forces, and especially to the unity of the most selfless fighters for the great cause of peace and socialism--the communist and workers' parties and the liberation movements. The events in Poland have been another forceful reminder of this sacred internationalist duty of the communists.

There is no, nor can there be any doubt that the peoples of the socialist community, successfully resolving their own problems and resolutely repelling

the attacks of imperialism in the international arena, will continue to advance confidently along the road of the October Revolution. And no one will be able to divert them from this highroad.

There is no doubt that the strengthening of the Soviet Union and of the socialist community, the further progress of world socialism will continue to strengthen the positions of all forces marching under the banner of peace, democracy and social progress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

CSO: 1802/8

## MORAL POTENTIAL OF SOVIET SOCIETY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 104-109

[Review by V. Motyashov, candidate of philosophical sciences, of the books listed in the footnotes appended to the present article]

[Text] In today's world, the people are paying increasing attention to the ethical facets of life. This concentrated attention to morality has its reasons. They include the understanding, which has developed together with the scientific and technical revolution, that all progress achieved by production forces becomes senseless unless it is subordinated to truly human objectives and the firm aspiration to reach an inner state of harmony, which is frequently experiencing today the destructive pressure applied by cold practicalism deprived of moral evaluations, one-sided intellectualism and bourgeois and petit bourgeois morality hostile to man.

In addition to reasons which are common to the different social systems, this increased interest in moral problems has been triggered by reasons specific to each one of them. In the socialist countries, this interest is related above all to the vital needs of the building of communism. We are familiar with V. I. Lenin's statement that communist morality is based on the struggle for the consolidation and achievement of communism which characterizes the nature of the morality of the new society. This broad Leninist formula also contains the most important characteristic of that same society, which is inconceivable without reaching the highest level of moral consciousness and moral behavior on the part of an increasing number of people. In a certain sense the words "communist" and "highly moral" are synonymous.

The tremendous attention which our party is paying to the full realization of the moral potential of developed socialism, therefore, is understandable. This was confirmed by the practical science conference on "Molding an Active Life Stance: Experience and Topical Problems in Moral Upbringing," sponsored by the CC CPSU, which was held in Baku in 1979. The country's central publishing houses published a number of books on the basis of the papers presented at the conference.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, the conference encouraged subsequent scientific and publicistic interpretations of the moral aspects of the socialist way of life. This was reflected in the series of books entitled "Personality, Morality and Education"<sup>2</sup> issued by Politizdat. These works offer the reader the possibility of understanding the entire comprehensiveness and complexity of the moral problems resolved by the socialist society and of experiencing



the lofty meaning of his own participation in building a new life. They offer rich data to the organizers of moral education.

The starting point of virtually all of the books considered has been most comprehensively substantiated in the collection "Aktivnaya Zhiznennaya Pozitsiya Bortsov za Kommunizm." It is that on both the social and the personal levels communism and morality combine in the active practical implementation of communist ideals. This makes it clear that not all kinds of socially active behavior are moral. Man can reach the level of civic maturity only as a result of a conscientious attitude toward social duty, which is manifested through his specific actions. This attitude alone makes clear the difference between the inspired noble objectives of the active stance of the collectivist and the egotistical activeness of the individualist, which is incompatible with communist morality.

The active life stance of the Soviet person is expressed in labor, outlook, recreation and family relations. As the authors prove, by converting human thoughts into actions it becomes the most important criterion for the objective assessment of the social role of the individual and of his political, moral and practical qualities.

Free labor, which is the main source of the well-being and moral health of society, a broad area for the moral enhancement of the individual and a decisive indicator of the individual's social value, is the linchpin of an active life stance. The works under review provide a thorough interpretation of the dialectical reciprocal influence in labor and moral relations and the educational role of labor in the different stages of life. As a rule, the works emphasize a profoundly interested, thoughtful study of vital and frequently grave problems rather than the mere statement of facts and dispassionate description of practical experience. Most of the books, regardless of the aspects of moral upbringing they discuss, pay attention precisely to such problems.

For example, it is well known that the moral qualities of the family are the foundation on which the individual builds himself and his entire life. Unquestionably, the initial feeling of pleasure resulting from work done for someone else is the most important base of this foundation. However, factors of contemporary life, urban life in particular, such as the mechanization of life and the small size of most families, which frequently have only one child, narrow the range of the domestic duties of the children and create in some parents the desire to spare their only child from doing most basic types of work or household chores. Life has shown that the consumer, with his "grabbing instinct" and desire to have more for himself and give less to others, develops in the absence of a systematically nurtured habit and ability to work from an early age.

Today, when most secondary school graduates go to work in the national economy, the labor training of boys and girls and their conscientious choice of a profession need considerable improvement. Many problems may be found in this area as well. Some of them are considered in the collections "Zhit' Dostoyno. Problemy Nравstvennogo Vospitaniya Molodezhi" and "Sem'ya v Sisteme Nравstvennogo Vospitaniya. Aktual'nyye Problemy Vospitaniya Podrostkov" and in "Luchsheye, Chto Cheloveku Vypadayet," by G. Bocharov and the book "Chto Znachit Byt' Sovremennym," by V. Lisovskiy.

What is particularly worth noting is the fact that after graduating from secondary school, some young people, profiting from the material well-being of their parents, show an inclination toward leading a carefree life and are not in a hurry to find a job. One of the reasons for this is the insufficiently high prestige of workers' professions. This is inconsistent with the social need for such professions and the real status of the working class in the socialist society. Secondary school graduates frequently limit their attention to intellectual, creative and highly prestigious jobs such as scientist, artist, engineer, journalist or physician. Such a one-sided approach originates above all in the family and occasionally in the school. It is unrelated to the real processes and changes which are currently taking place in material production. Therefore, the fact is ignored that today the work of thousands and thousands of workers, who have become true masters of their jobs, who live with their work and are happy with it, is distinguished by its highly creative nature.

The authors point out that mistakes in vocational guidance do not only harm social interests by creating shortages in some job categories. Sometimes they lead to the development of a severe moral disharmony within the individual, which becomes a mental trauma in the case of men and women who, yielding to misunderstood prestige, have chosen a skill which they neither like nor feel a vocation for.

Naturally, the solution of such moral conflicts involves more than making major changes in family and school upbringing and the vocational guidance system. Steady effort must be made to enhance the meaningful nature of labor and its proper organization, and the reduction and elimination of unattractive, hard and manual labor which brings no satisfaction to the young workers and which paralyzes the development of creativity are necessary.

The labor collective plays a decisive role in moral upbringing. As the collection "Trudovoy Kollektiv--Tsentral'noye Zveno Nravstvennogo Vospitaniya" emphasizes, the true collective is more than a group of people working under the same roof. It is a community of like-thinking and like-acting people, in which the communist ethic is asserted most fully and comprehensively and the life stance of the person is shaped and manifested. A number of clear proofs of this may be found in the books under review. At the same time, the "sore spots," related to the reasons for labor in particular, are brought up. The feeling of high social duty is an indivisible element in the labor activeness of the majority of Soviet people. However, there are also workers who, although overfulfilling their plan, pursue strictly mercenary objectives. Sometimes, as the saying goes, a person may have golden hands but remain an egotist and be indifferent to the interests of the collective. That is why in the socialist society the rating of a person "on the basis of his work," regardless of the motivations, is insufficient, for maintaining moral health on a high level is in this case both a social objective and a social necessity.

In this connection, several authors discuss material and moral labor incentives. They point out, for example, that whereas economists, economic managers and publicists speak out in a single voice in favor of using a variety of material incentives in socialist economic management, so far only isolated and rather uncertain statements have been heard in favor of taking into consideration in our practical work communist selflessness created by the socialist system. Propaganda does not sufficiently emphasize creative labor incentives.

For example, some economic managers developed such great belief in the universal capacity of the ruble as a means for stimulating labor activeness that they sometimes ignore reasons for human effort which exceed the framework of strictly material expectations. In their view, the simplest thing is to tempt the worker with a high salary. It is for this reason that they frequently resort to the notorious plan "amendments," overtime, equalization of bonuses and figure padding. Self-seekers and bonus hunters, who pursue higher wages, undertake "profitable" work only and avoid "unprofitable" operations, feel at home. Conversely, selfless and incorruptible people, who concentrate on making fuller use of their knowledge and creative capabilities to promote the common good, do not have an easy life always. That is why not only belittling the real importance of material incentives but also narrow deification of the ruble is inadmissible, for this undermines the efforts of the party and the state in promoting the communist education of the working people.

The realm of action of the moral factor is expanding steadily, and various aspects of social life are increasingly controlled by moral norms under developed socialist conditions. Our time--a time of accelerated social processes and tremendously expanded scale of reorganizing human activities--increases the number of problems the solution of which demands of an increasing number of people greater moral responsibility. In the age of universal rationalization and assumption of many mental functions by computers, a developed moral self-awareness frequently becomes the main criterion of the ability and the right to make decisions.

The attention which the authors have paid to the moral responsibility of the individual for the preservation of nature is therefore understandable. Under contemporary technical conditions, an increasing number of people acquire the potential for mounting a destructive and even catastrophic invasion of the environment. Morality is of great importance when we face nature either as a member of society or "on our own behalf." However, it becomes exceptionally important when this is done by those who define the norms of the daily practical attitude toward nature on the part of many people.

Economic managers and scientists bear particular responsibility in this connection. The extent of their moral maturity frequently determines the reasons which will predominate in making decisions which are essential in terms of the ecological balance. Treatment facilities are sometimes the last to be completed with the excuse that the plant had to be completed faster so that the country might receive the necessary output. Or else a hasty result of scientific research may be "pushed through," deliberately concealing its weak sides and bypassing the question of the likely or inevitable harm which this would cause the environment.

Under the new social circumstances, when all natural resources are becoming public property, it is unquestionably easier for a person to feel responsible for more than "his own backyard." The very essence of communist morality presumes concern for nature. However, as the book "Kommunisticheskaya Ideynost"--Osnova Aktivnoy Zhiznennoy Pozitsii" points out, not every person accurately understands and acts in the public interest. It is precisely such lack of understanding, ignorance and moral deafness in individuals that frequently result in "breakdowns" in the socialist use of nature. The authors call upon us not to limit ourselves to educational measures but to engage in the type of education which would involve active participation in achieving

harmony between man and nature and contribute to the conversion of a principled, concerned attitude toward the environment into an effective civic stance.

The scientific and technical revolution creates new value orientations not only in the production area or in the attitude toward nature. It sharply raises the question of the correlation between intellectual and moral progress in general. For example, modern science has already given frequent proof of the fact that service to knowledge for its own sake can become harmful and even criminal. We see today how successes in molecular biology and genetics, for example, seem to have brought us very close to the desired point at which man controls the mechanism of his own evolution. However, this immediately gives rise to the following questions: How is this being used, by whom and for what purpose? Laboratory experiments with the carriers of heredity--the genes--create the potential danger of a "leak" of bacteria, whether accidentally or deliberately caused, with extremely harmful characteristics. The democratic public abroad is also legitimately concerned about the possible use of the achievements of genetics by imperialist, militaristic and racist circles.

The conclusion which can be drawn from this topic in the books under review may be reduced to the following: a scientist, an engineer, an economic manager or any person involved in scientific and technical progress must take into consideration in his activities heterogeneous and distant causes and consequences. We must be able to combine and correlate the extent of novelty with that of stability, and aspiration toward the future with attention to the present. In other words, we need the type of integral world outlook which is inconceivable without high moral responsibility. The existence of the latter has a tremendous impact on the social good and the effective utilization of human, material and financial resources in the building of communism.

It is precisely the type of approach which takes into consideration the unity between socioeconomic and moral factors and the interconnection between education and economic and organization activities that helps us to be successful in all realms of life--labor, social work, family relations or recreation.

The further advancement of the socialist way of life is a process of the appearance, growth and maturing of communist principles paralleled by the decisive elimination of the vestiges of petit bourgeois mentality and morality and various phenomena alien to us. The active life stance of the Soviet person is not only a comprehensive assertion of the shoots of the new but the uncompromising struggle against shortcomings, the creation of an atmosphere of intolerance of vestiges of the past, irresponsibility or any violation of the norms of socialist morality. The party ascribes great importance to the development of the aggressive nature of propaganda and agitation and the training of active fighters for the implementation of the communist ideals. It is only through such struggle that moral qualities are tested and convictions are strengthened.

The book "Kommunisticheskaya Nravstvennost' i Pravoporyadok" discusses the directions, ways and means for energizing the struggle with opposites of the socialist way of life such as greed, money-grubbing, indifference, bureaucracy, parasitism, drunkenness, hooliganism and recurrences of a philistine, a petit-bourgeois attitude toward life. It discusses extensively the struggle

against crime--the extreme manifestation of the rejection of the norms and principles of socialist community life and socialist morality.

Thus, the absence of tangible results in the struggle against drunkenness is a matter of concern. One of the main reasons for this, as some of the authors emphasize, is the very organization of the project. Currently the struggle is being waged mainly against individual drunks, whereas it is necessary to struggle against the reasons for drunkenness as a social phenomenon. A comprehensive approach must be developed in the organization of the struggle with alcoholism and the center of gravity must be shifted to preventive measures. However, in many places the basic tasks in this area are entrusted to the militia and health-care organs which, by virtue of their social functions, deal primarily with the consequences of drunkenness.

Of late many authors have concentrated closely on consumerism as one of the opposites of communist morality. The increased material prosperity of the Soviet people, which created favorable conditions for the comprehensive development of the individual, also revealed a concealed contradiction: in a number of cases it encouraged a hypertrophied attraction for things to the detriment of the spiritual and moral characteristics of the individual. The reasons for the energizing of consumerist manifestations and the means and methods of fighting recurrences of philistinism and the specific assignments related to the shaping of sensible needs are reflected in the book by V. Sokolov, "Nравstvenny Mir Sovetskogo Cheloveka. Opyt Sotsiologicheskogo Analiza Nравstvennykh Problem Sovremennika."

Naturally, it would be naive to reduce the reasons for consumerism to shortcomings in moral upbringing. They are considerably more varied and are related, one way or another, to objective factors such as the still unsurmounted gap between mental and physical labor and the unpreparedness of the socialist economy to offer physical equality in consumption and to implement the principle "from each according to his capabilities and to each according to his needs." Nor should we discount the existence of the capitalist "consumer society" with its cult of objects, competitive spending and the subordination of man to material relations.

It is unquestionable, however, that an individual with high moral qualities is considerably less vulnerable to the "object disease" and does not fear the bacilli of consumerism. The road to the triumph of sensible needs over senseless ones coincides with the "manufacturing" of a comprehensively developed, creative and socially active individual as the main target of social progress. It is a shift from the world of objects to the world of ideas and to the peaks of intellectual and moral culture.

The books under review describe the great opportunities at the disposal of our propaganda and social science, mass information media, literature and the arts in proving the complete vanity and futility of so-called prestige consumption. Particular attention should be paid to the way a number of authors have addressed themselves to a phenomenon such as social mimicry of philistinism and attempts on the part of representatives of this despicable tribe to wear "intellectual" or "spiritual" garb, which does not change their consumerist nature in the least. This is convincingly proved by the writer Yevg. Bogat and the sociologist V. Lisovskiy. The various aspects of the

attitude of man toward spiritual values are also considered in the collection "Massovaya Fizicheskaya Kul'tura i Sport--Vazhneyshiye Stredstva Formirovaniya Aktivnoy Zhiznennoy Pozitsii Sovetskikh Lyudey."

The readers, the organizers of ideological and educational work above all, will find very useful studies of concealed, not always obvious manifestations of immorality such as parasitism, cynicism, hypocrisy and indifference. An indifferent person may not violate the law himself, engage in black marketeering or insult anyone. However, by ignoring such phenomena he encourages this evil which remains unpunished. It was no accident that Leo Tolstoy described indifference as spiritual cowardice. In our society, the authors emphasize, no happiness or sorrow may be another's alone. The struggle against social indifference is, in the final account, the struggle for the new man. The party calls for waging it consistently and purposefully.

Within a broad program of measures for surmounting mores which are alien to us the authors single out the shaping of a type of public opinion which will not tolerate the opposites of communist morality, the assertion in the social consciousness of the historical superiority of the moral values of socialism, the elimination of shortcomings in economic and cultural construction, the improvement of managerial and administrative activities and the effective utilization of all the levers of legal control and social prevention measures.

The effectiveness of the moral education system and the successful shaping of the active life stance of the Soviet people decisively depend on the level of party guidance of ideological work, the ability of party committees to single out the moral aspects of their various tasks and, finally, which of the principles of communist morality are becoming part of the character of every party member and his observance of the norms and principles of party ethics, which are stricter than the generally prevailing moral relations. All of these problems are considered in detail in the collection "Voprosy Patriynogo Rukovodstva Nravstvennym Vospitaniyem."

The strengthening of the party's guidance of moral education cannot be separated from the development of efficient, principle-minded and constructive criticism and self-criticism. As an accurate barometer of the political and moral health of the party organization, criticism and self-criticism help to mobilize the creative forces of the people and to surmount shortcomings. The party ascribes particular importance to criticism "from below" in which the active and militant life stance and the desire of the people to improve the state of affairs and moral climate in their collective, rayon or city are clearly manifested.

While suggesting specific measures aimed at molding in the working people civic courage in defending the national interests, the authors also distinguish between intolerance of shortcomings and the pseudocritical orientation of the individual. Petty criticism, skepticism and the finding of all possible reasons for discontent have nothing in common with the Leninist requirement of criticism, the essence of which is interest in rapidly eliminating anything which stands in the way of building communism.

It would be difficult to overestimate in the moral upbringing system the importance of mass information media, literature and the arts. In discussing the means for strengthening their social and civic importance, the authors of

"Sovetskaya Kul'tura i Dukhovnyy Mir Cheloveka Truda" and "Rol' Sredstv Massovoy Informatsii i Propagandy v Nravstvennom Vospitanii" emphasize the importance of the close ties between moral problems and intensified studies of the essential features in the life of the developed socialist society. They point out the need to arm the people with the values of culture, moral ideals and norms which will help them to find in ordinary matters as well an enhanced meaning, a confirmation of the involvement of every Soviet person with the destinies of the people and the building of the new life. Systematic struggle must be waged against a philistine, a nonsocial approach to moral requirements concerning creative work and against recurrences of abstract humanism and ethical relativism.

The idea of the comprehensive, the all-embracing nature of moral upbringing is substantiated in the book "Sovetskaya Armiya--Shkola Ideyno-Nravstvennogo Vospitaniya Molodezhi."

Several of the books raise the question of the dependence of the effectiveness of moral education on the level of the scientific and theoretical development of problems of morality. Addressing themselves to workers in the field of ethics, party workers and economic managers, educators express a number of wishes related to the scientific management of moral education. While acknowledging their duties to practical work, the scientists submit recommendations the implementation of which could avoid a number of errors and amateurish approaches in the purposeful molding of an active life stance in the Soviet people.

The ideas and materials in the books under review are already being extensively reflected in the current and long-term work plans of party committees and trade union and Komsomol organizations. The range of moral problems discussed within the party training system and in the Marxist-Leninist upbringing of the youth has increased substantially. The measures especially formulated by the Communist Party of Azerbaijan Central Committee on moral upbringing are being successfully implemented. In Moscow and Leningrad, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Uzbekistan and Sverdlovskaya and Chelyabinskaya Oblasts moral relations in labor collectives are being purposefully improved. Comprehensive programs for the development of an active life stance have become popular in the cities and rayons of Rostovskaya Oblast.

Books on moral problems are of major practical significance. As far as the books discussed here are concerned, not only the specific recommendations they contain but their entire content encourages us to contribute to the moral progress of the Soviet society and systematically to assert its collectivistic and communist values.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. "Aktivnaya Zhiznennaya Pozitsiya Bortsov za Kommunizm" [The Active Life Stance of the Fighters for Communism]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 349 pp; "Voprosy Patriynogo Rukovodstva Nravstvennym Vospitaniyem" [Problems of Party Management of Moral Upbringing]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, 205 pp; "Kommunisticheskaya Ideynost'--Osnova Aktivnoy Zhiznennoy Pozitsii" [Communist Idea-Mindedness--A Foundation for an Active Life Stance]. Politizdat,

Moscow, 1979, 237 pp; "Trudovoy Kollektiv--Tsentral'noye Zveno Nravstvennogo Vospitaniya" [The Labor Collective--Central Link in Moral Upbringing]. Profizdat, Moscow, 1979, 175 pp; "Sem'ya v Sisteme Nravstvennogo Vospitaniya. Aktual'nyye Problemy Vospitaniya Podrostkov" [The Family in the System of Moral Upbringing. Topical Problems of the Upbringing of Adolescents]. Pedagogika, Moscow, 1979, 232 pp; "Kommunisticheskaya Nravstvennost' i Pravoporyadok" [Communist Morality and Law and Order]. Yuridicheskaya Literatura, Moscow, 1979, 184 pp; "Sovetskaya Armiya--Shkola Ideyno-Nravstvennogo Vospitaniya Molodezhi" [The Soviet Army--A School for the Ideological and Moral Upbringing of the Youth]. Voenizdat, Moscow, 1979, 286 pp; "Sovetskaya Kul'tura i Dukhovnyy Mir Cheloveka Truda" [Soviet Culture and the Spiritual World of the Working Man]. Sovetskiy Pisatel', Moscow, 1979, 312 pp; "Rol' Sredstv Massovoy Informatsii i Propagandy v Nravstvennom Vospitanii" [The Role of Mass Information and Propaganda Media in Moral Upbringing]. Mysl', Moscow, 1979, 255 pp; "Massovaya Fizicheskaya Kul'tura i Sport--Vazhneyshiy Stredstva Formirovaniya Aktivnoy Zhiznennoy Pozitsii Sovetskikh Lyudey" [Mass Physical Culture and Sports--Most Important Means in Shaping an Active Live Stance in the Soviet People]. Fizkul'tura i Sport, Moscow, 1979, 221 pp.

2. "Zhit' Dostoyno. Problemy Nravstvennogo Vospitaniya Molodezhi" [To Lead a Worthy Life. Problems of the Moral Upbringing of the Youth]. 1979, 111 pp; V. T. Lisovskiy, "Chto Znachit Byt' Sovremennym" [The Meaning of Being Modern]. 1980, 207 pp; I. S. Kon, "Druzhba. Etiko-Psikhologicheskii Ocherk" [Friendship. Ethical-Psychological Essay]. 1980, 255 pp; Yevg. Bogat, "Nichto Chelovecheskoye..." [Nothing Human...]. 1979, 415 pp; G. Bocharov, "Luchsheye, Chto Cheloveku Vypadayet" [The Best That Happens to Man]. 1981, 110 pp; V. Tolstykh, "Sokrat i My. Raznyye Ocherki no Odnu i tu zhe Temu" [We and Socrates. Various Essays on the Same Topic]. 1981, 383 pp; V. M. Sokolov, "Nravstvennyy Mir Sovetskogo Cheloveka. Opyt Sotsiologicheskogo Analiza Nravstvennykh Problem Sovremennika" [The Moral World of the Soviet Person. Experiment in Sociological Analysis of the Moral Problems of Our Contemporary]. 1981, 279 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/8



## IN THE INTERESTS OF SOCIALIST CHANGE AND A SPIRIT OF FRATERNAL FRIENDSHIP

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 109-112

[Review by G. Kiselev of the book by Todor Zhivkov, "Izbrannyye Stat'i i Rechi (Iyul' 1975 g.--Mart 1981 g.) [Selected Articles and Speeches (July 1975-March 1981)]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 584 pp]

[Text] The comprehensive constructive activities of the Bulgarian Communist Party are followed with a fraternal feeling and sympathy by the party members and all working people in the Soviet Union, who are its sincere and loyal friends. They follow the course of the building of socialism in the Bulgarian People's Republic closely. The Soviet people are pleased by the successes achieved by the Bulgarian communists and try to find out, hear and read more about the fraternal party and its policies and the life of the industrious Bulgarian people. Hence the steady interest which the Soviet public is showing toward the documents of BCP congresses and the speeches of its leaders. Outstanding among them are the works of Comrade Todor Zhivkov, the noted leader of the international communist movement, tested leader of the Bulgarian communists and great and respected friend of the Soviet Union.

Not so long ago the Soviet party and scientific public was given the opportunity to read the latest work by T. Zhivkov--a collection of his articles and speeches. The work covers a period of less than 6 years. However, the importance of the materials it contains goes far beyond its chronological limits. The collection reflects extensively and profoundly the struggle waged by the BCP for building a developed socialist society, strengthening the communist and workers movements and the struggle for peace and social progress. Although the publishing house tells us that the book is aimed at scientific workers, teachers, lecturers and students enrolled in the party training system, it will unquestionably trigger the lively interest of the broad Soviet reading circles as well.

T. Zhivkov's articles and speeches describe the approach of the BCP to the solution of the vital problems of today on the basis of the creative application of the fundamental ideas of Marxism-Leninism. "Naturally, today the communists in all countries, whether socialist or capitalist," T. Zhivkov points out, "face new tasks and new problems which require creative analysis and approach. However, for any problem in contemporary reality we may consider, a proper solution is possible only as a result of mastering, creatively applying, developing and enriching Leninism" (p 228).

The article "A Word on Lenin's Party" is of great interest. It is a description of what gives the vanguard organization of the proletariat its power, which enables it to rally around itself millions of people and to change the entire course of history. These factors, the author emphasizes, are Marxist-Leninist theory, loyalty to the only accurate teaching of socialism and the laws of its development, and its inflexible, systematic and creative practical application. With its arguments and convincing facts and assessments, the article deals a crushing blow to the various efforts of anticommunists and revisionists to distort the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism.

In rebuffing the attacks on the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and all attempts to slander it and cast aspersions on the universal-historical gains of the working class, T. Zhivkov writes that "real socialism is the greatest accomplishment of the international proletariat, the world revolutionary process and the class struggle of our time and a brilliant confirmation of the correctness, strength and vitality of Marxist-Leninist theory" (pp 377-378).

In analyzing the problems which arise and interpreting the further tasks in the development of socialist Bulgaria, the author invariably turns to international experience, the experience of the CPSU and the theoretical and practical interpretation of the general laws of the building of socialism, which were tested by the Great October Revolution. "Each individual socialist revolution," he emphasizes, "is a model to the extent to which it obeys the general laws and thus reasserts the accuracy of the laws and reveals new facets in the mechanism and forms of their action and enriches Marxist-Leninist theory and the collective experience of the international communist movement on the basis of its experience" (p 261). In developing these concepts, T. Zhivkov points out that "that is why we reject any attempt to create some kind of 'national models' whose only 'merit' is their incompatibility with true socialism....The Great October Socialist Revolution was the first to follow the general laws of the socialist revolutionary process and the first to reveal the need for a creative approach in the consideration of the specific conditions and traditions of each individual country. That is why the experience of the October Revolution is of permanent historical significance and of universal importance and, naturally, has nothing to do with its automatic duplication" (pp 260-261).

T. Zhivkov's statement that "the basic principles and laws of the socialist revolution and the building of a new society, historically tested in the course of the October Revolution and the building of socialism in the Soviet Union, are of decisive importance under Bulgarian conditions as well" has a profound and political meaning. "This is a lesson from our history, a lesson which is tested and proved by the real achievements of the Bulgarian people" (p 379).

For Zhivkov, the loyal student, heir and continuator of the cause of the Bulgarian revolutionaries D. Blagoev and G. Dimitrov, makes an invaluable contribution to the struggle against opportunists of all hues, who are artificially separating patriotism against internationalism. He emphasizes the unbreakable link between the national and the international and between the general and the specific in the socialist revolution and the building of a new society.

The collection vividly reflects the theoretical and practical activities of the BCP in the building of socialism--the development of the economy and culture, the improvement of the forms and methods of management, the ideological education of the youth and the development of socialist democracy. That is why the summation of acquired experience and the search for the most acceptable means and methods of building socialism described in the work are of such great interest. Some of them are strengthened by life while others are corrected and amended in accordance with the new conditions and specific results and effectiveness.

The past 5 years have been among the fruitful periods in the practical activities of the BCP in the implementation of the immediate tasks related to building a developed socialist society. T. Zhivkov's reports submitted at the last two party congresses (the 11th in 1976 and the 12th in 1981) and his speech at the National Party Conference (1978), included in the book, are the basic documents of that period.

The reader is presented with a clear picture of the purposeful efforts of the party of the people to resolve the problems of the building of socialism and shares the feeling of legitimate pride experienced by our Bulgarian friends in their homeland and its accomplishments.

The idea of the strengthening and enhancement of the leading role of the party and the unity and cohesion of its ranks runs throughout all the materials dealing with BCP organizational party work. In particular, the author discusses extensively the party's orientation toward a political, a specific style of management, proper knowledge of the life of the masses and strengthening its ties with them and the making of decisions which express the will and interests of the working people and their systematic implementation. They are discussed most completely in T. Zhivkov's speech at the National Conference on the Role of Primary Party Organizations (July 1975) with which the book opens.

The BCP pays tireless attention to improving the functions and structure of the economic organizations and management organs as important elements in the implementation of the party's socioeconomic policy. The steps taken to improve economic planning and the structure of administrative organs are considered by the party as logically and closely interrelated links of a single chain. T. Zhivkov's speeches at party congresses, BCP Central Committee plenums, the 1978 BCP national conference, the constituent congress of the National Agroindustrial Union, held in 1979, and other party and state forums are imbued with the profound concern shown by the BCP for the destinies of the country and its people. They contribute to the development of creativity, energy and initiative in the people's masses, the intensive search for the most accurate solutions and the taking of practical steps with a view to ensuring radical improvements in the management system.

In improving the ways and methods of management, the party tries to make the economic management system most consistent with changes in Bulgaria's social development and related to the further intensification of specialization and cooperation within CEMA. The task is for the management system to operate on the basis of economic analysis, cost effectiveness and total self-support. In this connection we find interesting Bulgaria's experience in agricultural

management. A system of agroindustrial complexes and, subsequently, the National Agroindustrial Union were created on a national scale. All of this, T. Zhivkov writes, marks the beginning of a new stage in the development of the country's socialist agriculture, creatively develops and enriches the party's agrarian policy and makes it possible for agriculture to develop ever more consistently within the laws governing the building of mature socialism (see pp 390-391). We know that the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress pointed out the need to study carefully and make extensive use of the experience of the fraternal socialist countries, the useful forms of agroindustrial cooperation in Bulgaria in particular.

Many of the materials in the collection draw our attention to the close interconnection between economic activities and ideological and educational work. "In order to be in step with time and with the topical problems of the building of socialism and the shaping of the contemporary individual," T. Zhivkov pointed out at the 12th BCP Congress, "Marxist-Leninist theory must steadily develop. Its ideological-theoretical arsenal must be enriched with new concepts, analyses and summations" (p 563). The author invariably emphasizes that ideological work must be distinguished by creative search, aggressiveness and militancy and become the main form of steady spiritual ties between the party and the broad popular masses. These thoughts are consistent with the conclusions regarding the role and place of ideological work in the sociopolitical life of the socialist countries drawn at the conference of secretaries of central committees of communist and workers parties of socialist countries on international and ideological problems which took place in Moscow recently.

The problem of the youth and of its place and role in the socialist society holds an important position in T. Zhivkov's works. They deal with the major problems of raising the new generation, the activities of the Dimitrov Communist Youth League, the quality indicators of work with adolescents, the social effect of preparing young people for life, the educational influence of work, the need for a careful attitude toward working time, efficiency and organization, and consistency between the way of life of the young citizens and the principles and ideals of the socialist society. The BCP ascribes prime importance to developing in every Bulgarian young man and woman a feeling of organization as an inseparable part of the general culture of the youth, a feeling which must be understood as a vital need.

Georgi Dimitrov was right when he said that Bulgaria's path will not be smooth like the roadway in front of the National Assembly, T. Zhivkov points out. The building of socialism raises many new theoretical and practical problems which are both complex and difficult. Such problems will arise in the future as well. However, what matters most is that the party has a clear political guideline and a clear program formulated at the 12th and previous BCP Congresses. Today's Bulgaria and its great accomplishments, which were made possible by the 9 September 1944 socialist revolution, offer a convincing example of the invincible ideas of socialism embodied today in the victorious building of a mature socialist society in the country.

The broad and varied range of problems related to the building of socialism in Bulgaria, reflected in the collection, offers an impressive picture of

the way the BCP, guided by the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin, is creatively resolving the most important problems of building a new life. The years of socialist construction have become a period of strengthening the prestige and influence of the Bulgarian People's Republic in the international arena and of the BCP in the world communist and workers movement. The book describes the tireless struggle waged by the Bulgarian communists for strengthening the world socialist system and for the development and strengthening of fraternal relations with the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity. It emphasizes the significance of and historical need for unity in their actions and coordination in foreign policy.

Through its theoretical work and political practice, the BCP is actively contributing to strengthening the unity of the socialist states and above all the ties of fraternal friendship with the Soviet Union. It is firmly and consistently opposed to all manifestations of anti-Sovietism. With the help of convincing specific examples and facts, T. Zhivkov draws the conclusion that Bulgaria and the other members of the socialist comity have successfully resolved and are resolving problems of domestic and foreign policy thanks to their unity and reciprocal support. This is the purpose of Warsaw Pact and CEMA activities. The unity and joint actions of the fraternal parties are a prerequisite for the successful implementation of the common strategic objective of the socialist states--the establishment of a durable peace and the strengthening of international safety and cooperation among countries with different social systems.

T. Zhivkov's addresses, speeches and articles on Soviet-Bulgarian relations and fraternal friendship and cooperation among our countries, peoples and parties are imbued with particular warmth. In his address to the Fatherland Front National Council (February 1980), he said that "the Bulgarian People's Republic is a worthy and loyal member of the socialist comity. Its freedom and independence and its all-round development are becoming ever more closely linked with the destinies of the other fraternal countries and the socialist comity....Our country has never had a more loyal, more selfless, a more sincere or a more reliable ally than the Soviet Union; it has never been so free, so independent and so confident of its present and its future as it is within the fraternal family of the members of the socialist comity" (p 448).

Every mention in this book of the CPSU, the Soviet Union and the Soviet people is imbued with a spirit of true brotherhood and respect for the first socialist country.

The Soviet people note with a feeling of deep satisfaction that relations between the BCP and the CPSU and between Bulgaria and the USSR provide a vivid example of how natural and strong the fraternal relations are and how fruitful mutually profitable cooperation based on the tested Leninist principles and on internationalist policy is. "The range of Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said, "has become truly boundless. It would be no exaggeration to say that there is no area of social life in which the fraternal unity of our peoples is not apparent. It is confirmed by the relations between our communist parties, whose unity and fraternity constitute the truly unbreakable foundation of our political alliance and the core of the comprehensive relations which exist between our peoples and states. The new, broad

development of our friendship today and the steady process of rapprochement between us are the natural and legitimate extension of the consistent and steadfast course pursued by our two parties."

On the occasion of the presentation of the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star of Hero of the Soviet Union to Todor Zhivkov, Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev said: "You, Comrade Zhivkov, are well known and loved in our country. During the difficult war years you were one of the organizers and leaders of the partisan movement in unconquered Bulgaria. When freedom triumphed on Bulgarian soil you dedicated all your efforts to the building of socialism and proved yourself a worthy student and continuator of the course of Georgi Dimitrov, the great revolutionary."

The materials in the collection are characterized by a deep belief in the justice of our common cause, the unfading ideas of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the passion of the party propagandist and a sharp publicistic feeling. They deal with the events and problems of the past and the present. However, the entire spirit and meaning of the book is directed at the future, at the new victories toward which the Bulgarian people, led by the Bulgarian Communist Party, is marching purposefully and invincibly. To the readers, this will be another impressive encounter with socialist Bulgaria and Comrade Todor Zhivkov, its tested leader.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/8

## FOR AGGRESSIVE CRITICISM OF OUR CRITICS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 112-119

[Review by Prof V. Mazur, doctor of economic sciences, of the following books: "Kritika Sovremennykh Burzhuaznykh i Reformistskikh Fal'sifikatorov Marksizma-Leninizma" [Critique of Contemporary Bourgeois and Reformist Falsifiers of Marxism-Leninism] (M. P. Mchedlov, Ye. Ya. Vittenberg, A. Ye. Ivanov et al., editors). Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 440 pp; "Aktual'nyye Voprosy Sovremennoy Ideologicheskoy Bor'by" [Topical Problems of the Contemporary Ideological Struggle] (A. N. Aver'yanov et al., editors). Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, 446 pp; "Kritika Sovremennykh Burzhuaznykh i Revizionistskikh Kontseptsiy po Problemam Mirovovo Revolyutsionnogo Protsessa" [Critique of Contemporary Bourgeois and Revisionist Concepts on Problems Related to the World Revolutionary Process]. Textbook (A. P. Sheptulin, V. P. Agafonov, N. I. Dryachlov and Ye. S. Troitskiy, editors). Vysshaya Shkola, Moscow, 1979, 343 pp; and "Kritika Sovremennykh Burzhuaznykh i Revizionistskikh Kontseptsiy po Problemam Stroitel'stva Sotsializma i Kommunizma" [Critique of Contemporary Bourgeois and Revisionist Concepts on Problems of the Building of Socialism and Communism]. Textbook (V. P. Agafonov, N. I. Dryachlov, Ye. S. Troitskiy and A. P. Sheptulin, editors). Vysshaya Shkola, Moscow, 1980, 327 pp]

[Text] The struggle between scientific proletarian ideology, on the one hand, and pseudoscientific, bourgeois and petit bourgeois ideology, on the other, has never been sharper. It is focused on Marxism-Leninism as the theoretical foundation of the policy of the working class and the revolutionary-transforming activities of the toiling masses. This struggle is developing in connection with the analysis and assessment of processes occurring in the capitalist and the socialist worlds and in their interrelationship.

That is the reason for which books published at the beginning of the 1980's, which reveal the groundlessness of bourgeois, reformist and revisionist interpretations of the philosophical, economic and sociopolitical theory and history of Marxism-Leninism and criticize the various anticommunist and anti-Soviet misrepresentations of domestic and foreign CPSU policy and the contemporary anti-Marxist concepts on problems of the global revolutionary process and the building of socialism and communism are of undeniable interest. Noteworthy among them are the collection of scientific articles, which covers a broad range of problems of ideological struggle, issued by the CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism, a work for propagandists and students within the party education system and a textbook on scientific communism for VUZ students (in two volumes).

These works of different genres, aimed at a wide readership, are characterized above all by the fact that, combined, they recreate a panorama of the ideological confrontation between socialism and capitalism in the 1970's. On the basis of Marxist-Leninist methodology, the authors describe the fruitful theoretical and ideological activities of the CPSU and the other fraternal communist parties and the achievements of the social sciences over the past decade.

The books under review are a contribution to the exposure of the scientific groundlessness of the efforts of bourgeois, reformist and revisionist thinking to discredit the practice of scientific socialism. They continue to play a positive role in ideological and political-educational work. Naturally, it would be impossible for a review to point out everything that is topical and interesting in their content, nor would this be necessary. What is more important is that the study of these works, which could be considered as fundamental to a certain extent, enables us to assess the levels reached in criticizing our critics, to identify insufficiently developed problems and so to derive the necessary lessons for the purpose of ensuring further improvement in such works and the successful development of an active, aggressive struggle against the ideology of imperialism and its stooges.

The works direct our attention to the need to take into consideration (without, however, absolutizing!) differences in ideological concepts and propaganda actions of the class enemy based on the international circumstances and the foreign policy of imperialism, American imperialism above all. Thus, in the 1960's and the first half of the 1970's, our ideological enemies adopted more flexible objectivistic theoretical structures compared with the cold war period and present themselves as the supporters of "renovated," "improved," "national" and "pluralistic" socialism. In recent years the open extremism of a segment of the ruling circles in the capitalist countries has been noticeably reenergized. They openly call for proclaiming outside the law any revolutionary activity and for a comprehensive return to the bourgeois order. They place the defense of their class privileges above the preservation of the peace and ensuring the prime right of every person--the right to life. Extremism in politics is drastically aggravating the ideological situation.

Naturally, it is a question of tactical rather than strategic differences. The more objectivistic or more extremist anticommunist doctrines and ideological campaigns which reach the proscenium of the struggle do not exclude but supplement each other. They have common class and gnoseological roots and ideological origins and pursue the same objective--the falsification of Marxism-Leninism and the practice of real socialism. The anticommunist concepts which might have appeared to have vanished are being reanimated with the changed circumstances and actively used. That is why all actions dictated by bourgeois and petit bourgeois ideology of the past and the present directed against scientific communism, whatever their manifestations, must remain the target of permanent Marxist-Leninist criticism and be discussed comprehensively in publications similar to those under consideration.

One of the merits of the books under review is the further development of the theory and methods of the contemporary ideological struggle waged against our class enemy and the all-round exposure of its objectives, tasks and role in social development. Their content proves that the scientific nature of



communist ideology and the ideological and theoretical activities of the communists are manifested in the attainment and defense of objective truth and in the struggle against attempts to distort and falsify it by bourgeois and petit bourgeois ideologues--the defenders of an obsolete system--and against the ideological-political forces and age-old traditions of the private ownership world, which is nurturing and supporting false concepts, misrepresentations and prejudices in all areas of human intellectual and spiritual life. This helps us to understand the importance of the criticism of the ideology hostile to the working class and scientific socialism in terms of the study and revolutionary reorganization of the world. Unfortunately, the functions of this criticism are not especially considered in the books under review, which would have been particularly desirable in the case of textbooks, but are discussed in their various sections.

The works under review justifiably note the firm links between the development of a proletarian outlook and the dialectical-materialistic study "of all aspects of activities and life of all classes, strata and population groups" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 6, p 69). Their authors refer to Lenin's view to the effect that "the awareness of the working masses cannot be a true class awareness unless using specific and mandatorily topical (current) political facts and events the workers learn how to observe each of the other social classes in all manifestations of mental, moral and political life" (*ibid*) and to look at statements regarding the program and tactical line of the party which, should they ignore the topical ideological and political currents hostile to socialism, "could degenerate into dead 'items' whose implementation...would be inconceivable without an understanding of the essence of the matter, an understanding of the meaning with which they are invested" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 20, p 357).

The books under review emphasize that criticism considered in this light is called upon to play an important role in the implementation of cognitive functions of social science. This is a necessary prerequisite for the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory. That is why social science must closely combine the logical-gnoseological with the sociopolitical approach and avoid extremes such as, on the one hand, reducing criticism only to the exposure of internal contradictions within bourgeois theories and, on the other, replacing their thorough analysis with exposing the politically reactionary nature of the authors of such theories. It is only thus that criticism will enable us to interpret knowledgeably non-Marxist theories and viewpoints, to define and properly formulate new and truly real problems, while rejecting false ones, and thus to focus our efforts on the promising directions of scientific research, to resolve arising problems or at least to earmark accurate ways leading to such solutions.

The drawing of an accurate and clear line in the criticism and study of the various Marxist schools and currents in philosophical and socioeconomic thinking is quite difficult. We agree with the authors of the collection issued by the CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism that in this area as well Marxism-Leninism puts a great distance between itself and revisionism and dogmatism. "Revisionism," the authors say, "is unable to distinguish between general ideological positions and strictly scientific achievements by bourgeois authors, such as facts, data, the formulation of problems and individual summations. The acknowledgment of one or another fact or separate law defined by bourgeois scientists is followed as a rule by the noncritical acceptance of the entire

Ideological and political package characteristic of the bourgeois outlook.... Conversely, the sectarian, the dogmatic attitude toward social science in the contemporary capitalist world rejects its entire content and any possibly honest searching for the truth by scientists in the capitalist countries" (p 376). Dogmatism is also related to the indiscriminate approach to various ideological directions and their supporters. It belittles the attractiveness of Marxism-Leninism, the importance of the erosion of bourgeois ideology under its influence and the possibility that under such circumstances progressive scientists can convert to the positions of a dialectical-materialistic outlook.

We must also take into consideration that state monopoly capitalism needs, for its own purposes, recommendations based on the study of real social phenomena and processes which it could use for the elaboration of a more effective domestic and foreign policy and anticommunist strategy and tactics. Although bourgeois and petit bourgeois, political economy and sociology have limited possibilities of gaining scientific knowledge, it would be unforgivable to ignore their thorough critical analysis or to make poor use of the results they have achieved.

Marxism-Leninism rejects the bourgeois-revisionist concepts of "deideologization" and "depoliticization" of social science and attempts to consider it a single science, like mathematics or physics, to "integrate" or "synthesize" proletarian with bourgeois philosophy, political economy and sociopolitical theory. In this respect its attitude is absolutely clear and firm: "...No professor of political economy who can offer most valuable works in the field of factual and specialized research can be trusted in the least in the matter of the general theory of political economy, for the latter is as much a party-minded science in modern society as is gnoseology. By and large, the professors of economics are nothing but learned salesmen of the capitalist class.... The test of the Marxists...is to be able to master and rework the gains made by these 'salesmen' (for example, one would be unable to take a single step forward in the study of new economic phenomena without using the works of these salesmen), and to be able to eliminate their reactionary trends and promote one's own line and struggle against the entire line of forces and classes hostile to us" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 18, pp 363-364).

The articles by M. T. Iovchuk and B. N. Bessonov on philosophical problems, by A. I. Malysh on problems of economics, by N. Yu. Kolpinskiy on the struggle against anarchism, by A. G. Zdravomyslov on sociology, by M. Veber and F. S. Teplov on the falsifying methods used by the opponents of Marxism-Leninism and others (see "Kritika Sovremennykh Burzhuaznykh i Reformistskikh Fal'sifikatorov Marksizma-Leninizma," pp 21, 49, 180, 375-376, 379 and 415) discuss the need and means for the implementation of this Leninist stipulation. However, the collection and, to an even greater extent, the other books under review, virtually ignore the way in the struggle against non-Marxist thinking and the specific problems in which principle-minded criticism is combined with the development of the social sciences and the "gains" made by the "salesmen of the capitalist class" in the study of new phenomena and the manner in which they are reworked and the scientific communist line is promoted. Individual mentions are made in the works of the way Marx, Engels and Lenin developed their theory in the course of the struggle against their ideological opponents. However, virtually no mention is made of specific data on the

period between the 1930's and the 1970's, although everything new introduced in Marxist-Leninist theory within that period was not developed in a vacuum of ideas but under conditions of principled criticism of erroneous views and their revisionist, reformist and bourgeois theories.

Thus, problems of the historical position of socialism in the development of human society, i.e., its relationship with the preceding period and capitalism, on the one hand, and total communism, on the other, and the stages of development of socialism and level of its maturity have become particularly topical in recent decades. The creative development of such problems triggered a broad and sharp debate with the global communist movement, in the course of which convincing criticism was made of views which revised under the pressure of bourgeois and petit bourgeois ideology the basic principles of historical materialism and the Marxist-Leninist theory of the two phases of the single communist system (the concept of multiple "models of socialism," the concept of socialism as a transitional period which begins virtually within capitalism and ends with the establishment of full communism and the concept of socialism as a relatively autonomous socioeconomic formation), all of which led to the further development of Marxist-Leninist theory. The collective efforts resulted mainly in the formulation of the concept of developed socialism, which includes a set of new ideas of exceptional importance related to the relatively lengthy stage of development of the socialist society on its own basis, its advancement as a mandatory condition for the creation of prerequisites for the conversion to communist relations in production, distribution and communication; on the qualitatively new level of production forces, socialist socialization of production and labor, a unified national economic complex, international socialist integration and combination of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism; on the Soviet people as a new historical community and the socialist state of the whole people, and so on. All of this deserves a far broader interpretation than is provided in the books under review and, thus, one offering more tangible and convincing proof of the way theoretical criticism of unscientific views is one of the conditions for the creative development of scientific communism. On the other hand, the ideological wealth of concepts of developed socialism can and must be used more extensively and substantively in proving the groundlessness of the anticommunist falsifications of the realities of the mature socialist society and the possibilities and laws of building communism (in the corresponding chapter of "Kritika Sovremennykh Burzhuaznykh i Revizionistskikh Kontseptsiy po Probleмам Mirovovo Revolyutsionnogo Protsessa" for example).

Let us mention briefly the importance of criticism in the substantial utilization of the specific results, methods, analytical instruments and factual data of bourgeois science, which reflect more or less adequately one aspect or another of reality and individual socioeconomic ties and relations. This side of the matter is insufficiently covered as well. Let us take as an example the best chapter on this topic, "Critique of Some Bourgeois Concepts of Social Management," in the VUZ textbook "Kritika Sovremennykh Burzhuaznykh i Revisionistskikh Kontseptsiy po Probleмам Stroitel'stva Sotsializma i Kommunizma." It discusses the need to distinguish within bourgeois concepts the characteristics of management systems and technical facilities and specific management recommendations which, after proper critical interpretation, can be used in socialist practice. It is a question of Lenin's study of Taylorism, the criticism of its class nature and the utilization under socialist conditions of the

progressive elements it contains. The familiar Leninist view is cited to the effect that "...Taylor's system, like all progress in capitalism, combines the refined excesses of bourgeois exploitation with a number of very rich scientific practical accomplishments...the formulation of most accurate work methods and the best possible systems of accountability and control, etc.... Socialism can be achieved precisely through our successes in combining the Soviet system and the Soviet organization of management with the latest progress of capitalism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, pp 189-190). The chapter further describes the class and reactionary nature of bourgeois labor sociology, "the human relations schools" and the latest management theories. However, the second part of Lenin's stipulation is totally ignored--the determination of the scientific significance of the research conducted by representatives of these currents, as in the field of the "human factor," sociopsychological characteristics of the worker and so on in terms of upgrading labor productivity and production intensification and effectiveness. However, whereas the organization of labor according to Taylor's system was mainly adapted to extensive development, many organizational and incentive systems operating under intensive development conditions appeared between the 1950's and the 1970's, clearly reflecting the new processes, phenomena and organizational and technical forms triggered by further production socialization and the scientific and technical revolution under capitalist conditions. Understandably, the refusal to consider them and to engage in their critical analysis and use of them in the interests of the theory and practice of intensive socialist expanded reproduction conflicts with the spirit and letter of scientific communism.

The further development of Marxist-Leninist science through the confrontation of ideas and the arguments on the basis of which it resolves real problems are not described with sufficient clarity, as a result of which we cannot determine the level of effectiveness of criticism as a means of resolving the problem of the socialist reorganization of social life on the basis of previous results. However, there is more. If the polemical process fails to yield an accurate, convincing and sufficiently complete explanation of the true situation, the role of criticism itself is essentially weakened in the struggle for the minds of the people and in tempering their ideological firmness and vigilance.

It is important in writing fundamental works to determine how criticism is to be applied--by direction, current or school of non-Marxist thinking or else on the basis of individual problems which are the subject of ideological struggle, and how the two are to be combined. Both have their positive and negative sides. We may cite in favor of the first the possibility of exposing more consistently and substantively the class, the gnoseological roots and ideological-theoretical origins of one or another bourgeois school, socio-democratic reformism or right-wing and left-wing revisionism, and combining this with a general characterization of the basic problems which are thus given a scientific classification; we can show the general and the specific in the logic governing their theoretical elaborations and can expose initial erroneous postulates, contradictions in arguments and weak links in the system of views and thus strengthen the ideological-theoretical and conceptual positions of scientific communism in the ideological struggle and enrich the dialectical-materialistic methodology of the knowledge and reorganization of the world. The second method enables us to define more completely all possible approaches to a given problem from the bourgeois and petit bourgeois viewpoints, their one-sidedness, exaggeration and absolutization and, therefore,

the groundlessness of their solutions. This enables us to gain a better knowledge of the problem itself, to avoid extremes and errors and to formulate and implement policy with a deeper knowledge, particularly in the areas of propaganda and counterpropaganda.

Understandably, both approaches are of equal value and fruitfulness and must be optimally used in criticizing hostile ideology. This is characteristic of the books under review as well. Unfortunately, the possibilities offered by these approaches have by no means been used fully (as is the case with the textbook which criticizes contemporary bourgeois and reformist concepts on problems of the world revolutionary process and the building of socialism and communism). The reader can hardly be satisfied with the classification and depth of characterization of a number of currents and concepts analyzed in this work and with the thoroughness of the criticism of the various views on some problems. The desire to follow the order of presentation and the logic of the sections and topics in the course on scientific communism at all costs, allegedly based on the accepted teaching method, leads to numerous and occasionally persistent repetitions and, above all, makes it necessary sometimes to engage in an essentially defensive ideological argument, ascribing to this argument merely the appearance of aggressiveness through energetic expressions regarding the "exposure" of corresponding "falsifications," "distortions" and "misrepresentations." Let us consider this in somewhat greater detail.

In connection with the classification of sociopolitical currents and concepts, it is pointed out that such classification "could be structured on the basis of sociopolitical characteristics of the problems and organically combined with the development of the various sections in the course of scientific communism" ("Kritika Sovremennykh Burzhuznykh i Revizionistskikh Kontseptsii po Probleme Mirovogo Revolyutsionnogo Protsessa," p 13). Consequently, the various ideological currents are classified and described in the sections on anticommunism, nationalism and opportunism, which includes both social reformism and revisionism (ibid). The natural question is the following: what are the specific criteria on which such classifications are based? However, no answer is given. Obviously, no such answer is possible, for if social reformism and revisionism are indeed the currents of petit bourgeois thinking, anticommunism, anti-Sovietism, anti-Marxism, nationalism, etc, are only features or characteristics, although most important, of a great variety of sociopolitical currents, which include opportunism in the labor movement. It is not astounding, therefore, that it would be difficult to include in such classification a number of concepts of nonproletarian socialism found in Asian, African and Latin American countries which are discussed in the textbook in two very substantive chapters. The lack of a substantiated criterion leads to the combination within a single item (anticommunism) of a great variety of currents, theories and concepts ranging from the "stage of economic growth," "the postindustrial society," convergence, etc, to "Marxology," futurology, "Sovietology," Zionism, neofascism and "dissidence" (as well as a great variety of authors such as major bourgeois philosophers, economics and sociologists like D. Bell, J. Tinbergen, John Galbraith, P. Sorokin, R. Tarendorff and even the inveterate anti-Soviet Solzhenitsyn). This is hardly consistent with the task of classifying them.

However, in criticizing their critics proletarian ideology and scientific communism are guided by quite definite criteria. They explore the socioclass roots of ideological currents (monopoly bourgeoisie, other bourgeois strata, the petite bourgeoisie, the peasantry, the social groups in various socio-economic systems in state monopoly capitalist countries and in the liberated countries, etc), the attitudes which the corresponding classes and strata express in these currents toward the main components of the global revolutionary process, including both the opponents and the active or potential allies of the working class in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism; the ideological-theoretical origins and gnoseological foundations of the various currents; and the nature of the strategy and tactics used in the ideological-political struggle they substantiate.

In describing in a separate item social reformism and revisionism (incidentally, the interpretation of social reformism is continued in a separate chapter on the ideology of ruling social democratic parties), the authors raise the important question of the distinguishing features of contemporary revisionism (for some reason, right-wing revisionism only) compared with revisionism at the turn of the century. Here, however, they omit a number of substantial aspects: contemporary revisionism is the revisionism of the age of the general practice of capitalism, the establishment and development of socialism in the USSR and, subsequently, the world socialist system; as the antiscientific revision of Marxism-Leninism, under the banner of its allegedly creative development, it appears, it is born within the contemporary communist movement including the individual ruling parties. Consequently, this circumstance must not be ignored in its analysis.

The struggle against revisionism is a struggle above all within the communist movement, for which reason it is particularly important to detect, to understand the difference between revisionism and a simple erroneous viewpoint, confusion or even the vulgarization of nonrevisionist science; it is important to distinguish between the uncompromising struggle against revisionism and the holding of intraparty and interparty discussions and debates and engaging in comradely and constructive criticism.

Revisionism starts where errors caused by the violation of the laws of dialectics such as the logic and theory of knowledge have class origins. It means above all a revision of Marxist-Leninist methodology in the course of the solution of new problems on the basis of nonproletarian positions of petit bourgeois outlook hostile to real knowledge. The admission that the communist parties independently formulate their policy and substantiate it theoretically and the display of tolerance toward someone else's views in a discussion cannot eliminate the main problem as far as the communist movement is concerned: is it a discussion of specific problems reflecting the specific conditions of one country or another or does it affect the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, the basic views of dialectical and historical materialism, political economy and scientific communism; is this discussion based on and conducted within the limits of a proletarian outlook or does it lead us outside the limits of this outlook, expressing the various class concepts of its participants?

All of this proves that a textbook dealing with the criticism of the vulgarizers and falsifiers of scientific communism should have paid greater attention

to revisionism, discussing this topic in a separate chapter in which, after summing up the nearly century-old experience of the struggle against it, it could be analyzed as an eternally single system of views, although represented by different (right-wing and left-wing) concepts, exposing the reasons for the appearance, the law of development and the extreme forms of revisionist vulgarizing of Marxist-Leninist theory and the need and ways for the surmounting of revisionist confusions for the sake of the unification of the international communist movement and the enhancement of its vanguard role in the global revolutionary process. Here is yet another remark. The conclusiveness of the exposure of our ideological opponents in basic political problems (the nature of the contemporary epoch, the role of the working class and its party, the consequences of the scientific and technical revolution, the problem of war and peace, the socialist revolution, the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, developed socialism, political organization, social management, national relations, and so on, under socialist conditions, is weakened if socioeconomic aspects of the development and change of socioeconomic systems remain outside the scope of active scientific criticism. In particular, it is a question of the fact that under contemporary conditions aggressive criticism requires mainly the use of the new knowledge gained of real socialism as a specific historical organism, a specific system and a functioning and developing entity.

In the same way that the most important proofs which substantiate the revolutionary conclusions of scientific communism are found in Marxist-Leninist philosophy and political economy, the philosophical-economic arguments are fundamental in refuting contemporary bourgeois and petit bourgeois sociopolitical theories and concepts. This is clearly manifested in the textbook whenever thoughts and statements by Marx, Engels and Lenin are cited so as to refute the views and concepts of the opponents of scientific socialism, mainly in the chapters on the groundlessness of bourgeois-revisionist falsifications regarding its appearance and development. However, the results of political-economic studies of the process of socialization at the stage of state monopoly capitalism, the permanent and the variable in the change and development of socioeconomic systems in different countries, economic bases of bourgeois and socialist democracy and the unified political system of the socialist society are described quite insufficiently in the authors' analysis of a number of problems of the contemporary ideological struggle (contradictions and general crisis of capitalism under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution, conversion to socialism, multiplicity of "models of socialism," democracy and totalitarianism, alienation, etc). For this reason, occasionally the criticism is merely superficial without exposing the roots of contemporary processes and phenomena. Thus, for example, anticommunist views on the political organization of the socialist society are studied in "Kritika Sovremennykh Burzhuzaznykh i Revizionistskikh Kontseptsiy po Problemam Stroitel'stva Sotsializma i Kommunizma." The authors fail to use the achievements of our critics of bourgeois and revisionist concepts of the Soviet political system and socialist democracy (as is the case with the works of G. Kh. Shakhnazarov, N. M. Keyzerov, M. N. Marchenko, M. Kh. Farukshin, and others). Unfortunately, the textbook is full of examples of haste and slipshod writing. The concept "Sovietology" is between quotation marks in the first chapter and not in the second of the second volume; various spellings are given to names of bourgeois authors. For example, J. F. Hough is also referred to as D. F. Hock (p 14) and D. F. Hook (p 36). A careless scientific

... has been used mainly in describing foreign publications. Therefore, although this textbook, the purpose of which is to improve teaching and study of scientific communism in VUZs, meets this need in general, it requires substantial further work regardless of its overall positive value.

The main problem of the ideological struggle of the 1970's, which unquestionably will be retained in the foreseeable future, is that of Marxism-Leninism as the only scientific system of philosophical, economic and sociopolitical views which constitute the outlook of the working class, and the only international steadily developing theory of the knowledge and revolutionary transformation of the world. It has been suitably discussed in all works under review and, naturally, above all in "Kritika Sovremennykh Burzhuaznykh i Reformistskikh Fal'sifikatorov Marksizma-Leninizma." The authors pit substantive scientific arguments and concepts, accurate historical data and precise facts against attempts to depict Marxism-Leninism as an allegedly "obsolete" social development concept; to pit monism and the integrity of Marxism-Leninism against "conceptual pluralism" and multiple Marxist variants, thus eliminating the qualitative distinctions of Marxism and bringing it closer to bourgeois and petit bourgeois thinking; to proclaim Leninism as the "revision" of Marxism, a strictly regional or national Russian current of political thought which draws its origins from non-Marxist theories; to pit reality and real socialism against Marxist-Leninist theory and the communist ideals, specifically to depict Leninism responsible for errors and omissions allowed in the international communist movement and the building of socialism in one or another country, and other attempts to falsify the theory of Marxism-Leninism and socialist practice.

The 19th and 20th centuries have been marked by the efforts of bourgeois academic science to develop a general theory of the development of human society as an alternative to historical materialism. However, it is only the materialist understanding of history that has converted socialism from utopia to science and which has made it possible to create and develop further an integral theory of the appearance of the new system, which was born within capitalism in the course of the proletarian revolution and which must cover a number of historical stages such as the transitional period and the socialist phase before it reaches the highest phase--communism.

Marxism-Leninism is international. Lenin particularly emphasized that in formulating the theoretical foundations of the party's program we should not "pay our entire attention on the specific national transitional stages which are peculiar to us but not by Europe, for this would be theoretically wrong" (Lenin, "Collected Works," Vol 36, pp 49-50). On the same basis that Marx' scientific summation of the experience of the Paris Commune does not make the French theory of the Marxist theory of the state or the dictatorship of the proletariat, that the summed-up experience in the development of English capitalism does not make British economic theory, Lenin's summation of the experience of socialist Russia does not make Russian the theory of the revolution and the building of socialism. Essentially, Marxist-Leninist theory reflects mainly the contradictions and contradictions within a given system or transitional age rather than an individual country.

... however, better than anyone else Lenin developed the problem of the correlation between the general laws and the characteristics of their



implementation in a given country and under specific historical circumstances. The communists, he wrote, must "be able to apply the general and fundamental principles of communism...to the characteristic feature in the objective development toward communism inherent in the individual country, which must be studied, found or guessed at" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch., " Vol 41, p 74). That is why the attempt to belittle the international nature of the Leninist theory on grounds that it allegedly does not suit one or another area or country is aimed at justifying those who are unable to resolve the problem of the general and the specific and defaming those who are successfully resolving this problem in theory and in practice.

In summing up historical practice, after emphasizing the loyalty of the CPSU to the Leninist stipulations, the 26th congress pointed out that "...In no single currently existing socialist country were the forms, methods and means of socialist revolution an automatic repetition of foreign experience. The GDR, Poland, Hungary, Cuba, Mongolia, Yugoslavia--in a word, all socialist countries--made their revolutions their own way, in the forms dictated by the ratio of class forces within each of these countries, the national situation and the external circumstances." The creation and consolidation of the foundations of socialism, it is further emphasized, also had and have their specific features in the different countries. This is one more argument against the attempts to depict the difficulties and even crises which appear in some communist parties as being allegedly the result of the nature of the party of a new type and of the socialist system, or efforts to impose upon them patterns or development systems.

The Leninist theory of the socialist revolution, the transitional period and the building of socialism and communism is based on the Marxist analysis of the bourgeois society and state monopoly capital. Consequently, those who understand and acknowledge the trueness of Marx' "Das Kapital" and of the Leninist theory of imperialism as the development of capitalism cannot fail to understand or to acknowledge, on the basis of the logic of the subject, the truth that Leninism as a whole is Marxism of the contemporary epoch, a reliable manual for the revolutionary reorganization of the world confirmed by universal-historical practice. It is from such positions and on the basis of extensive factual data that the authors of "Aktual'nyye Voprosy Sovremennoy Ideologicheskoy Bor'by" engage in a convincing polemic on problems of the theory and practical activities of the ruling communist parties and their domestic and foreign policies. They aggressively expose imperialist ideological diversions and the reactionary nature of the policy, ideology and propaganda of contemporary reformism, revisionism, Maoism and Zionism, and the old and new means used in the defense of the bourgeois world.

The books under review support with argumentation the attempts typical of most modern bourgeois and petit bourgeois philosophy to gain capital as the result of a pseudo-alliance with the basic trends of contemporary social thinking--Marxism--and thus to strangle it. The once-refined bourgeois academic science is borrowing ideas from "noncommunist Marxists," neo-Trotskyites, Maoists, etc. The monopoly bourgeoisie supports such radical currents, which it converts into safe forms of pseudo-Marxism. Essentially, it is a question of defense of state monopoly capitalism, the misrepresentation of the so-called "mixed economy" as being socialist or a transitional form leading to socialism, and the dissemination of various forms of sociopolitical romanticism and reactionary utopianism.

Let us sum up a few results. In the 1970's we developed cadres of specialists in the criticism of bourgeois and petit bourgeois philosophical, economic and sociopolitical doctrines. The number of works published on such problems increased substantially. In this respect as well, the books under review reflect the situation in this sector of the ideological front. At the same time, however, the education, information and conceptual training of the readers have increased. Today no single important problem can be convincingly presented to the readers without a profound analysis of the main views on it found throughout the world.

The critical analysis of the ideas and concepts of our class enemy, as we pointed out, has always been a close part of the ideology of the working class, as is confirmed by all classic Marxist-Leninist works. Noteworthy in this respect is the question of the division of labor, specialization and cooperation in the social sciences. Unquestionably, increasing priority is being given in the criticism of our critics to pitting their views against positive scientific developments and solutions of intrinsically difficult problems of scientific communism. It is understandable, therefore, that the division of Marxist social scientists into critics and so to speak "noncritics" is very relative. Hence the importance in writing critical works of broadening the creative cooperation among philosophers, political economists, sociologists, jurists and others who specialize in problems of contemporary currents of bourgeois thinking, and in the elaboration of topical problems which are in the center of the ideological confrontation. The strengthening of the close interaction between the critics of hostile ideology and those engaged in the creative development of scientific communism is today, in our view, the main factor in the successful implementation of the tasks set by the 26th CPSU Congress of exposing anticommunism, the bourgeois and revisionist concepts of social development and all falsifiers of Marxism-Leninism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS, "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/8

## BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 p 120

- [Text] 1. Brezhnev, L. I. "O Lenine i Leninizme" [On Lenin and Leninism]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 336 pp.
2. Brezhnev, L. I. "Na Strazhe Mira i Sotsializma" [Guarding Peace and Socialism]. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 815 pp.
3. Brezhnev, L. I. "Ob Internatsionalizme i Druzhe Narodov" [On Internationalism and Friendship Among the Peoples]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 702 pp.
4. Brezhnev, L. I. "Sovetskiye Profsoyuzy v Usloviyakh Razvitogo Sotsializma" [The Soviet Trade Unions Under Developed Socialism]. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 623 pp.
5. "Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev." Life and activities. Photographic documents. V. A. Golikov, general editor. Compiled by I. I. Chkhikvishvili, G. Ya. Kovalenko and A. N. Sakharov. Planeta, Moscow, 1981, 286 pp with ill.
6. Kunayev, D. A. "Leninskaya Natsional'naya Politika KPSS -- v Deystvii" [The Leninist National Policy in Action]. Selected speeches and articles. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 624 pp.
7. Baybakov, N. K. "O Gosudarstvennom Plane Ekonomicheskogo i Sotsial'nogo Razvitiya SSSR na 1981-1985 Gody, Gosudarstvennom Plane Ekonomicheskogo i Sotsial'nogo Razvitiya SSSR na 1982 God i Khode Vypolneniya Plana v 1981 Godu" [On the State Plan For the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985, the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1982 and the Implementation of the 1981 Plan]. Report and concluding speech at the joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, USSR Supreme Soviet sixth session, 10th convocation. "Zakon Soyuz Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik o Gosudarstvennom Plane Ekonomicheskogo i Sotsial'nogo Razvitiya SSSR na 1981-1985 Gody. Zakon Soyuz Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik o Gosudarstvennom Plane Ekonomicheskogo i Sotsial'nogo Razvitiya SSSR na 1982 God. Postanovleniye Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR o Khode Vypolneniya Gosudarstvennogo Plana Ekonomicheskogo i Sotsial'nogo Razvitiya SSSR na 1981 God" [USSR Law on the State Plan For the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985.

USSR Law on the State Plan For the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1982. USSR Supreme Soviet Decree on the Fulfillment of the State Plan For the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 47 pp.

8. Garbuzov, V. F. "O Gosudarstvennom Byudzhete SSSR na 1982 God i ob Ispolnenii Gosudarstvennogo Byudzheta SSSR za 1980 God" [On the 1982 USSR State Budget and the Execution of the 1980 USSR State Budget]. Report and concluding speech at the joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, USSR Supreme Soviet sixth session, 10th convocation. "Zakon Soyuza Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik o Gosudarstvennom Byudzhete SSSR na 1982 God. Postanovleniye Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR ob Utverzhdenii Otcheta ob Ispolnenii Gosudarstvennogo Byudzheta SSSR za 1980 God" [USSR Law on the 1982 USSR State Budget. USSR Supreme Soviet Decree Ratifying the Execution of the 1980 Budget]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 32 pp.

9. Anchishkin, A. I. "Nauchno-Tekhnicheskii Progress i Intensifikatsiya Proizvodstva" [Scientific and Technical Progress and Production Intensification]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 94 pp. (Steps of the 11th Five-Year Plan).

10. Vasil'yev, I. V. "Obraz Zhizni i Ideologicheskaya Rabota" [Way of Life and Ideological Work]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 63 pp. (Party Worker's Library).

11. "Vneshnyaya Politika ChSSR" [The Foreign Policy of Czechoslovakia]. S. I. Kolesnikov, general editor. Progress, Moscow, 1981, 239 pp. (Socialism: Experience, Problems, Prospects).

12. Volkov, Yu. Ye. and Rogovin, V. Z. "Voprosy Sotsial'noy Politiki KPSS" [Problems of CPSU Social Policy]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 286 pp.

13. Gavrilov, A. T. "Muzhestvo i Chelovechnost'" [Courage and Humaneness]. Sovetskaya Rossiya, Moscow, 1981, 224 pp.

14. Gayevoy, V. M. "Kazhdomu Rabochemu Chasu -- Vysokoyu Otdachu" [High Returns From Each Work Hour]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 64 pp. (Party Worker's Library, 6).

15. Dribin, L. G. "Znamenets Leninizma v Latvii" [Flag Bearer of Leninism in Latvia]. Outline of the life and activities of P. I. Stuchka. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 238 pp.

16. Kaznacheev, A. A. "V. I. Lenin o Politicheskom Rukovodstve Massami v Bor'be za Sotsializm" [V. I. Lenin on the Political Leadership of the Masses in the Struggle for Socialism] (November 1917-1923). Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 175 pp.

17. Karlyuk, I. Ya. "Agrarno-Promyshlenny Kompleks" [The Agroindustrial Complex]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 95 pp with diagrams. (Steps of the 11th Five-Year Plan).

18. Kostin, A. F. "Voskhozhdeniye" [Ascent]. Pages from young Lenin's biography. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 255 pp.
19. Kuz'min, E. L. "Demokratiya i Konstitutsii Dvukh Mirov" [Democracy and the Constitution in the Two Worlds]. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1981, 80 pp. (Library of the Internationalist).
20. "Opyt KPSS v Reshenii Zhenskogo Voprosa" [CPSU Experience in Resolving the Women's Problem]. N. I. Kondakova (responsible editor), A. V. Krasnov and L. V. Shirikov, editors. Mysl', Moscow, 1981, 269 pp.
21. Petropavlovskiy, R. V. "Revolyutsionnaya Moral' Rabochego Klassa" [The Revolutionary Morality of the Working Class]. Origins and establishment. Profizdat, Moscow, 1981, 256 pp.
22. PROBLEMY NAUCHNOGO KOMMUNIZMA, No 15. A. A. Amvrosov, responsible editor. Mysl', Moscow, 1981, 254 pp.
23. "Chast' Obshcheproletarskogo Dela" [Part of the All-Proletarian Cause]. Literary criticism in prerevolutionary bolshevik publications. Compiled by I. V. Kuznetsov. Sovremennik, Moscow, 1981, 382 pp. (Lovers of Russian Literature Library. From the literary heritage).
24. Shishkov, Yu. V. "Kapitalisticheskaya Ekonomika Bez Kompasa" [The Capitalist Economy Adrift]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 192 pp with tables.
25. "Ekonomicheskaya Politika KPSS" [CPSU Economic Policy]. Textbook. By a group of authors headed by L. I. Abalkin. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 367 pp with diagrams.
26. Yurenev, R. N. "Kniga Fil'mov" [Book on Films]. Articles and reviews from different periods. Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1981, 336 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/8

JOURNAL'S MAIL FOR JULY-DECEMBER 1981

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 2, Jan 82 pp 121-128

[Text] In the second half of 1981 KOMMUNIST received 1,089 contributions, including 202 articles, essays, reviews and notes, 244 answers to materials published in the journal, 149 queries, suggestions and wishes and 494 citizens' declarations, petitions and complaints.

Virtually all materials received--articles, notes, essays, reviews, answers to materials published in the journal and readers' suggestions and wishes--are related to the implementation of the tasks formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress in the areas of production technology, science, culture, the organizational and ideological work of the party and the state, and domestic and foreign policy. Their authors try to contribute to the solution of ripe problems. Almost all letters contain an interesting study of a phenomenon or process or useful conclusions and considerations. Naturally, the journal cannot publish all manuscripts received. However, it is also desirable to acquaint the readers of KOMMUNIST with the ideas expressed by our correspondents which, from the editors' viewpoint, are of the greatest social significance.

1

As was emphasized in the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th congress, reality proves that the tendency to engage in scholastic theorizing has still not been surmounted. The party is profoundly concerned with this phenomenon which has affected some scientists. At the all-union conference of the heads of chairs of social sciences, which was held last year, Comrade M. A. Suslov described this tendency as the main obstacle in the development of the social sciences. Essentially, it means that "sterile discussions which set the teeth on edge are conducted over many years and sometimes decades on the subject of one or another concept or definition in political economy, philosophy, sociology, law and some other areas. Meanwhile, discussions on topical problems are held sometimes timidly sluggishly, without always developing into an efficient and comprehensive exchange of views." This party criticism, according to V. Davydov, an economist from Rostov-na-Donu, fully applies to the elaboration of the theory of socialist reproduction, which requires further fundamental studies. He disagrees with economists who consider that the indicators used by Marx in the second volume of "Das Kapital" are the most important elements and indicators of systems which illustrate the reproduction process (in

the USSR national economy). Had such been the case, both capitalist and socialist reproduction could be reduced to the same system.

V. Davydov cites Marx to the effect that "the capitalist production process is a historically defined form of social production process in general" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 25, pt II, p 385). Consequently, the most important task in theoretical knowledge is the study of the historical production method and its division into general categories and characteristics which give it a specific historical aspect.

It is necessary to formulate and resolve this problem today in order to identify the objectively common nature of the production process in general and the objective differences within the internal organization of the capitalist and the socialist (communist) public production methods. Therefore, it must be a question not of the acceptance or rejection of Marx' structures of reproduction systems in terms of Soviet economic science but of their further development. As we know, the profit of an enterprise is one of the important indicators of its operational effectiveness. However, economic management practice proves that higher profits are not always the result of best work, increased labor productivity or reduced production costs. Under the existing economic management conditions profits can be increased otherwise as well--by unjustifiably raising prices and refusing to produce goods "unprofitable" to the enterprise but needed by the country. This was mentioned at the 26th CPSU Congress.

Illegal profits have been with us for quite some time. They are also referred to as "inflated," "fictitious," "supplementary," "undeserved," etc. The harm they cause is obvious. In his article, I. Proskurin, candidate of economic sciences and docent at the Voronezh Technological Institute, raises the question of introducing into scientific-economic practice the concept of net profit, or profit free from nonproduction influence. Such profit would reflect the real results of enterprise activities more objectively. In his view, the computation and analysis of indicators such as the total net profit per worker and per ruble of wages by enterprises and economic organs would be an important step aimed at upgrading labor economic effectiveness.

The questions raised by I. Proskurin are topical but require further study and extensive discussion by economic specialists.

The CPSU congress called for increasing the average annual output of agricultural commodities by 12-14 percent during this five-year plan, i.e., to double the per-capita growth compared with the previous five-year plan. This is a very difficult task the solution of which requires the fuller utilization not only of the biological, agrochemical and organizational-technical but the social potential of agriculture. This is the view expressed by V. Samarkin, senior engineer for scientific research at Voronezh University. He emphasizes that upgrading the labor and political activeness of the rural population becomes a primary project.

Occasionally economic managers overestimate the possibilities of modern equipment and technology and their role in agricultural production and lower their attention to the rural cadres and their social needs. However, we know that without knowledgeable and dedicated people any equipment is useless. The underestimation of the professional growth of the rural worker and the improvement

of his living conditions and cultural atmosphere considerably lowers the production potential of labor collectives.

In recent years, V. Samarkin goes on to say, a great deal has been done to resolve the ripe social problems of the countryside. However, by no means everything planned has been carried out. This is not only because of a shortage of funds and forces but also because they were frequently used regardless of the long-term development of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. This situation must be corrected and all social and cultural construction must be based on the long-term plans for the economic and social development of each farm for the five-year plan and with annual breakdowns. However, experience in social planning in the individual farms has proved that by no means does it always yield the expected results. This is due to the fact that sometimes plans have been formulated and implemented formally, merely paying lip service to fashion. The lack of balancing of social development with actually available material, financial and other necessary resources at the disposal of the collective has been a widespread error. For example, a plan which calls for the construction of a nursery or cafeteria without providing for money and materials becomes totally senseless. The low effectiveness of social development plans in the past is also explained by the fact the production collectives themselves were not involved in their formulation. Such errors must be avoided.

The development of the creative forces of the collectives by improving working and living conditions and raising the standards of the workers' culture and skills and their all-round moral, labor and political education must become the main target of social planning. Only then could this contribute to the implementation of the plans for increasing the production of agricultural commodities.

Many readers are concerned with problems related to the struggle against departmentalism and parochialism, which are major obstructions in serving the national interest. That is the reason for the extensive response to the letter by M. Mikhaylov "On the Subject of Departmentalism" (KOMMUNIST, No 8, 1981). Our correspondents approve the stand taken by the author, who has depicted this negative phenomenon, which clashes with the principles and objectives of socialist economics, thoroughly and convincingly. In their unanimous view, the need has long existed for a daring and profound discussion of this greatly figured phenomenon in economic and other publications and the elaboration of scientific methods to stop it.

M. Mikhaylov characterizes departmentalism as the egotistical neglect of the national interest for the sake of the interests of the group, and as a "method of administrative action which deviates from the national interest." Indeed, the damage which this causes to the economy and to our entire life is tremendous, states D. Epshteyn, candidate of economic sciences (Leningrad), who agrees with him. Departmentalism leads to the inadmissible increase in the use of resources. It causes shortages of many items and wrecks the work of inter-affiliate units. Nevertheless, the results of its own activities are always reported in favorable figures; however, the end product which goes to meet the needs of society is reduced in relative and sometime even absolute terms.

It is the writer's opinion that departmentalism cannot be considered a manifestation of one or another accidental omission or of the subjective qualities of individuals. The material status of the individual working person, the



production collective or a group of people under socialism depends not only on the well-being of society as a whole but on their labor contribution as well. However, this contribution does not always add to the satisfaction of the national interest. Furthermore, quite frequently and for a variety of reasons (imperfect planning, egotistical objectives, "profitable" and "unprofitable" work, etc.) it conflicts with this interest. The contradiction between economic interests provides favorable grounds for a variety of negative phenomena in which the public interest assumes secondary priority while the activities of the individual or the collective are inconsistent with the basic interests of the working people.

Such manifestations cannot be successfully fought merely with the help of appeals or various modifications of the cost effectiveness system. According to D. Epshteyn, it is precisely the public interest of the working people that provides a real basis for the elimination of narrow departmental and parochial interests. It is precisely the public interest that must be firmly defended by all party, state and public organs and organizations and officials. This also means that the broader toiling masses must become involved in this effort. This struggle is directed by the communist party, whose programmatic objective is to serve the interests of society and the working people. "The national interests must always stand above the interests of the individual ministries and enterprises" was the demand voiced at the 26th congress.

The decree on perfecting the economic mechanism includes the indicator of normative net output, which enables us to assess more accurately the real work done by a collective, as one of the basic assessment indicators. However, it would be erroneous to think that without increasing exigency and responsibility and without strengthening state discipline the system of indicators would automatically benefit properly working enterprises and prevent poor work. Without strict control the new indicator itself could be used by individual "expert" economic managers pursuing narrow departmental and selfish objectives. Despite its great qualities, in itself the normative net output indicator cannot eliminate departmentalism or the pursuit of local interests.

The party follows a course of enhancing the role of specific assignments and the natural-physical aspects of production plans. This is the most important feature in improving management. It represents a firm rejection of formalism in assessing the activities of enterprises and associations. The quality aspects of the workers collectives, the realization of social interests and the full implementation of specific assignments are given priority in the areas of management and control.

Some authors cite manifestations of departmental approach to the implementation of the current five-year plan tasks and the decrees of directival authorities. A. Tkachenko, who works for the RSFSR State Committee for Labor, writes: "Our collective is studying the initial results of the use of the indicator of a ceiling on the number of workers and employees. It is entirely clear that the mechanism used in the application of this normative indicator is experiencing to the fullest extent the obstructive power of narrow departmental interests, something which we, too, feel as representatives of an interdepartmental organ."

Yu. Tarasov, candidate of historical sciences and docent at the Leningrad Higher Party School, points out that "my colleagues and I clearly see the negative influence of departmentalism on the frame of mind of our students. Some of them have developed the opinion that party organizations and committees are 'helpless' in the struggle against departmentalism..."

Let us point out that the ability to fight departmentalism and parochialism day in and day out is one of the criteria in assessing the firmness and political preparedness of all management cadres and the work quality of all supra-departmental organs. This calls for people who are loyal to the party, who are fearless and persistent in defending the interests of the state. A clear and accurate understanding of the political nature and danger of departmentalism and its harmfulness not only in economic activities but in ideology and politics is needed. In this connection, Yu. Tarasov suggests that a more thorough study and discussion of the struggle against narrow departmental and parochial trends be conducted at the Institute for Upgrading the Skills of Leading Party and Soviet Cadres of the CC CPSU Academy of Social Sciences and at the Academy of the National Economy.

The party committees at all levels must have a final say in this struggle. They must continually check their decisions against the common interests and demand of economic managers and specialists the strict observance of state discipline. Only this will help to surmount the narrow departmental interests.

Those who responded to M. Mikhaylov's letter include A. Kiryushin, candidate of philosophical sciences (Moscow), P. Mikhalevich (Rostov-na-Donu), E. Petrov, candidate of technical sciences (Krasnotur'insk), V. Doroshenko (Krivoy Rog) and others. All of them expressed their approval of the article "On the Subject of Departmentalism" and discussed problems not mentioned by its author. They share the opinion that this phenomenon must be studied in depth and that a decisive struggle must be waged against it.

2

The 26th party congress paid great attention to problems of the ideological struggle. The contemporary international circumstances and the gravity of the ideological confrontation in the world demand the taking of additional steps for achieving a radical turn in the solution of the essential problems of ideological-moral education and strengthening the unity between organizational-party and ideological work. The insufficient tie with life and with topical problems affecting the people remains one of the weak spots in such activities. This is also confirmed by letters addressed to KOMMUNIST.

A. Rusakov, a member of the bureau of the Turkestan section of the History-Literature Association of Old Bolsheviks of the CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism, sent a communication to the editors, the essence of which is the following:

Usually, development of the social structure and relations linked with it are studied on one level only. For example, the population is classified only on the basis of a general class characteristic such as position in the public production system. However, social processes in real life take place and develop also in a variety of groups and communities smaller than a class. According to the author, we must particularly single out communities whose

members are engaged in production activities in addition to public farming, such as auxiliary plots. Although here as well relations are shaped and developed under the determining influence of general class processes, they nevertheless have their own characteristics which should be studied and taken into consideration. Thus, the private auxiliary farm is unquestionably useful to socialist society. Its essential purpose is to supply the family with foodstuffs, while the surplus goes to the public food fund and is sold to cooperatives and state procurement organizations or at the kolkhoz market. At the same time, the private auxiliary farm contributes to the efficient utilization of the leisure time and to the active relaxation of the working people. However, the moment the private plot becomes oriented toward the production of any given single crop (strawberries, citrus fruits, grapes, flowers, etc), it loses its auxiliary character in the initial meaning of the term and becomes a petty commodity project aimed at earning a profit by selling the entire output on the market. In the absence of a state-cooperative marketing organization, it contributes to the acquisition of unearned income.

The socialist society harmoniously combines public production with the family farm with no harm to the interest of society and the individual. However, recurrences of private ownership mentality exist. This calls for the profound study of current socioeconomic processes and, on the basis of scientific data, the formulation of correcting economic, social and ideological steps.

In his letter, R. Medvedev (Saratov) discusses the correlation between the concepts of "philistinism" and "petit bourgeois ideology."

The article by L. Onikov "On the Reorganization of Ideological Work: Thoughts of a Propagandist" (No 17, 1981) triggered a lively response.

The author's thoughts are supported by S. Kozlov (Moscow). Actually, he states, the well-established propaganda of elementary and basic truths with the help of cliches and "pseudoscientific" and meaningless verbosity, without fresh thinking, has begun to irritate and anger more and more people. L. Onikov is entirely right when he says that we must reorganize our propaganda not only in terms of form but mainly content. According to S. Kozlov, the essence of such reorganization must be to link more closely ideological work with each specific step and breath taken by our society. Contradictions must not be glossed over in propaganda and, particularly, in agitation. On the contrary, they must be exposed and trigger in the masses class and bolshevik intolerance of recurrences of petit-bourgeois thinking which are still encountered in some people.

"I will put my signature under each of the theses formulated by propagandist L. Onikov with great pleasure," writes I. Ivanov, from Moscow. "The task is indeed great. So far by no means has it been realized by everyone. However, once the time has come, the party will resolve it without any question and our society will take yet another step toward its objective." The correspondent expresses the wish that KOMMUNIST would publish more articles on the positive experience in ideological and propaganda work, containing specific recommendations for the organization of this work and for upgrading it effectiveness, as is the case with this article. Such articles could play a major role the implementation of the reorganization of ideological activities as planned by the party.

In his letter, propagandist I. Grishko (Bakhmach, Chernigovskaya Oblast) shares his rich experience, observations and conclusions, which coincide with the main ideas expressed in L. Onikov's article. The author expresses the hope that such publications in the journal will help the propagandists to interpret the essence of the reorganization of their work.

Many correspondences discuss party ideological and organizational activities. They include notes by miner V. Galushnik (Shakhtinsk, Karagandinskaya Oblast), K. Gordeyehik (Leningrad), G. Yarovog (Bryanka, Voroshilovgradskaya Oblast), V. Zhukov, Great Patriotic War veteran (Moscow), N. Shakhov (Leningrad) and others.

3

Throughout 1981 the editors continued to receive reactions to the article by Academician L. S. Pontryagin "On Mathematics and the Quality of Its Teaching," published in KOMMUNIST (No 14, 1980). The following is a brief review of such letters in accordance with our promise to return to such letters to the editor the moment the USSR Ministry of Education and the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences defined specific steps leading to substantial changes the situation in the schools.

"I was a teacher of mathematics in secondary schools," writes P. Litvinov (Sevastopol'). "Subsequently I taught this subject in a VTUZ and thus had the opportunity to observe the consequences of the measures related to the reform in the mathematics curriculum. The mathematics teachers in the VTUZ are like 'consumers' of secondary school training and can see the drop in quality with every passing year despite statements to the effect that ever new successes are being achieved by the secondary schools in this area."

Engineer S. Degtyarev (L'vov) who, incidentally, has a university degree in mathematics, looked at the current algebra and geometry textbooks and was amazed at the way mathematics was being taught to children today. "I realized," he writes, why it is that today's youth, which is generally speaking more developed and sharper than the youth of my generation, is poorly acquainted with mathematics and is frequently experiencing difficulties with its most basic applications. I am deeply convinced that the current curricula and textbooks are to be blamed entirely."

On the initiative of the bureau of the methodical council of chairs of mathematics of higher educational institutions in the Ural zone, a seminar was held last year to discuss the article by Academician L. S. Pontryagin. Representatives of the chairs of mathematics at the Sverdlovsk and Perm VUZs, scientific associates of the Institute of Mathematics and Mechanics of the USSR Academy of Sciences Ural Scientific Center, secondary school teachers and method workers of the Sverdlovsk and Sverdlovskaya Oblast Institute for the Advancement of Teachers reached the unanimous conclusion that the level of knowledge of mathematics among graduating students in many VUZs in Ural cities has noticeably declined in recent years. First-year students are experiencing difficulties in handling fractions and the simplest algebra operations, resolving square root equations, handling complex numbers, structuring the simplest geometric shapes and charting elementary functions. To a large extent, this can be explained by the imperfect mathematics curricula and textbooks. The participants in the seminar supported the article in KOMMUNIST.

In the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th party congress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: "...The quality of curricula and textbooks must be improved. It has been properly pointed out that they are excessively complex. This hinders the training process and unjustifiably overloads the children. The Ministry of Education and the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences must correct this situation without delay." Many of our correspondents justifiably believe that this instruction fully applies to the mathematical training in secondary schools which, as confirmed by about 200 answers to the article, is not entirely consistent with the demands of reality today.

We would like to know, writes V. Abonosimov (Moscow), what specific steps are being taken in answer to proper criticism. The same question is asked by many other correspondents--secondary school mathematics teachers, instructors, VUZ chair associates, scientists, engineering and technical workers and parents.

The editors received a letter from the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences Presidium. It states that the materials published by KOMMUNIST on the teaching of mathematics in the secondary schools are of great importance to the science of education. "By the end of the 1950's, after the Soviet Union launched an artificial satellite and following Yu. Gagarin's flight, a sharp positive interest in the curricula and textbooks in mathematics, physics and chemistry used in Soviet schools arose among Western educators and were given a high rating." Nevertheless, at the beginning of the 1960's, the view developed among certain mathematical circles of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences (at that time the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences was only being organized) to the effect that "until recently our secondary school mathematics course had remained somewhere on the threshold of the great achievements of the 17th century...." Eventually, it was suggested that the mathematics curriculum and textbooks be subjected to a basic revision, to be followed by all secondary school curricula and textbooks. The draft curricula were discussed at general meetings of the RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. "No fundamental debate developed," the letter points out. "Such a passive attitude is explainable: in the period which preceded the meeting, most academy members had not taken part in drafting the curricula."

The RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences Presidium submitted the draft curricula to the RSFSR Ministry of Education.

The introduction of the new curricula in the general schools, in the view of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences Presidium, "began before a number of essential problems had been resolved (such as a clear definition of what should be taken as the foundations of the science of mathematics)....The RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences Presidium, in violation of the logic of the pedagogical process and of common sense and practical experience, gave its approval to the use of the new curricula and textbooks for a period of 4 years (instead of 10, as required). Precipitate actions were the inevitable result: a number of "raw" textbooks (on mathematics mainly) were sent to the schools, the teachers were given no time to study the new curricula and textbooks, and so on....

"The new mathematics textbooks began to be issued to the schools starting with the 1971/72 school year. They were quite unfinished and had not been tried by experienced teachers. It is precisely they that triggered sharp criticism. The new textbooks were criticized mainly by secondary school teachers on a serious, substantiated and knowledgeable basis."

According to expert evaluations made by scientists and experienced teachers, the letter goes on to say, the situation regarding mathematics textbooks today is as follows: "a. Mathematics textbooks for the first-third and fourth-fifth grades are acceptable and require no extraordinary measures whatever. They will be improved in the way applicable for all textbooks; b. algebra textbooks for the sixth-eighth grades require further major changes: particularly complex concepts must be deleted and the style of the presentation must be improved; c. particularly serious attention must be paid to geometry and algebra textbooks for the 9th-10th grades.

"School practice over the past decade and the critical assessments of curricula and textbooks," it goes on to say, "lead to the following conclusions: a. one of the main reasons for the difficulties which developed in connection with mathematics curricula and textbooks was a certain although limited authorship monopoly. Reliable barriers must be erected to block all attempts to restore it; b. scientific topics being discussed by scientists should not be included in secondary school textbooks; c. together with the scientists, experienced teachers must participate more extensively in the writing of textbooks, for which purpose the necessary organizational and material conditions must be created; d. textbooks must be tested not only in experimental academic schools but in ordinary schools, with the help of the teachers' practical experience."

Between 1972 and 1980 the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and its institutes paid great attention to improving the curricula and upgrading the level of accessibility of textbook material. The academy will soon be engaging in the expert assessment of geometry and algebra textbooks written under the guidance of the RSFSR Ministry of Education Scientific-Research School Institute. The selection of authors who will write a number of new experimental mathematics textbooks has been started.

"The draft plans for academic scientific research for the 11th Five-Year Plan ascribe a central position to problems of improving the content of education and to the rhythm of the school activities of secondary school students. The draft plans are substantially improved on the basis of stipulations included in the report by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU General Secretary, submitted to the 26th CPSU Congress, and the documents adopted at the congress."

The editors also received a letter from Yu. Ivanov, head of the USSR Ministry of Education Main Administration of Schools. His report follows:

"Following the journal's articles on problems of secondary school mathematics training, the USSR Ministry of Education concentrated on the writing of clearer mathematics textbooks for secondary schools. It involved the participation of the best mathematicians and method workers in revising the content of school training." The content of mathematics training in secondary schools has been approved. This document assigns a stable minimum of mandatory material to be covered and requirements regarding the mathematics training of the

students. The content of the training has been coordinated with and approved by the USSR Academy of Sciences Mathematics Department Bureau.

The new "Geometry for the Sixth-Tenth Grades" textbook by Academician A. V. Pogorelov, which was tried in Khar'kovskaya Oblast schools, has been approved for the entire union. It will be used starting in the 1982/83 school year. The retraining of teachers has been initiated and method aids containing the necessary (particularly at the start) recommendations to teachers have been drafted.

"At the same time, work is underway on the writing of and experimentation with new mathematics textbooks for the fourth-fifth grades, written by I. V. Baranova and others; for sixth-eighth-grade algebra, by two groups of authors--Sh. A. Alimov et al. and by D. K. Faddeyev; for algebra and elements of analysis for the 9th-10th grades, by N. Ya. Vilenkin et al.; for geometry for the sixth-eight grades, by L. S. Atanasyan and for the 9th-10th grades, by A. D. Aleksandrov et al. Most of these textbooks will be part of the 'Library of the Mathematics Teacher' series, which will make it possible for a large number of teachers to become familiar with them."

Further work is being done on the current textbooks. The theoretical material is being looked over with a view to shortening it by deleting secondary matters, simplifying definitions, terminology and symbols, paying greater attention to assignments which develop skills and habits of the students and intensifying the conceptual and applied areas.

On a parallel basis, textbooks are being written on other subjects (physics, biology, history, etc). The USSR Ministry of Education ascribes exceptional importance to this work.

Many readers were interested in the article by Prof A. Losev "History of Philosophy as a School of Thought" (No 11, 1981). The author noted the timeliness of raising the question of improving the philosophical standard of all specialists. This is a prerequisite for creative success and a protection against methodological and methodical shortcuts which lead to imperfect thinking. Dialectical-materialistic philosophy is a reliable base for the high thinking standard of any educated citizen. However, this base cannot exist without proper familiarity with the history of the development of philosophical thinking in general and Marxist-Leninist philosophy in particular.

In our Philosophical Sciences B. Genzelis (Vil'nyus) emphasizes in his letter that every researcher must become properly familiar with the scientific ideas of his predecessors. He fully supports A. Losev in that our contemporary philosophical thinking must be as good as any other in history and even better. He also asks: Do all of our works meet these requirements? In this connection, he points out two extremes noted today. The first is the retelling of familiar concepts; the second is dealing with excessively narrow topics of interest to no more than a few specialists who, in turn, are working on these problems. In a word, it becomes a "philosophy for philosophers." These two extremes share one common feature: the "marginal" reader is of no interest to them.

Sometimes there is excessive stir in connection with the elaboration of a categorical apparatus in the natural sciences. To what extent does this

contribute to the development of the sciences themselves, and could this sometimes be a subconscious due paid to positivism? The fact is that a number of farfetched problems come into being while man with his daily needs is ignored.

Those who responded to the article by A. Losev include P. Krysin (Astrakhan'), G. Dapralov (Moscow), Ye. Tyugashev (Novosibirsk), M. Kafarov (Kirovabad), V. Markov (Kstinino Village, Kirovskaya Oblast), I. Makhan'kov (Moscow) and others.

In a letter to the editors, M. Rutkevich, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, states that "as a regular reader of many of our central leading literary-artistic and sociopolitical journals, I have noticed with a certain concern that less attention is being paid to conceptual problems. I am amazed by cases in which religious-mystical ideas and feelings which are profoundly alien to the materialistic outlook which dominates in our country and, one must assume, among the Soviet readers, find their way into journals. In my view, such flirtation with divinity may be found, for example, in the selection of notes by Vl. Soloukhin entitled "Pebbles in One's Hands"....

"'In the 20th century,' the writer insists, 'there is no doubt in the mind of any sensible person that there is a superior sensible origin of the world, the universe and the variety of life. Otherwise we should have to assume that a complex and precise organization such as a blossom (plant), a bird, man and, finally, the human brain has appeared as a result of a lucky accident of the blind and unprogrammed combination of chemical elements, molecules and atoms. Was the blind self-organization of such most precise and most complex instruments such as the lungs, the heart, the thyroid gland, the eardrum, the eye, not to mention the chromosomes, possible? All of this operates according to the sensible laws of mathematics, chemistry and physics....The question is not one of whether or not a superior intellect exists but whether this intellect is aware of me and concerned with me in any way' (NASH SOVREMENNİK, No 3, 1981, p 39).

"Let us note that references to a purposefulness in nature, in animate nature above all, have been long and extensively used by all sorts of theologians. In this connection, I remember coming across a Catholic rag titled SVET I ZHIZN', printed in Belgium in several languages, including Russian. The arguments of the neo-Thomist theologians in support of the existence of a 'higher intelligence' strikingly coincide with the arguments of the author of 'Pebbles in One's Hands.' It is true that in order to be more convincing the theologians do not begin with blossoms and birds but with a Renault car. There are dozens of thousands of parts in this car, remarkably coordinated with each other in order for the car to serve an intelligent purpose--to move according to the will of the driver. The theologians ask the following question: Could all of these parts become interconnected as a result of a 'blind accident,' or become 'self-constructed' in order to make a car which will perform its assigned role? Naturally not!...It is only after citing this example, the purpose of which is to flabbergast the contemporary car-owning petit bourgeois, that the holy fathers turn to animate nature. They quite justifiably claim that even the simplest living being has an incomparably more complex 'structure' than an automobile. This leads to the following rhetorical question: Could even the simplest living being appear in the world 'blindly,' i.e., as a



result of a random lucky combination of atoms and molecules? No. Therefore, the theologians conclude, it was created by a superior intellect which acted like the designer of an automobile.

"The thinking of authors of articles supporting neo-Thomism and of the Soviet writer Vl. Soloukhin seem to coincide even to the commas...."

S. Filippova, engineer at the USSR Academy of Sciences Bashkir Branch Chemical Institute, writes: "I recently read in the journal NASH SOVREMENNİK (No 3, 1981) the works of Vl. Soloukhin.

"...In the notes 'Pebbles in One's Hands' I was amazed by views on a superior intellect (meaning God!), the acknowledgment of which the writer considers self-evident to any sensibly thinking person. Apparently, he does not include among them the atheists, for they do not believe in God. His proof that a superior intellect exists consists of nothing but primitive proofs of the existence of God, familiar since most ancient times! They are used to this day by the clergy in its religious propaganda, and are assisted by a Soviet journal, by Soloukhin, a CPSU member."

The feelings of our correspondents can be easily understood, the more so since this is not the first time and, obviously, not accidentally, that divinity and mystical plots have appeared in the works of Vl. Soloukhin.

Similar motifs may be frequently encountered in previous notes. In the book "Kameshi na Ladoni" [Pebbles in One's Hands] (1977), we find the following excerpt on page 23: "Telepathy is as real as television or radio...The designer (?!), having given man an apparatus for the most perfect and most powerful communication, for some reason has not given man the ability to use this apparatus, in the apparent belief that in his early stages of development man may have been worthy but incapable of using it sensibly...." This, as the saying goes, merits no comment. Questions arise, however: What is the view of the party organization to which CPSU member Soloukhin belongs on his religious-mystical views, for it is its duty to shape in literary workers a materialistic, a Marxist-Leninist outlook? How is the party organization reacting to the editors of the journal NASH SOVREMENNİK, which is propagandizing idealistic views? This has interested a number of our correspondents, particularly S. Spasibenko, head of the communist education of students sector of the laboratory for higher pedagogical education of the Moscow State Pedagogical Institute imeni V. I. Lenin, Z. Tazhurizin, docent at the chair of atheism at Moscow State University, and R. Aleksandrov, doctor of philosophical sciences in Saransk.

As usual, the mail received by the journal on various topics or questions is considerably more varied than indicated in this survey. Some of the manuscripts sent to the editors deal with problems of the international situation, which has been aggravated of late as a result of the intrigues of American imperialism, or with specific problems of upgrading the effectiveness of the national economy and improving the quality of the work and social construction. The editors continue to receive letters whose authors discuss with interest the questions raised by M. Tetel'baum in his note "School Responsibility and 'Successful' Percentage" (No 7, 1981). In answer to this publication, letters were received from the USSR Ministry of Education and the USSR Ministry of

Higher and Secondary Special Education, which will be published. A number of letters were received on the subject of L. Golobanov's article "Moral Climate in the Scientific Environment" (No 9, 1981), which will be discussed by the editors in another mail review.

Occasionally, book manuscripts are sent to the journal. In this connection, we are forced to issue yet another reminder that the editors do not consider manuscripts of books and pamphlets, nor do they review them. This is the task of publishing houses.

The study of letters, statements and wishes of the working people, as well as manuscripts of articles, reviews, notes and literary and artistic works mailed to KOMMUNIST proves that the readers are concentrating on the key problems of economic, social and cultural construction, formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress, the close unity between the communist party and the people, and the full support expressed by the Soviet people of the domestic and foreign policy of the CPSU and its resolutions and the active aspiration of the masses to implement them.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/8

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

April 23, 1982