


215113

JPRS 80955

1 June 1982



USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 4, March 1982

19980902 109

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

5
167
A78

NOTE

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

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

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

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

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.

1 June 1982

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 4, March 1982

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

CONTENTS

On the 60th Anniversary of the Founding of the USSR.....	1
Defending Peace is the Most Vital and Urgent Task of the Peoples (L. I. Brezhnev).....	15
L. I. Brezhnev's Reply to the Letter by the Australian Organization for International Cooperation and Disarmament.....	17
To Japanese Writers--Authors of an Appeal Against Nuclear War (L. I. Brezhnev).....	20
Lenin's Work on the Creation of the Party (A. Solov'yev).....	22
Serious Test for Construction Workers (I. Dmitriyev).....	34
Economic Mechanism and Economic Legislation (V. Alekseyev).....	50
Militant Materialism--The Philosophical Banner of Communism.....	63
Scientific and Political Problem (Lucien Seve).....	77
Define' and Develop Human Capabilities More Fully (A. Milokhin).....	79
More on the Positions of the Leadership of the Italian Communist Party ..	83
"Psychological Warfare"--A Symptom of Nuclear Pathology (L. Tolkunov).....	106

Some Problems of Consumer Goods Production (I. Motorin).....	118
Price of Mistrust (A. Dunart).....	124
Socialist Production as a Research Topic (M. Volkov).....	128
Society, the Individual, Art (A. Dubrovin).....	132
Leninist Science of Victory (Yu. Kirshin).....	138
Educating the Educators (Yu. Vazhenin).....	141
State and Church in the USSR (V. Klochkov).....	144
Struggle for a New School (G. Vodolazov).....	148
Ethnodemographic View of the World (V. Pokshishevskiy).....	154
Bookshelf.....	157
Student Enrollment in Republic and Interoblast Higher Party Schools..	161

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 4
Mar 1982

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : Mar 1982

Signed to press : 10 Mar 1982

Copies : 804,000

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

ON THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE USSR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 3-15

[19 February 1982 CC CPSU Decree]

[Text] The first united multinational state of workers and peasants -- the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics -- was created by the will of the peoples of our country 60 years ago, on 30 December 1922.

The 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR is a noteworthy event in the life of the Soviet people. It confirms the triumph of the Leninist national policy of the CPSU and the historical accomplishments of socialism. On this glorious anniversary, the Soviet Union stands in the eyes of the world as a united family of equal republics jointly building communism. The sociopolitical and ideological unity of our society is monolithic. The cohesion of the Soviet people rallied around their communist party and its central committee headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, the loyal perpetuator of the great Leninist cause, is inviolable.

The Soviet people welcome their great holiday with new successes in all fields of social life, implementing the plans for the building of communism elaborated by the 26th CPSU Congress with their persistent and creative toil. Guided by the congress' decisions, the party and the people are waging a persistent struggle for the removal of the threat of war and strengthening peace on earth.

The birth of the USSR is the result of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The revolution broke the chains of social and national oppression and led the peoples of our country to independent historical creativity. The establishment of the power of the working class and the public ownership of productive capital laid a firm foundation for the free development of all nations and nationalities and their close unity and friendship.

The Russian working class was the leading force in international unification. It earned the recognition and trust of the working people of all nationalities through the dedicated heroism of its revolutionary struggle against autocracy and capitalism, daring and firmness in the civil war fronts, selfless toil and consistent internationalism. As V. I. Lenin predicted, the working class led the toiling masses to the Soviet system. The idea of a

Soviet organization was accepted by the toiling masses of all the peoples in Russia. It was simple and applicable to the great variety of conditions in which they lived.

The RSFSR, around which all Soviet republics rallied voluntarily, played a decisive role in the creation of the single union state. As the first multinational Soviet state, the RSFSR became the prototype of the USSR. Despite difficulties and privations, the Russian people gave selfless aid to the other peoples in the country in defending their revolutionary gains and made an invaluable contribution to helping the former national outlying areas to overcome their backwardness.

The founding of the USSR is the greatest accomplishment of the Leninist Bolshevik Party, a party multinational in compositions and profoundly international in its ideology, politics, organizational structure and operational principles. Through its tireless defense of the basic interests of the working class and the broadest masses, loyalty to the ideals of communism, greatest attention to the national interests and feelings of all the peoples and intolerance of manifestations of bourgeois nationalism, chauvinism and national nihilism the party earned the noble right of being the leader of the working people of all nations and nationalities in the country. With its systematic theoretical, political and organizational work the party developed in them a firm resolve to be united and mobilized their will and strength to achieve the common objective -- the building of socialism and communism. The party invested the tireless efforts, talent and spiritual zeal of its members and the knowledge and organizational skill of the cadres in the social and national liberation of the peoples in the country.

The creation of the USSR is the live embodiment of the ideas of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin and the Leninist principles of national policy. V. I. Lenin creatively and comprehensively developed the views of Marx and Engels on the national problem on the basis of his scientific analysis of the new age. He saw the class struggle of the proletariat for the seizure of political power and the creation of a new society free from exploitation as the main road to its solution. Lenin profoundly substantiated the need for establishing the closest possible union among Soviet republics in order to resolve the problems of building socialism and defending the homeland from imperialist encroachments. Lenin considered complete mutual trust, voluntary agreement and the elimination of any form of inequality in relations among nations the guarantee of the firmness of this union. As a convinced internationalist, he fought consistently and irreconcilably for the revolutionary unification of all working people and against any excesses in the solution of national problems. Lenin's political and organizational genius and his tremendous efforts blended with the combat organization of the communists, the revolutionary energy of the proletariat and the insurmountable aspiration of the peoples for national equality and freedom. His ideas were implemented.

History knows of no other country which has done so much for the all-round development of nations and nationalities within such a short time as has the USSR -- the socialist fatherland of all our peoples. Their unity was tempered and strengthened in the course of the industrialization, agricultural collectivization and cultural revolution and in the struggle for

building socialism. In the trying years of the Great Patriotic War, shoulder to shoulder the fraternal peoples defended the homeland, displayed mass heroism and an inflexible will to win, defeated the fascist aggressors and rescued the peoples of the world from slavery and destruction. The postwar restoration of the economy was an unforgettable national exploit.

The peoples of the land of the soviets saw for themselves that their cohesion within a single union increased their strength and accelerated their socioeconomic development. We can be proud of the fact that, marching in the single ranks of the working people of all nations in the country, the peoples of the former national outlying areas, previously doomed to age-old backwardness, started their confident march toward a socialist future, bypassing capitalism and reaching the peaks of social progress. The great fraternity of working people and the feeling of belonging to a single family developed in the course of the joint struggle for a new and just world. The unbreakable Leninist friendship among peoples -- an inexhaustible source of constructive creativity of the masses -- appeared.

The past 60 years have been noted by the headlong socioeconomic development of the Soviet Union. The national income increased greatly during that time. The share of the USSR in the world's industrial output increased from 1 percent in 1922 to 20 percent today.

The economy of all the Soviet republics is growing dynamically in the united family of peoples. Today they all have a modern industry, agriculture and science and are experiencing a real cultural blossoming. At the same time, they have preserved their unique characteristics and original national features.

A developed socialist society was built as a result of the revolutionary-transforming activities of the peoples united within the USSR under the leadership of the communist party. Mature socialist social relations have been established in the country, and the problem of equalizing the levels of economic development of the Soviet republics has been essentially resolved. The juridical and actual equality among all nations and nationalities has been secured. The Soviet people -- a new historical community -- has come into being. It is based on the indivisibility of the historical destinies of the Soviet people, the profound objective spiritual and material changes and the unbreakable alliance among the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia. It is the result of the growing internationalization of economic and all social life and the development of socialist nations in our country, among which relations of true equality, fraternal mutual aid and cooperation, and respect and reciprocal trust have been established.

The new levels of socioeconomic progress reached by our homeland enabled the party and the people to resolve increasingly bigger and more complex problems in laying the material and technical foundations for communism, the further enhancement of the well-being and standards of the working people, the development of socioclass and national relations, the advancement of socialist statehood and democracy and the education of the new man. The 26th CPSU Congress formulated an expanded program for the solution of these problems.

The single national economic complex -- the material foundation of the fraternal friendship among the peoples of the USSR -- is successfully developing in the mature socialist society. The Soviet Union is a powerful industrialized state with a highly mechanized agriculture and progressive science and culture.

The economies of the individual republics play an important role in the social division of labor and are making increasingly greater contributions to the country's national wealth. Multinational production, scientific and creative collectives have been organized and are successfully functioning everywhere. This is a noted social and political phenomenon in our time.

The further upsurge of all Soviet republics is greatly contributing to the solution of major all-union problems, such as the development of the fuel-energy and raw material resources of Siberia, the Far East and the North, the BAM and the Nonchernozem areas. This requires the joint efforts of the working people of all republics and the active mobilization of their material and labor resources.

As was pointed out at the 26th congress, the party's course calls for the growth and maximal utilization of the material and spiritual potential of each republic in order to ensure the harmonious development of the entire country. The party believes this to be a necessary prerequisite for the progress of Soviet society, the strengthening of the economic and defense power of the USSR and the increased prosperity of the working people. Centralized planning combined with the broad initiative of union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts and okrugs ensures the balanced and effective development of the Soviet economy. The resolution of all economic and social problems from the national standpoint above all and the struggle against any manifestations of parochialism and departmentalism are mandatory requirements governing the proper party and internationalist approach to the matter.

The rapprochement among all Soviet classes and social groups leading to the establishment of a mainly and essentially classless social structure within the historical framework of mature socialism is continuing under contemporary conditions. The working class is the decisive force in this process, its social mind and its social heart (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 1, p 425). In terms of its economic status, ideology, mentality and morality it was and remains the most consistent representative of the international solidarity and fraternity among working people. The CPSU is doing everything necessary for the steady growth of the ideological maturity, social activeness, general culture and professional mastery of our multinational working class and its role in resolving the central problems of contemporary politics.

All national detachments of the Soviet working class developed in the 1970s, particularly in the republics in which its share in the population's structure was below the all-union level. The party will continue to pay steady attention to the training of cadres of skilled native workers. All of this is contributing to the expanding influence of the working class on the development of society. It strengthens the social base of the unity among all classes, groups, nations and nationalities.

The most profound changes in the social appearance, standards and living conditions of the kolkhoz peasantry in the Soviet republics are intimately related to the implementation of the Leninist national policy. The solution of the food problem, the all-round upsurge of agricultural production and farming and animal husbandry standards are today the most important economic and political tasks. Their implementation requires the further strengthening of the material and technical base of agriculture, the development of industrial integration, improvements in the training and retention of cadres and the perfecting of working and living conditions in the countryside.

The USSR holds leading positions in world science, technology and culture. This is a tremendous accomplishment of the Soviet multinational intelligentsia. Large units of the engineering-technical, scientific and artistic intelligentsia, teachers and physicians have developed and are continuing to expand in each union republic. It is important to continue to improve the system of planning and quality of training of specialists and to take more accurately into consideration the actual needs of the individual republics and the USSR as a whole in placing them, and to make fuller use of their creative potential in the interests of the building of communism.

The nationwide nature of the social policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state is becoming increasingly clearer in the developed socialist society. It is aimed at resolving vital problems affecting all nations and nationalities, such as upgrading the well-being, education and culture of the working people, improving their working and leisure time conditions, developing housing construction and improving social insurance, medical and service facilities and environmental protection systems. The most extensive program in the country's history for enhancing the living standard of the people was implemented in the 1970s. The funds appropriated for this purpose were twice those of the previous decade. As a result, the real per capita income increased by nearly one half. The achievements of socialism in the areas of socioeconomic development and in upgrading the material and cultural standards of the people are the equivalent of an entire epoch of accomplishments.

However, the party is aware of unresolved problems and existing difficulties and shortcomings. The CPSU is mobilizing the party members and all working people for their elimination. The Soviet people accepted as a combat party order L. I. Brezhnev's statement at the November 1981 CC CPSU Plenum: "We must work better. Our plans must be better formulated and implemented. We must organize the production process better and produce better. In a word, we must work more efficiently."

In the course of the general increase in the consumption of material and spiritual goods, the party sees to it that the differences among social groups, regions, towns and villages inherited from the past are steadily eliminated, that the just socialist distribution principles are consistently observed and that their distortion is not allowed to occur.

The most important facets of the Soviet way of life are an atmosphere of collectivism and comradeship, unity and friendship among all nationalities, a morally healthy society, true democracy and social optimism and intolerance of deviations from socialist morality. The lofty humanism of relations among

nationalities, which has been firmly established in our country, is manifested with particular clarity against the background of the aggravation of national contradictions in the capitalist countries and the raging of nationalism, chauvinism and racism in them.

The entire world is familiar with the cruel exploitation and discrimination against national minorities and foreign workers in the capitalist countries, whose ruling circles are hypocritically blabbering about "human rights." The fighters for civil and national rights are severely repressed and persecuted in the United States, Northern Ireland, South Africa and other countries. It is clear to any unprejudiced person that capitalism is unable to resolve the national problem it created.

The founding of the USSR and the establishments of relations of friendship, trust and mutual aid among peoples tremendously accelerated the spiritual development of the society born of the Great October Revolution. Socialism was able to resolve a problem of truly historical significance: to arm with the achievements of culture millions of working people and to grant every person, regardless of social status and nationality, access to all sources of knowledge. Extensive opportunities have been created for the manifestation of talents and gifts, the blossoming of the culture of all nations and nationalities and the creative activities of the masses in science and art.

The single international culture of the Soviet people, which serves all working people and expresses their common ideals, is growing and strengthening on the fertile soil of mature socialism. It encompasses everything significant in the achievements and original traditions of national cultures. Socialist in content, varied in national forms and internationalist in spirit and nature, Soviet culture has become a great force in the ideological and moral unification of the nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union.

Soviet multinational literature is published in dozens of languages of the peoples of the USSR, many of whom had no literacy before the October Revolution. The Russian language, which was voluntarily adopted by the Soviet people as the language for international communication, has become an important factor in strengthening the sociopolitical and ideological unity of the Soviet people and in developing and reciprocally enriching the national cultures. It has opened to all our peoples wide access to the spiritual wealth of world civilization. In Lenin's words, every Soviet citizen has the possibility of learning the great Russian language, which is freely spoken by 82 percent of the country's population today.

Concerned with the development of Soviet culture and the extensive utilization of the rich cultural legacy of the fraternal republics, the CPSU guides the multinational creative intelligentsia toward the creation of works imbued with the spirit of party-mindedness and nationality, worthy of the present and the future of our homeland.

Developed socialism clearly proves the unbreakable interconnection between the blossoming and rapprochement among all nations and nationalities in the country and the intensification of socialist democracy. The adoption of the new USSR Constitution, the true creator of which was the entire Soviet

people, as L. I. Brezhnev emphasized, was a historical milestone in the development of Soviet society. The nationwide discussion and unanimous approval of the constitution proved once again the desire of the peoples of the USSR to protect and strengthen their governmental union.

In reflecting the steady rapprochement among the nations, the USSR Constitution closely combines socialist federalism with democratic centralism. The party considers this a reliable protection from parochialism and national exclusivity and scornful attitude toward the specific interests of nations and nationalities.

The USSR Constitution and the constitutions of union and autonomous republics are the concentrated expression of the most essential changes which have taken place in the economic, social and spiritual life of Soviet society and the profoundly democratic nature of our state. They codify the basic foundations of the socialist way of life shared by all nations and nationalities. They strengthen the guarantees of the sovereign rights of the republics and their enhanced role in the solution of national problems.

The USSR experience proves that the broader socialist democracy becomes and the more democratic the country's life is, the greater the strength of the reciprocal voluntary unification of the working people of all nations and nationalities becomes. Unlike bourgeois democracy, with its formal proclamation of the equality of nations, socialist democracy reliably protects the social and national interests and rights of the working people. It provides every person with real opportunities for the increasingly broader and direct participation in the administration of governmental and social affairs. This is the main direction followed in the further development of the Soviet political system.

Under socialism, democracy is inconceivable without a strong and authoritative governmental power enjoying the complete trust of the people. The Soviet state represents the power organized and exercised by the working people themselves. It expresses and defends their basic interests. The demands and needs of all classes, social groups, nations and nationalities in Soviet society are met through a system of state and party organizations, trade unions, the Komsomol, the people's control organs, the labor collectives, the mass information media and nationwide discussions and electoral campaigns. The most widespread and full-powered state organs -- the soviets of people's deputies -- are a vivid manifestation of the common political life of all nations and nationalities and the close unity among them. In the soviets 2.3 million people's representatives, party and nonparty members, representing more than 100 nationalities, resolve on the basis of nationwide viewpoints, important problems of political, socioeconomic and cultural construction and undergo real training in socialist internationalism.

Reality has proved that the USSR is a dynamic and effective form of governmental unification of Soviet nations and nationalities, which will extend throughout the historical period of the gradual development of socialist statehood into communist social self-management.

The role of the leading, guiding and organizing activities of the CPSU is expanding steadily under developed socialist conditions in the development of the nations and nationalities and in strengthening their fraternal alliance. The proper party leadership in the area of national relations, based on Marxist-Leninist principles, is a mandatory prerequisite for the progress of the multinational socialist society. The party, the CC CPSU and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev are showing steady concern for the all-round strengthening of the inviolable friendship and unity among the peoples of the USSR and are creatively developing the Leninist doctrine on the national problem.

The party members were and remain the promoters of the gradual and increasingly closer rapprochement among nations on a truly democratic and internationalist basis, as V. I. Lenin said (see "Poln. Soobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 27, p 68). The establishment of a classless society will be an important milestone in the further development of this legitimate process discovered by Marxism-Leninism. Nothing is more alien to communist ideology than the desire artificially to urge on a specific objective process or to hinder it. The task is to provide scope for its natural development on the basis of voluntary participation, equality and fraternal cooperation among peoples.

The focuses its attention on the close consideration of the interests and needs of each nation and nationality, their close combination with the interests of the entire Soviet people and the unification of the efforts of the working people for the solution of topical social development problems.

The party attentively sees to it that the new processes and problems in the area of national relations, continually created by the development of a large multinational state such as ours, are promptly and fully reflected in the activities of party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations and economic organs. The strict observance of the scientific principles of management, the Leninist work style and Leninist cadre policy are the proper means for the implementation of this task.

The Soviet republics are multinational. It is important for all nations to be properly represented in the party and state organs, taking strictly into consideration the practical, ideological and moral qualities of the representatives. Since the number of citizens of non-native nationalities, who have specific requirements concerning language, culture and way of life, has considerably increased in a number of republics in recent years, the party committees must make a more profound study of these problems and submit prompt suggestions on the means to resolve them.

"In our country the national feelings and dignity of every person are respected," the CC CPSU accountability report to the 26th Party Congress stated. "The CPSU has fought and will always decisively fight acts alien to socialism, such as chauvinism and nationalism, and any other nationalistic quirk such as, for example, anti-Semitism or Zionism." Through all of its activities and purposeful ideological work the party educates the working people in a spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism and the proud feeling of belonging to the united great Soviet homeland.

Lenin emphasized that to be an internationalist means "to think not only of one's nation but to put the interests of all above it..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 30, pp 44-45). He called for opposing petty national narrow-mindedness, exclusivity and separation. Loyal to Lenin's behests, the party is encouraging in the working people the ability to approach all national problems from class positions. It strives to make every Soviet person understand that the actual fulfillment of international duty today means above all to engage in conscientious creative work for the common good, the all-round enhancement of work effectiveness and quality and active participation in the solution of national problems and in the further strengthening of the economic and defense power of the USSR and the world socialist comity.

The founding and successful development of the USSR is of permanent international importance. It marked an important historical milestone in the age-old struggle waged by progressive mankind for equality and friendship among nations and for the revolutionary renovation of the world.

Life proved Lenin's prediction that the new social system creates entirely different international relations, free from discrimination, domination and subordination, typical of the capitalist world. The fraternal socialist countries are providing an example of such relations.

The socialist comity is the fullest embodiment of relations among countries inherent in the nature of socialism. The comity is a new, socialist type of international relations among sovereign and equal countries united by common basic interests and objectives and Marxist-Leninist ideology, bound by the ties of comradely solidarity, mutual aid and all-round cooperation.

The communist and workers parties in the socialist comity are their living soul and guiding and directing force. Experience proves that loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, socialist internationalism, and close interaction among the fraternal parties in all areas make the proper combination of the common and the national interests of the socialist states, the successful solution of contradictions and difficulties which arise in the course of progress, and the confident progress of the individual country and the entire socialist comity possible. CEMA and the Warsaw Pact reliably serve this purpose.

The socialist countries have achieved unquestionable successes in building the new society. At the same time, the international experience of global socialism proved Lenin's thought that the road to socialism will be complex. We must not ignore the fact that the development of the new system is taking place under circumstances governed by the constant economic, political, military and ideological pressure of imperialism. Wherever errors and omissions in domestic policy are added to imperialist subversive activities grounds develop for the energizing of alien anticommunist forces. Practical experience proves the importance for the ruling communist party of working for strengthening its ties with the masses, pursuing a balanced realistic policy, educating the working people in a spirit of internationalism, rebuffing the foes of socialism promptly and decisively, and strengthening the solidarity with the fraternal countries.

The world socialist comity is developing steadily and the process of rapprochement among fraternal countries is proceeding in accordance with their national and historical characteristics. This is expressed through the variety of forms of their social life. Their interaction in the struggle for the peace and security of the peoples is becoming increasingly closer. Bilateral and multilateral cooperation is improving in the areas of economics, ideology, science and culture. Economic integration is intensifying on the basis of long-term target programs. Life itself has given the fraternal countries the task of increasing the coordination of their plans by harmonizing their overall economic policies.

The CPSU has consistently stood for strengthening the solidarity between the socialist comity and all detachments of the international communist, workers and national liberation movements. The 26th party congress emphasized that the consistent struggle waged by the communists for peace and against imperialism's aggressive policy and the arms race it is encouraging, which is threatening the peoples with nuclear catastrophe, is a powerful factor in promoting the further unification and greater prestige of the world communist movement. Armed with the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, the communists are tirelessly defending the interests of the working class and the working people in their countries, democracy, peace and socialism.

The USSR is developing its cooperation with the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and with the liberated countries which are fighting against imperialism and for strengthening national independence and social progress. The Soviet Union firmly supports the elimination of the vestiges of colonialism. It opposes neocolonialism, racism, economic and political diktat and inequality. It systematically supports the anti-imperialist traditions of the nonalignment movement and gives practical support to the struggle of the developing countries for the reorganization of international economic relations on a democratic basis. The young countries, those which have chosen a socialist orientation above all, are expressing a lively interest in the Soviet experience in national-state construction and the conversion of many nations in the USSR to socialism bypassing the capitalist stage of development.

Today hundreds of millions of peoples in various European, Asian, African and Latin American countries are following the path laid by the Great October Revolution, together with the peoples of the USSR. No roads to socialism can be followed by evading the general laws discovered by Marxism-Leninism and confirmed by the experience of the USSR, the countries of real socialism and the international practice of the revolutionary struggle and the building of socialism, or by failing to take comprehensively into consideration the national characteristics of the individual countries.

Under the aggravated international situation created as a result of the policy of imperialism, American above all, the active implementation of the Leninist strategy of peace supported by our party and state is of prime importance to the fate of mankind. The peace program for the 1980s formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress and expanded by L. I. Brezhnev's new initiatives, provides realistic and constructive means for reducing the threat of

war, strengthening detente and developing extensive cooperation among countries with different systems. It offers the possibility of resolving difficult international problems on the basis of honest and equal talks rather than confrontation.

The policy of the Soviet state effectively counterbalances the aspirations of the aggressive imperialist circles to impose on the world another spiral in the arms race, steadily to exacerbate the international situation and to undermine the foundations of mutually profitable international relations. It is profoundly humanistic, open and democratic. It is consistent with the interests of the peoples of the USSR, the fraternal socialist countries and all progressive mankind. This ensures its support on the part of the broadest possible international circles and all people of good will.

The peaceful policy of the USSR and the members of the socialist comity is also one of firm rebuff of the aggressive imperialist aspirations, supported by the anti-Soviet policy of the present Beijing leadership, and any threat to the security of the USSR and its allies. The socialist comity has everything necessary for the defense of its historical revolutionary gains.

The soviet Union does not impose on anyone patterns or "models" of governmental structures which ignore the nature of one country or another. It is exerting a growing influence on the course of events through its very existence, actual practice of a new type of social and international relations and force of its example in resolving most complex problems which capitalism is unable to resolve. The USSR, which is a powerful socialist state, builds its relations with other countries on the lofty human principle of equality rather than that of privileges, which degrades a great nation, to use V. I. Lenin's words (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 26, p 108).

As they approach the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR, the Soviet people are justifiably proud of their accomplishments and the revolutionary historical mission which our homeland is performing honorably as it marches in the front ranks of the fighters for peace, independence, freedom and happiness of the peoples. The resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress inspire the working people of all nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union to new labor accomplishments for the triumph of communism.

The 11th Five-Year Plan is a significant step in the further development of all republics and the creation of the material and technical foundations for communism. It is also an important stage in the implementation of the Leninist national policy and in strengthening the friendship and fraternity among the peoples of the USSR.

The party's course of public production intensification and comprehensive increase in effectiveness requires high-level organization, efficiency, discipline, the efficient and coordinated functioning of the management system and the development of the creative initiative of the masses.

The tasks formulated by the party for the 11th Five-Year Plan and the entire period of the 1980s are consistent with the vital interests of the Soviet

people, who are consistently struggling for their implementation. In the socialist competition which has developed in honor of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR the working people of all republics, krays and oblasts are setting outstanding examples of shock work and are doing everything possible to ensure the successful implementation of the 1982 plan.

Confident in their strength and full of optimism, the Soviet people are following the path traced by the Leninist party. The tasks of building communism, as earmarked at the 26th CPSU Congress, will be met unquestionably. This is guaranteed by the inviolable unity among the peoples of the USSR and their joint and united work for the sake of this great objective.

The CPSU Central Committee decrees:

1. The central committees of communist parties of union republics, the party kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorkoms and raykoms, the primary party organizations and the political organs of the armed forces shall engage in extensive organizational and ideological-educational preparations for the celebration of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR.

2. It approves the initiative of the leading collectives of Moscow, Leningrad and all union republics, which have launched a socialist competition in honor of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR and the successful fulfillment and overfulfillment of the 1982 economic and social development plan and the 11th Five-Year Plan.

The level of the entire organization of the competition must be steadily enhanced and developed in close connection with the efforts to improve the economic mechanism. The main attention must be focused on economic intensification, upgrading social production effectiveness and work quality, accelerating scientific and technical progress and achieving high end results with the lowest possible outlays of raw and other materials, electric power, fuel and financial and labor resources.

The great traditions of the competition must be strengthened. An atmosphere of creative search for new reserves, comradely mutual aid, high responsibility for the implementation of tasks and obligations concerning production procurements and intolerance of shortcomings and labor discipline violations must prevail in every labor collective. The competition must become an effective means for mobilizing the working people for the implementation of the decisions of the 26th party congress and strengthening the economic and defense power of our socialist homeland.

3. The preparations for the anniversary celebrations must contribute to the further improvement of the ideological-political, patriotic and international education of the working people and their class tempering.

To this effect:

the great revolutionary-transforming force of Marxism-Leninism, the ideas of proletarian internationalism and the great constructive contribution which

our party and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev are making to the theory and practice of scientific communism must be brought to light convincingly;

the role of the heroic working class and the CPSU in the international unification of all working people, the implementation of the Leninist national policy, the all-round progress of and rapprochement among nations and nationalities and the building of socialism and communism must be depicted extensively;

the historical advantages and achievements of socialism in resolving the most difficult sociopolitical, economic and national problems and the course charted by the 26th CPSU Congress of further strengthening the friendship among the peoples of the USSR must be propagandized vividly and verifiably. The socioeconomic policy of the party and the state, aimed at increasing the material and spiritual potential of each republic and its maximal utilization for the sake of improving the efficiency of the entire national economy of the USSR and, on this basis, ensuring the steady growth of the material and cultural standards of the Soviet people must be depicted comprehensively;

the nature and characteristics of the formation and development of the Soviet people -- the new historical community -- and the ways leading to the further consolidation of the alliance among workers, peasants and the intelligentsia, the rapprochement among the nations and nationalities of the country and the establishment of a classless society must be brought to light fully;

the importance of the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of union and autonomous republics in systematically strengthening socialist democracy in national relations and in all areas of social life must be explained comprehensively;

the achievements of union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts and okrugs must be described extensively; convincing proof must be offered to the effect that the socialist system and friendship and fraternal cooperation alone can ensure their free, comprehensive and dynamic development;

the peaceful internationalist nature of the Leninist foreign policy of the CPSU and the common basic interests of the Soviet people and the working people in the fraternal socialist countries, the international working class and the peoples of the developing countries in the struggle against imperialism and for peace, democracy, national independence and social progress must be described convincingly. Imperialism's interventions in internal affairs of sovereign countries, and its attempts to address them in the language of threats and to impose on them its will by applying political pressure and economic and military blackmail must be firmly exposed;

bearing in mind the fact that nationalism is one of the principal means of imperialist subversive activities against real socialism, systematic aggressive struggle must be waged against attempts to encourage nationalistic prejudices in some individuals; decisive steps must be taken against any deviation from the Leninist principles of national policy. The falsifiers of the history of our country and CPSU national policy must be substantively

exposed. The inability of the capitalist world to eliminate national oppression and inequality, cases of national and racial antagonism and the predatory nature of relations imposed by imperialism on the peoples of the developing countries must be proved clearly, citing specific examples;

the patriotic and international education of the youth must be increased; the revolutionary, combat and labor traditions of the communist party and the Soviet people and the heroic accomplishments of the USSR Armed Forces must be disseminated; every Soviet person must become convinced of the rightness and invincibility of socialism, and develop political vigilance and readiness to defend the homeland and the gains of socialism.

Every party member has the duty tirelessly to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the Soviet people and to develop in the working people a feeling of pride in the socialist fatherland, the fraternal friendship among the peoples of the USSR, high standards in international relations and intolerance of any manifestation of nationalism.

4. On the basis of the present decree the central committees of union republics, the party kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorkoms and raykoms, the AUCCTU, the Komsomol Central Committee, the Ministry of Defense, the Main Political Administration of the Soviet Army and Navy, the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Marxism-Leninism and the Academy of Social Sciences of the CC CPSU, the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, the editorial boards of newspapers and periodicals, TASS and the Novosti Press Agency, the USSR State Television and Radio, USSR Goskino and USSR Goskomizdat, the All-Union Copyright Agency, Politizdat, Izdatel'stvo Plakat, the USSR Ministries of Culture, Higher and Specialized Secondary Education and Education, the USSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education the USSR Sports Committee, the DOSAAF Central Committee and the board of the Knowledge All-Union Society shall formulate and implement measures related to the preparations for the celebration of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR.

The CC CPSU appeals to the party and Komsomol members and the working people of all nations and nationalities in the country to welcome the 60th anniversary of the founding of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with new accomplishments in implementing the historical decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the development of the economy, the strengthening of the country's defense capability and the enhancement of the well-being and standards of the Soviet people. The Central Committee expresses its confidence that the Soviet people will tighten their ranks even more closely around the Leninist communist party and will display even greater initiative, creativity, dedication, persistence and conscious discipline in the struggle for building communism in our country and strengthening peace throughout the world.

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

5003
CSO: 1802/10

DEFENDING PEACE IS THE MOST VITAL AND URGENT TASK OF THE PEOPLES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 16-17

[L. I. Brezhnev's "Address to the Indian Readers" in the collection of his speeches and addresses entitled "Socialism, Peace, Freedom and Independence of the Peoples," published by India's Allied Publishers Private Limited]

[Text] Slightly more than a year has passed since I had the opportunity to visit friendly India again. I still clearly remember my visit to the land of India and my meetings with the leaders and representatives of the public of your great country. During that time, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the prime minister, other Indian government officials and I worked hard and fruitfully to strengthen the friendship and cooperation between our countries even further, and to help strengthen peace and security for the peoples of Asia and the rest of the world.

Peace and broad international cooperation are vitally important to all nations on our planet. Mankind's constructive efforts and progress are possible only when there is peace. Now, when the aggressive forces of imperialism and world reaction are trying to exacerbate the international situation and are cynically bragging about unleashing a nuclear war, the peoples have no more vital and urgent task than to defend peace.

It is now clearer than ever before that the main motivation of those who are fiercely opposing detente and peaceful cooperation among countries, regardless of their social and political system, and who are trying to apply in international relations methods of subordination and diktat and the practice of interfering in the affairs of sovereign states is their hostility to the cause of progress and freedom of the peoples. In the final account, their efforts, which are thinly concealed behind demagogic phraseology, are aimed at "hurling back" socialism, suppressing the national liberation movements and restoring the unchallenged rule of imperialism. The Soviet Union and India are natural allies in the struggle against such a course.

This book will prove to you once again that the policy of the Soviet Union follows two main interrelated directions. The first is the solution of the tremendous and difficult problem of building communism in our country, a problem which could be expressed as follows: everything for the sake of man, everything for the good of man. The second is the struggle for peace, the prevention of war and the security and freedom of the peoples.

The Soviet Union is systematically pursuing a course of all-round development of equal and mutually profitable cooperation with the liberated countries. We want them to play an increasingly greater role in world affairs for the good of peace and social progress. In this area, the nonaligned movement, one of the founders and universally acknowledged leaders of which is India, is of great importance today.

In addressing myself to the Indian readership, allow me to make particular mention of the respect which the Soviet people feel for India's peaceful and independent foreign policy, the foundations for which were laid by Jawaharlal Nehru, the outstanding leader of the Indian people. Today this policy is being successfully continued by Mrs. Indira Gandhi, India's prime minister. The Soviet Union values highly India's realistic and principle-minded approach to the most important international problems and its consistent support of the cause of peace and security of the nations.

The steadily growing friendship and all-round cooperation between the Soviet Union and India is a vivid example of the fruitfulness of the policy of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. Our relations, which are developing on the basis of the Soviet-Indian Peace, Friendship and Cooperation Treaty, are imbued with the spirit of equality and mutual respect. They are reliably serving the basic interests of our peoples and the strengthening of international peace.

I take this opportunity to express my profound respect for the great Indian people and to wish them further success in building the new India.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

L. I. BREZHNEV'S REPLY TO THE LETTER BY THE AUSTRALIAN ORGANIZATION FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND DISARMAMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 18-19

[Text] Dear friends:

I read your letter addressed to me and TO U. S. President Reagan. I share and understand your feeling of anxiety and concern regarding the continuing arms race and the growing threat of thermonuclear war.

The party and state leadership of the Soviet Union and the entire Soviet people believe that unleashing a thermonuclear war would be a crime which would threaten all mankind with catastrophe. We have stated this repeatedly.

In answer to your questions, let me say the following:

1. You request a confirmation of the pledge never to be the first to use a nuclear weapon. In this connection, allow me to draw your attention to the declaration of the Soviet Union never to use nuclear weapons against countries which refuse to make or acquire nuclear weapons or to store them on their territory. We are prepared to provide guarantees to this effect, supported by a treaty, to any such non-nuclear country and appeal to all other nuclear powers to assume the same obligation. Furthermore, at the 36th UN General Assembly, it was precisely the Soviet Union which came up with the important and constructive initiative that no one ever be the first to use nuclear weapons. This declaration solemnly states that any country which would be the first to use a nuclear weapon would be guilty of the gravest crime against mankind. The resolution, which meets the expectations of the peoples of the entire world, was rejected only by the United States and its closest military and political allies.

2. Your letter appeals for the conclusion of serious accords on ending the nuclear arms race before or during the second special disarmament session of the UN General Assembly. On our part, we understand the urgency of such measures and will do everything we can to help reach such accords.

In this connection, we consider that reaching quick and constructive results at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on the subject of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe is the primary task. Although the European Continent is thousands of kilometers away from Australia, we believe that this problem is

of global importance, for a nuclear conflict in Europe would inevitably grow into a worldwide conflict.

I also believe that we must hasten the resumption of Soviet-American talks on limiting and reducing strategic nuclear armaments. The Soviet Union is prepared to do so instantly. However, the American side is endlessly postponing a dialog on this problem which affects all mankind. We also consider the resumption of Soviet-American talks on banning the use of chemical weapons, which were unilaterally broken by the American side, exceptionally topical.

The Soviet Union is also prepared to resume talks with the United States on restricting military activities in the area of the Indian Ocean at any time, talks which, once again, were broken by and are not being resumed by the American side in violation of the summit accord which was reached in Vienna in 1979. Let me say that we see no obstacles to extending such measures to the Pacific Ocean as well. Generally speaking, we have never considered, nor do we consider now, as ideal a situation in which the navies of the great powers engage in long trips far from home. We are ready to resolve this problem, naturally on the basis of equality and identical security.

3. You raise the question of the need to ban all nuclear weapon tests. Let me remind you that the Soviet Union has not conducted such tests in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space for nearly 20 years -- ever since the enactment of the corresponding treaty. China and France were the only nuclear powers who refused to sign it, and China is continuing to conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere. We are also ready to ratify instantly the 1974 treaty limiting underground nuclear tests. However, it is the American side which is dragging the ratification. As to the Soviet Union, it is ready to reach an agreement not only on the total banning of all nuclear weapon tests but eventually on the total destruction of nuclear weapon stockpiles.

4. We are ready to consider with an open mind all suggestions which the other side may make on the subject of disarmament. I can assure you that we study closely the views and proposals of the other side and that we never reject them out of hand. We assess them on the basis of a single yardstick -- the extent to which they meet the purpose of preventing war and strengthening peace and are consistent with the principle of equality and identical security.

The socialist countries have achieved a military-strategic balance with the capitalist world. This balance is a factor which restrains the aspirations of the aggressive forces. Any hope of disturbing this balance is doomed to failure. A military balance on the lowest possible level of armaments is our constructive approach to nuclear disarmament, serving the interests of all nations. However, any disturbance of the balance in this area would be fraught with the violation of stability and would threaten the preservation of peace.

Bearing in mind the considerations expressed in your letter, allow me particularly to emphasize that we proceed from the belief that reason will prevail and that in the final account a nuclear catastrophe will be

prevented. This cannot be achieved unilaterally. It will require the active efforts of all countries and nations.

I wish all supporters of the peace movement in Australia, whose number, to the best of my knowledge, is growing success in their noble efforts for disarmament and strengthening of international cooperation.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

TO JAPANESE WRITERS-AUTHORS OF AN APPEAL AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 20-21

[Statement by L. I. Brezhnev]

[Text] Gentlemen!

I cannot remain indifferent to your anxious appeal for the prevention of a nuclear war. I fully share your concern on the subject of the growing nuclear threat. I join you in firmly condemning insane ideas on the admissibility of using nuclear weapons even for "limited" purposes.

Only naive people, who are out of touch with reality, could assume that the flames of a thermonuclear catastrophe would not engulf their home if it is distant from the center of the fire. Anyone concerned with the future of life on our planet must make his contribution to the elimination of the threat of a nuclear war and to the search of ways for strengthening peace.

The Soviet Union remembers the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Japanese cities victim of American nuclear bombs. It is familiar with many works of Japanese prose and poetry writers who have described this tragedy, works which have been translated into the languages of our peoples. Since then, the atomic bomb was followed by thermonuclear weapons. It is no secret that the new weapons, which involve the use of atomic energy, are even more destructive, something which is hard to imagine.

Apparently, however, not everyone understands as yet the seriousness and threat to mankind of the new spiral in the nuclear missile race which is being unleashed by the United States presently.

That is precisely why the proposal of setting up a prestigious international committee of most noted scientists from different countries was formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress. Such a committee would make the broad people's masses the world over aware of the truth about the fatal consequences to mankind of a nuclear war and prove the vital need to prevent a nuclear catastrophe.

The Soviet Union has never initiated an arms race. We were not the first to develop nuclear weapons. On the contrary, the Soviet Union has tirelessly made specific and realistic suggestions aimed at ending the arms race and achieving disarmament. The Soviet Union is prepared to destroy its nuclear arsenal, naturally providing that all other nuclear powers do the same.

At the recent 36th UN General Assembly session the overwhelming majority of its members supported the Soviet proposal to declare the use of nuclear weapons first the gravest crime against humanity, and approved the Soviet resolution on banning the production of the nuclear bomb. However, the governments of some countries, Japan among them, opposed these humane proposals.

It was the Soviet Union which initiated talks on the total and universal banning of nuclear weapon tests and which has persistently called for the conclusion of a corresponding agreement as soon as possible. Our country has proclaimed its readiness to initiate talks immediately with all nuclear powers and other interested countries, aimed at terminating the production of all types of nuclear weapons and limiting and eventually totally eliminating weapon stockpiles.

At the same time, we have called for concluding a convention on strengthening the guarantees for the safety of non-nuclear countries and an agreement on the nondeployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of countries which do not possess such weapons today. The Soviet Union has declared most clearly that it will never use nuclear weapons against countries which refuse to produce or acquire them and which do not have them on their territory. Furthermore, the Soviet Union is ready to sign a special agreement to this effect with any non-nuclear power. We see no obstacle to initiating an exchange of views on this matter with Japan as well, both within the framework of the suggestion formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress on initiating talks on promoting measures of trust in the Far East or in any other form acceptable to both sides.

THE Soviet Union has consistently tried to reach practical results in the matter of restraining the nuclear arms race. It is not our fault that accomplishments in this area are still far from adequate.

Considering today's worsened international situation in which the United States is developing and producing qualitatively new mass destruction weapons, delaying the resumption of talks on limiting strategic armaments and adopting an obstructionist stand regarding the Soviet proposals aimed at improving the international climate, energizing the activities of all peace loving forces on the planet becomes particularly important. In this connection I can only support your appeal for taking immediate action in the defense of peace. The fact that the Japanese supporters of peace are firmly resolved to make their contribution to this noble cause and are strongly opposed to the deployment of domestic and foreign nuclear weapons on their territory is very valuable.

Let me assure you that the Soviet Union was, is and will always remain a firm and consistent fighter for the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, and for peace throughout the world, detente and disarmament.

COPYRIGHT: TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/10

LENIN'S WORK ON THE CREATION OF THE PARTY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 22-33

[Article by A. Solov'yev written on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the publication of V. I. Lenin's book "Chto Delat'?" [What Is to Be Done?]]

[Text] V. I. Lenin's outstanding work "Chto Delat'?" came out 80 years ago. This book which, in Lenin's words, dealt with the then "urgent topics" of the Russian social democratic and workers movements is imbued with a passionate appeal for the creation of a militant proletarian revolutionary party.

Lenin worked on the book in 1901 and the beginning of 1902. As we know, this period coincides with his most active work as editor of ISKRA, the Russian revolutionary newspaper, which was just being started in Germany. Many of the questions and problems discussed in the book were initially raised by Lenin in ISKRA. In the editorial "The Essential Tasks of Our Movement," which was published in the first issue of the newspaper, and subsequently in the articles "How to Begin" (No 4), "A Talk With the Supporters of Economism" (No 12) and others, he struggled firmly for a Marxist party of the working class, formulated an organizational plan for building a revolutionary party of a new type and exposed the opportunistic nature of "economism," a line which had become dangerously widespread at the turn of the century.

The first mention that Lenin was starting work on "Chto Delat'?" dates back to April 1901. In the spring of that year, he described the layout of the book and the progress he had made to his sister A. I. Ul'yanova-Yelizarova during their meeting in Munich. In his letters to G. V. Plekhanov and L. I. Aksel'rod written between October and December 1901, Vladimir Il'ich reported on his writing and the difficulties he was facing ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 46, pp 149, 158, 160). In his letter to the ISKRA organizations in Russia, dated December 1901, Vladimir Il'ich reported that the book would be published in about a month and a half. He wrote that "All differences will be thoroughly analyzed in it. We shall prove the entire harm caused by the RABOCHEYE DELO line and expose its entire shameful unreliability and helplessness in the face of Bernsteinianism and economism. The pamphlet is partially ready and is progressing rapidly" (Ibid., p 162). In his 7 February 1902 letter to G. V. Plekhanov, he reported with satisfaction that "My pamphlet is being set to print" (Ibid., p 170). Lenin wrote the preface in February and the book was published by Dietz Verlag in Stuttgart, in March.

"Chto Delat'?" -- a book written by this outstanding 30-year old Marxist -- expresses the author's profound faith in the great historical liberation mission of the proletariat, which was called upon to head and lead to victory the struggle for the reorganization of social life on a communist basis. The book is an unsurpassed scientific work on the party of the working class. It is a profound philosophical and historical study which answers the question of what kind of party does the proletariat need and why does it need it?

1

The last quarter of the 19th century was characterized by the headlong development of capitalism in Russia. Railroads, which required large amounts of metal, were being built across the huge country. Metallurgical plants were growing in the south and the Urals. The oil fields in Baku and the Donbass mines could not meet the huge demand for petroleum and coal. New metal processing and machine building enterprises were being constructed and older ones were being expanded. The number of workers, recruited mainly among the peasants, was increasing.

However, the development of capitalism in Russia was greatly hindered by the numerous manifestations of serfdom and by czarism -- a reactionary political system. Extremely backward and underproductive agriculture dominated the country's economy. The estates of the nobility were flanked by millions of poor, squalid and ruined peasant farms enslaved by landowners, the church and the state. Primitive labor tools, illiteracy and low standards were the lot of the majority of the population. The unparalleled contradictions and rightlessness of the people's masses, which were cruelly exploited, increased the discontent of the working people and the broad public circles. Russia was irrepressively advancing toward a revolution.

The bourgeois revolutions which had rolled over Western Europe in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries had cleared the way for capitalism, given the power to the bourgeoisie and consolidated the domination of bourgeois ideology. The 19th century was the period of ascending capitalism in Europe. However, the more it advanced, the more it was characterized by the appearance of the proletariat on the historical stage. The class battles of the proletariat were accompanied by the birth of Marxism -- its scientific ideology.

By the time the bourgeois revolutions had ended and class battles for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the seizure of power by the proletariat were beginning in Western Europe, most clearly expressed by the Paris Commune, Russia was yet to discard its feudal-serfdom police-autocratic system which paralyzed its economic and sociopolitical development. In Russia the revolution was developing under the new historical conditions in which capitalism was entering in its final stage -- imperialism -- and at a time when the proletariat with its goals was making its powerful appearance in the arena of the historical struggle. The inevitable revolution was growing frighteningly and mercilessly as a people's democratic revolution. The Russian bourgeoisie feared the development of the revolution and its scope, and was inclined to compromise with the czar and the ruling upper crust. The multi-million strong peasantry was socially heterogenous and unorganized. It

needed firm political leadership. The working class was the only consistently revolutionary force capable of heading a popular revolution.

The working class was being subjected to most cruel exploitation and police oppression under czarist autocracy. However, the workers masses were concentrated in a number of large industrial and transportation enterprises, which was a contributing factor in the growth of their political maturity, discipline and organization. By the turn of the century, the working class in the Petersburg, Moscow, Ural, Southern and Transcaucasian industrial areas had quite convincingly proven its worth in the class battles against the owners-capitalists and czarism. The strikes of 1890-1900, which frequently developed into armed clashes with the police and the army, had proved that a frightening force of revolutionary struggle was rising. The center of the revolutionary movement was clearly shifting from Western Europe to Russia. The actions of its proletariat were drawing the attention of all social forces in the country. However, in order to assume the leadership of the people and to lead them in storming the autocracy it needed a political leader suitably familiar with the nature and essence of the developing events, a clear purpose and a good organization. In other words, the Russian proletariat needed a militant political party.

The actions of the Russian proletariat at the end of the 19th century raised the question of mastering Marxism and developing the social democratic movement. The experience of the European countries was considered. However, after the death of K. Marx, followed by that of F. Engels, insistent efforts to revise Marxism had become apparent in the European social democratic movement.

The establishment of the "Liberation of Labor" group abroad and above all the creation of the Petersburg "Alliance for the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class," the embryo of a Marxist party in Russia, marked the birth of the country's social democratic movement. The First Congress of Social Democratic Organizations of Russia was held in 1898, and proclaimed the founding of a Russian social democratic workers party. However, the congress, which was held without the exiled Lenin and his closest fellow-workers, was unable to formulate a party program and bylaws and to eliminate the discoordination within the social democratic movement.

In "Chto Delat'?" Lenin graphically depicted the situation with the Russian social democrats at the turn of the century: "A small group of us are following a hard and steep road, firmly holding on to one-another. We are surrounded by the enemy on all sides and are almost always under fire. We joined forces freely precisely for the sake of fighting the enemy rather than sliding into the nearby swamp, whose population has blamed us from the very beginning for having formed a separate group and chosen the path of struggle instead of conciliation. Now, some of those among us are beginning to shout: let us go into the swamp! And when others begin to shame them they accuse us of being backward and depriving them of the freedom to call upon us to take a better road! Oh yes, gentlemen, feel free not only to call upon us but to go wherever you wish, even into a swamp; we even believe that your true place is precisely in the swamp and are ready to help you to move there. But then, let go of our hands, do not hang on to us and do not sully the great word

freedom, for we too are now "free" to go where we please, free to fight not only the swamp but also those who are turning in its direction!" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 6, pp 9-10). This allegorical image accurately reflected the nature of relations among the different groups of the Russian social democracy of the 1900, before it had become a single party. The very title and subtitle of the book revealed Lenin's concern for the state of affairs in the proclaimed but not yet definitively organized party of the working class. In the work Lenin provided a thorough study of the reasons for the situation which had developed.

Lenin's book is not only a profoundly scientific and comprehensive substantiation of the need, role and significance of a militant revolutionary party of the working class and its program and organizational principles, but also a passionate call for the defense of Marxism, the education of the proletariat and the systematic reaching of the democratic and socialist objectives of the struggle. This work, which is imbued with the topical and pertinent problems of the period and passionate debate with domestic and foreign opportunistic movements, is a basic scientific study of the nature, targets and principles of party organization. It analyses, substantiates and resolves the basic problems of the life and activities of the party of the working class, and remain topical 80 years after its original publication.

2

In a letter written in 1889, Engels wrote that "In order for the proletariat to be sufficiently strong at the decisive moment and to be able to win, it must organize its own party, which must be separate and in opposition to all other parties, conscious of being a class party. Marx and I have defended this view ever since 1847" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 37, p 275). Like Marx and Engels, Lenin believed that the working class can head a revolution and win only if it is led by a party armed with a progressive theory and strong by virtue of its revolutionary consciousness and discipline. The party is the political leader of the working class. It plays a progressive role and is the conscious vanguard of the workers movement.

Nearly 80 years of experience in the building and activities of our party and the experience of the communist and workers parties of many countries prove that the proletariat can defeat the bourgeoisie in its own country in a socialist revolution only if it is headed by a militant revolutionary party. After the victory of the revolution the working class and the revolutionary forces need the party even more in order to be able to defend the revolution and to organize the creation of the new society.

Nevertheless, occasionally renegates appear who, either driven by their own error or obeying the class order of the bourgeoisie, try to reject the leading role of the party of the working class in the victory of the revolution and the building of the new society, or else at least to belittle its role in these events in all possible manners. There is no historical precedent of a socialist revolution victory and successful building of socialism without a working class party, without its leading role and without reliance on Marxism-Leninism.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has pointed out the unshakeable nature of the Marxist-Leninist party doctrine: "The facts are that the communists win wherever the party systematically fulfills its role as the vanguard of the working class and the toiling masses, the Leninist norms of party life are sacredly observed and the party protects and steadily strengthens its political, organizational and ideological unity. Conversely, any belittling of the party's role or deviation from Leninist party construction principles result in major failures and may threaten the socialist gains of the peoples."

This profound and substantiated conclusion is confirmed by specific historical events. Not so long ago, the deviation from Marxist-Leninist doctrine in China brought about an unprecedented desecration of the party. Party organizations were broken up and cadres of party workers were eliminated and denigrated under the slogan "Hit the Headquarters!"

Last year we witnessed the way malicious anticommunist forces in the Polish People's Republic, supported from the outside by imperialist circles, organized fierce attacks against the party of the working class in an effort to behead the working class and to put an end to the socialist system.

Marxist-Leninist doctrine is the basis of the activities of the revolutionary party of the working class. The party must educate all of its members, the vanguard of the working class, and develop their scientific dialectical materialistic outlook. It does not simply master and disseminate Marxism-Leninism but is guided by it in its practical work during the preparations for the socialist revolution and after its victory. That is precisely what gives the party the right to lead the working class.

In "Chto Delat'?" Lenin gave a high rating to revolutionary theory and posed with exceptional urgency the question of the struggle for the purity of Marxism and the intolerance of revisionism, which was then hiding behind the fashionable but false slogan of "freedom of criticism."

In his exposure of the German Bernsteinians, the admirers of the French socialist Millerand and the Russian "economists" and after exposing their true class nature, Lenin gave a deadly description of their role. "If we judge the people not by the brilliant uniform they wear or the showy label they have chosen for themselves," he wrote, "but by their actions and objectives, it becomes clear that "freedom of criticism" means freedom of taking an opportunistic direction in the social democratic movement, turning the social democratic party into a democratic reform party and introducing within socialism bourgeois ideas and elements" ("Ibid., Vol 6, p 9).

The Russian "economists" were inspired by the example of the European opportunists and repeated many of the latter's "revelations." "Chto Delat'?" offered the first thoroughly supported and consistent criticism of the German revisionist Bernstein, who became notorious for his desire to convert the social democratic movement from a party of the social revolution into a party of parliamentary opposition.

"Chto Delat'?" is a clear confirmation of Lenin's loyalty and devotion to the doctrine of Marx and Engels. It is an exceptionally accurate and timely

defense of this doctrine against the then initial early attempts on the part of German, French, Russian and other revisionists to refute, distort or adapt it to the interests of the bourgeoisie.

In defending the purity of Marxism, Lenin called for its development and enrichment with new concepts and conclusions. Life, the practice of the class struggle in the individual countries, time and changing circumstance have invariably proved that Marxism must not be taken as dogma and that it is a manual for action, flexible in its conversion from general truths to specific circumstances and situations, not at all opposed to the discovery of new laws or the summation of cumulative revolutionary experience. Like Engels, Lenin emphasized that along with economic and political struggle the party of the proletariat must engage in theoretical or ideological struggle. He personally waged such a theoretical struggle selflessly, impeccably and better than anyone else, and bequeathed to the party to do so always and under all circumstances.

In his "Vospominaniya" [Reminiscences], Comrade L. I. Brezhnev speaks very convincingly of the exceptional danger created by ideological errors and omissions. They may frequently appear petty and almost imperceptible. "However," Leonid Il'ich writes, "ideological errors are as a rule concealed, camouflaged behind nice-sounding words. This makes them even more fraught with dangerous consequences, for they are bound to exert an influence and to cause tremendous harm unless corrected on time."

While waging his fierce ideological struggle, the enemy of the proletariat widely uses all possible tricks and misconceptions. He tries to conceal his petty ideas behind nice-sounding words borrowed from the revolutionaries. "Freedom," Lenin wrote in "Chto Delat'?" "is a great word. However, the most predatory wars have been fought under the banner of industrial freedom, and the working people have been robbed under the banner of the freedom of labor" ("Ibid., Vol 6, p 9).

These words have retained their permanent wisdom. They have been confirmed on hundreds of occasions during the past decades.

Let us take the Chilean example. The Allende government, which came to power democratically, as a result of an electoral victory, strictly observed all democratic rules. What happened? With the support of outside imperialist forces the bourgeoisie savagely dealt with this fully legitimate government and cruelly suppressed the revolutionary movement in the country. The working people were taught an object lesson on the way in which the imperialist bourgeoisie drags in the mud the concept of pure democracy when its class interests become threatened. This lesson must not be forgotten.

What lurks behind the hypocritical "concern" of the imperialists for the freedom of the peoples of Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Nicaragua and others? Nothing but a hidden pharisaic attempt to stop the revolutionary process, to perpetuate feudal barbarism and spiritual obscurantism rejected by the peoples and to justify the savage genocide of enraged Pol Pot supporters and Somosa's bloody despotism.

The crisis which developed in Poland at the start of 1981 had its internal reasons, naturally. They were openly expressed in the resolutions of the extraordinary Ninth PZPR Congress and in PZPR plenum decrees. However, the origin and particularly the development of the crisis occurred with the direct intervention of outside imperialist forces. The PZPR leadership and the Polish government cannot be accused of lack of good will and desire to settle the crisis peacefully. During an 18-month period, anyone interested in reaching such a solution was given total freedom providing that the socialist nature of the state was maintained. However, the proffered hand was either ignored or countered with a barely concealed fist. Urged on by foreign reaction, the extremist leadership of Solidarity took readiness to reach an agreement for weakness on the part of the socialist forces in Poland and raised the crisis to the confrontation level. Demagogic calls for freedom turned into anarchy and counterrevolution.

Maksim Gor'kiy, the great proletarian writer, has left us a splendid explanation of a misuse of the concept of freedom and expressed his attitude toward it quite simply: "Yes, I am against freedom when it oversteps the line beyond which it becomes unruliness...", he wrote. "This transformation begins when a person who has lost the awareness of his true sociocultural value turns loose the old hidden philistine individualism and shouts: 'I am so charming, original and unique and yet I am not allowed to live as I wish.' This is tolerable as long as he is merely shouting it, but if he begins to act as he feels he turns both into a counterrevolutionary and a hooligan..."

The leaders of the People's Republic of Poland had no choice other than to resort to extreme constitutional measures -- the proclamation of martial law. The "savagely shouts of animosity" on the part of the U. S. government, echoed by all reactionary forces, were the best proof that the measure was both proper and timely.

The most important problem which Lenin analysed in "Chto Delat'?" is the development of socialist awareness in the labor movement. He pointed out that the proletariat is spontaneously attracted to socialism on account of its status and concepts but is unable to formulate a doctrine of socialism and communism by itself. Scientific communism is a science, and as such it must be created by scientists. Like Lenin, Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific communism, came from intellectual families. They had higher education and a tremendous knowledge of historical events and the most advanced philosophical achievements of their age -- German classical philosophy, English political economy and the talented predictions of the utopian social-ists. They were able to rise above them, to surmount their limitations, to refute their errors and to create a truly scientific doctrine -- Marxism-Leninism.

In studying the role and tasks of the revolutionary party of the proletariat, Lenin reached the important conclusion that the party had to bring socialism and the workers movement together. This meant that the most advanced scientific theory was to blend with the revolutionary practice of the working class. It was thus that the class struggle waged by this consistently revolutionary class could be armed with the scientific objectives and that the movement could acquire historical justification and great strength.

"There can be no revolutionary movement without revolutionary theory," Lenin wrote. "...The role of leading fighter can be played only by a party guided by a leading theory" (Ibid., Vol 6, pp 24-25). These crystal-clear views, which are now axiomatic in Marxist-Leninist doctrine, had to be proved during those long-gone years. Many practical workers in the labor movement had to be persuaded and overpersuaded to accept them.

"Lenin steadfastly followed Marx' appeal not only to interpret the world but to change it," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said. "The ability of Lenin's genius to resolve theoretical problems in close connection with practical work and the class struggle was consistent with the basic needs of the revolutionary movement in the 20th century, when the proletarian revolution was put on the agenda."

It is sometimes claimed that socialist awareness became part of the labor movement a long time ago and that it was necessary only at the dawn of the development of the proletarian class struggle, during the period of organization of Marxist parties. Now, when socialism has become established in the world arena, and when a powerful communist movement has spread over most countries in the world, this has allegedly become unnecessary. Nothing could be more mistaken. Communist ideology has become dominant in the socialist countries and the communist and workers parties are its carriers. It is being extensively disseminated throughout the world and is being adopted by an increasing number of toiling strata. However, this does not guarantee its steady and automatic establishment on the planet. Each new generation must study and profoundly master Marxist-Leninist doctrine and defend it against attacks and distortions.

The imperialist ideologs are waging a fierce battle against scientific communism. Whenever possible they mount ideological diversions against the socialist countries and try to weaken the communist convictions of the working people, to impose on them views and mores alien to socialism in the hope of undermining the socialist countries and to provoke radical changes in them to the advantage of imperialism. That is why socialist awareness must be continually disseminated among the masses with the help of contemporary means and methods, in accordance with changing circumstances and the level of readiness of the masses to accept socialism.

"Chto Delat'?" was the first to provide a thorough interpretation of the correlation between spontaneity and consciousness in the labor movement.

The upsurge of the class struggle of the proletariat in the 1900s, on the one hand, and the ideological disorder and confusion among the social democrats, on the other, led to the blind veneration of the economic successes achieved with the help of strikes and the scope and heroism of the struggle of the masses and the feeling to ignore the propaganda and education of the working class in the spirit of Marxism. The "economists" and the supporters of the strictly economic struggle of the working class undertook to provide a "theoretical" explanation of the adequacy and suitability of and alleged total consistency with this spontaneously developing struggle for the basic

interests of the proletariat. "The economic struggle is a collective struggle waged by the workers for selling their work to the owners under better conditions and for improving their working and living conditions," Lenin wrote (Ibid., Vol 6, p 60). This struggle is both important for its own sake and necessary. However, it can result only in partial improvements and concessions granted by the owners, which can make life better under capitalism for a while. A strictly economic struggle cannot result in its elimination.

Lenin describes the policy based on spontaneous economic strikes as trade unionism, i.e., as a policy which defends the professional interests of the working class against the owners and the government. It does not include the revolutionary task of changing the existing social order but tends to be satisfied with achieving reforms and limited objectives. According to Lenin, "The spontaneous labor movement can create (and inevitably creates) by itself only trade unionism, but the trade unionist policy of the working class is precisely the bourgeois policy of the working class" (Ibid., p 96). The revolutionary parties do not reject and even welcome reforms. However, they subordinate the struggle for reforms to the revolutionary struggle for freedom and socialism. Armed with a scientific theory, the party leads the struggle of the proletariat not only for improving the conditions for selling its labor, but for the abolishment of the social system which forces the poor to sell their ability to work to the rich.

Regardless of the flag under which it operates and the reasons it gives, opportunism is nothing but an aspiration, wish and attempt to subordinate proletarian to bourgeois ideology. Revisionism is one of the clearest manifestations of opportunism. Its other variety is the acceptance of spontaneity. This was the most typical feature of the "economists." For example, they believed that socialist awareness develops spontaneously within the labor movement and spreads with equal spontaneity among the working class.

In "Chto Delat'?" Lenin proved with particular forcefulness that in practice neglect of theoretical activities and socialist propaganda leads to concessions to bourgeois ideology. "...The only choice in this case is between bourgeois and socialist ideology. There is no third choice. ...Therefore, any belittling of socialist ideology, and any departure from it means the strengthening of bourgeois ideology" (Ibid., pp 39-40).

The working class, which has been called upon to liberate mankind from all social and national oppression, is firmly struggling for a radical reorganization of social life and for socialism. To win this universal-historical battle, the proletariat must become aware of its status in capitalist society and understand the objectives and tasks of the struggle. "...The main economic interest of the proletariat," Lenin asserted, can be met only through political revolution, which will replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with that of the proletariat" (Ibid., Vol 6, p 46).

In "Chto Delat'?" Lenin compellingly proved that the working class needed a party of a new type -- a party of the social revolution and proletarian dictatorship, rather than a conciliationist party agreeable to adaptations and social reform. He comprehensively developed the question of the proletariat as the leader of all working people and all revolutionary forces

in resolving the problem of democracy -- the gain of full political rights and freedoms -- and the problem of social tasks -- the elimination of the exploitation of man by man. He viewed the problems of the strategy and tactics in the struggle waged by the working class from an identical standpoint.

"In order to be a social democrat," Lenin wrote, "the worker must acquire a clear idea of the economic nature and sociopolitical picture of the landowner, the priest, the government official, the peasant, the student and the beggar. He must find out their strong and weak points. He must be able to understand popular phrases and all the sophistries which each class uses in order to conceal its egotism and inner self. He must be able to understand the type of institutions and laws which reflect one interest or another and how this is accomplished" (Ibid., p 70).

The spontaneous actions of the working people are of tremendous importance to the general democratic and the socialist movements. The party of the working class, the Marxists-Leninists, cannot and must not stand aside or ignore spontaneously arising or developing popular movements. They must find themselves in the thick of the masses and understand the reasons for and true meaning of such movements. However, they must not follow them blindly, tailing behind them and absolutely support them in all cases. Only movements consistent with the true objectives of the proletariat and the working people are worthy of support. If such is not the case, the party should oppose unfair spontaneous movements, outbreaks or enthusiasms. On numerous occasions the party has opposed spontaneous movements and won. Suffice it to recall the so-called revolutionary conscientious defensive movement of 1917 and the revolutionary phrase-mongering and demagogy of the "left" during the period of the Brest peace negotiations. Reliance on the masses and appeals to the progressive, most mature and reliable detachments of working people and party members have always brought the party success.

For decades the bourgeois ideologs have tried to describe CPSU policy as tailing behind the spontaneous feelings of the workers, adapting itself to their backward tastes and egotistical aspirations, or else as totally ignoring the interests of the people and their just aspirations. In either case the bourgeois authors have remained totally unconcerned with the truth, presenting their wishes as reality and cynically and shamelessly slandering the policy of the Leninist party. They are unwilling to acknowledge the truth that CPSU policy is consistent with the real interests of the people, for this would indicate the failure of their ideology. This truth is working its way into the minds and hears of millions of people through the practices and successes of the building of socialism and communism and the Soviet way of life. The truth of life is stronger than the curtain of lies, ideological tricks and disinformation. Whether dealing with revolutionary or national liberation movements or the struggle for peace and true human rights, the communists have always defended the interests of the revolutionary-liberation process as a whole. They have no reason to distort the truth or to lie, for the truth is on their side and, in the final account, it is bound to prevail.

Most bourgeois ideologs and propagandists are totally unable to explain the steady economic successes achieved by the socialist countries. From their

viewpoint, the communists are forcing the working people to generate the national wealth at the cost of incredible efforts. They are unable to understand the ideological power of the vanguard which is leading the people to their cherished goal selflessly, with the power of its convictions and example. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the November 1981 CC CPSU Plenum that "The circumstances, the mood and, therefore, the production indicators in the labor collectives are greatly affected by the manner in which the communists work. Every single party member -- we have almost 18 million of them -- must dedicate all his efforts, experience and knowledge in his sector to finding additional reserves, upgrading labor productivity and setting a worthy example of labor dedication." This is the main strength of the party members. It is precisely this that the ideological defenders of capitalism are unable or, rather, unwilling to understand.

3

One of the main questions raised in "Chto Delat'?" is that of the organizational principles of the structure and functioning of the party of the working class.

The scope of the labor movement and its growing strength necessitated high-level management and centralization on a national scale. However, the organizational forms of the movement fell behind its expansion. They developed spontaneously and were undermined by police repression. Amateurism and clannishness predominated in the organization of the leadership of the struggle waged by the working class, as well as lack of centralization and narrow-minded organizational views and methods. This frequently resulted in the neglect of conspiratorial methods, frequent failures, the impossibility of organizing work continuity and increased mistrust on the part of the workers of the intellectual social democrats.

The trouble was not only that the movement was primitive, parochial and narrow-minded. Such growing pains could have been surmounted in the course of its development and upsurge. The real trouble was that the "economists" were literally enamored of amateurism and were doing everything possible to justify, praise and perpetuate such organizational backwardness. An all-Russian centralized organization was not needed in the economic struggle against the owners and the czarist government, nor could it be set up in the course of such a struggle. A centralized all-Russian organization of revolutionaries, acting as a political leader, was needed in order to unite all revolutionary forces and to guide them in the struggle against the entire bourgeois-landowner system and the overthrow of the autocracy. The "economists" had not contemplated such objectives for the labor movement, for which reason they accepted spontaneity in organizational matters as well. "...In addition to lack of training," Lenin noted, "the concept of 'amateurism' includes something else as well -- a narrow scope of all revolutionary work and the impossibility of setting up a good revolutionary organization; finally and above all, the attempts to justify such restricted work and raise spontaneity to the rank of special "theory", i.e., to a feeling of reverence in this area as well (Ibid., Vol 6, p 104).

In contrast to the narrow and limited "economist" organizational concepts, in "Chto Delat'?" Lenin painted a broad picture of the organizational structure of the revolutionary party of the working class and the means for its creation under the specific conditions of Russian reality at the onset of the 20th century. He believed that the implementation of the great historical objectives of the proletariat and the transformation of backward and semi-feudal czarist Russia into a progressive and economically developed state required mainly and above all a militant and theoretically mature revolutionary party acting as the political leader of the working class.

The party of the working class must include above all revolutionaries, i.e., individuals whose profession is revolution. Their number should be small and must inevitably include progressive workers and members of the intelligentsia and other social groups. Their consistent Marxist convictions guarantee their loyalty to the interests of the working class and the complete trust of their fellow-fighters. The professional revolutionary must disseminate socialist ideas and beliefs among the working class. He must always be in the thick of the masses, be familiar with their needs and feelings and dedicate his knowledge and strength to the organization and development of the revolutionary activity of the working people. According to Lenin, the professional revolutionary must also be omnipresent and omniscient. He must be able to find his way quickly under all circumstances, establish the contacts necessary for the revolutionary movement, be able to gain access to governmental and commercial secrets and to be a good conspirator able to avoid police surveillance and pursuit.

The centralized organization of professional revolutionaries, which must necessarily remain small, must rely on a wider circle of local party organizations, including those in large industrial enterprises. Lenin considered democratic centralism, i.e., party leadership from a single center, with the strictest possible obedience to superior organizations, aimed at ensuring unity of action, the most important organizational principle of party structure. The democratic principle requires electiveness and extensive publicity. Under the police system which prevailed in czarist Russia, however, this principle could not be applied in full.

Lenin suggested that the establishment of a political party of the working class in Russia begin with the publication of a Russian-wide political newspaper, which would make the formulation of a unified correct view of the objectives and tasks of the struggle possible, become the rallying center of the revolutionary forces and collectively expose autocracy, police arbitrariness and economic oppression. Such a newspaper would act not only as a collective propagandist and agitator but as a collective organizer as well. Lenin considered, thoroughly developed and discussed this plan with his closest collaborators toward the end of his Siberian exile and did tremendous work for its implementation after his release.

By the time "Chto Delat'?" was published, ISKRA had become widely known in Russia and in the European countries as the organ of militant Marxism and a school for the development of workers class awareness. For the first time in the history of the revolutionary movement, a newspaper which consistently

expressed very clear political and literary views was also an organizational center around which the revolutionary party cadres rallied.

At the very beginning of the 20th century, Lenin boldly asked revolutionary Russia what was to be done? Naturally, the answer was neither simple nor easy. The book, which answered the question, proves that its author had become deeply familiar with the nature of events. It showed the strength of his Marxist convictions and infinite faith in the creative possibilities of the working people. The main answer was clearly provided by the content of the work and the many references and arguments, as follows: "...Give us an organization of revolutionaries and we shall turn Russia over!" (Ibid., Vol 6, p 127). Lenin's famous book "Chto Delat'?" is precisely aimed at proving the need for the creation of a party of a new type, a militant revolutionary party of the working class. It became the ideological and theoretical foundation for the creation of a bolshevik party, which was founded in 1903, or shortly more than 1 year after the book was published.

It is perfectly justified to say that "Chto Delat'?" which appeared at the turn of the century, played an exceptional role in the ideological unification of the Russian social democratic movement and the creation of a Marxist party of the working class. The large number of positive responses to the work indicated that it contributed most directly to the victory of Lenin's ISKRA line within the RSDWP, to the unification of party cadres and to the elimination of organizational narrow-mindedness and backwardness. It struck a theoretical blow at the revisionists in the Western European democratic parties represented by Bernstein and his followers, and exposed their opportunism and betrayal of the interests of the working class.

Like Lenin's many other works, "Chto Delat'?" spread widely throughout the world. According to the All-Union Chamber of Books it has had 244 editions in 60 languages of the peoples of the USSR. It has had 199 editions in 41 languages in 37 foreign countries, totalling 13,558,000 copies. This is unquestionable proof of the tremendous interest shown in Lenin's ideas in the contemporary world.

"Chto Delat'?" is a most valuable scientific work in the highest meaning of the term. Nevertheless, its profoundly theoretical content did not prevent it from becoming a specific, purposeful and sometimes extremely detailed informative work on how to found and manage a working class party. Such a close combination of theory with practice is a most characteristic feature of Leninism, steadfastly implemented by the CPSU. Lenin wrote a brilliant work on the party of the working class. He did more than that. He created a party, trained and tempered it ideologically, and taught it how to serve the working people with dedication. Today this party acts as the political nucleus of our entire social system, as the collective mind and leader of the great Soviet people.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

SERIOUS TEST FOR CONSTRUCTION WORKERS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 34-46

[Article by I. Dmitriyev, head of the CC CPSU Construction Department]

[Text] The decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, aimed at raising further the material and cultural standards of the Soviet people, are inspiring the construction workers to achieve further labor successes. Today they are focusing their efforts on implementing the main task in capital construction set by the congress -- increasing the country's production potential on a new technical basis and building housing and communal and sociocultural projects.

Many construction collectives began the five-year plan with good work. Productive capital worth 133.1 billion rubles, financed out of all available sources was commissioned in 1981. New energy generating units and facilities for steel, pig iron, rolled metal and automotive vehicles production, oil and gas extraction and light and food industry enterprise construction went into operation. An extensive program was fulfilled in the countryside. The Soviet people received more than two million new comfortable housing units.

However, we cannot ignore the major shortcomings in the work of construction workers and their failure to use available reserves. The leading construction ministries are not fulfilling their plans for contract projects, the commissioning of industrial capacities and projects and growth of labor productivity assignments. The time spent on completing major industrial projects is inadmissibly long and the volume of unfinished construction is high. In many construction sites efficient coordination among all partners in the project has not been established; production technology is being violated, the organization of the work is unsatisfactory and available equipment is not used at full capacity. Instead of channeling funds into the most important projects, the customer ministries disperse them among numerous projects. Substantial material and manpower resources are frequently used on secondary and unplanned projects.

"The new five-year plan," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, "will be a major test for the construction workers." The sector's work must be radically improved over the next few years. This demand formulated by the CC CPSU was reflected in the 1982 and the five-year plans, whose specific feature is that they call for a considerable increase in the commissioning of capital assets despite a slower increase in capital

investments. Capital investments in the national economy from all financing sources will total 700 billion rubles during the five-year plan. The volume of capital investments, broken down by year, will remain substantially on the level of the funds actually used in 1980. The volume of capital assets financed out of state capital investments will total 627 billion rubles in 1981-1985, which is a 22 percent increase compared to the previous five-year plan. The technical structure of capital investments will be improved: by the end of the five-year plan, construction and installation projects will be reduced to 51 percent of the total.

The 26th party congress reemphasized the need to channel capital investments mainly into the reconstruction and technical retooling of operating enterprises. Practical experience has proved convincingly that funds invested in such projects are recovered considerably faster than outlays for the creation of similar production capacities by building new enterprises and that they save on manpower. During this five-year plan, capital investments in the technical retooling and reconstruction of existing enterprises will be increased considerably and their share of the total volume of capital investments will reach 32.5 percent.

Substantial funds will be allocated for the development of the fuel-energy, machine-building, chemical, and ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy sectors in order to upgrade the technical standard of public production and the further growth of its effectiveness. During the five-year plan extensive work will be done on the reconstruction and expansion of existing and the construction of new enterprises in the light and food industries. Housing facilities totalling 530 million square meters will be completed.

The plan calls for further strengthening the production and technical base of the construction industry and raising the level of its industrialization and prefabrication of structures and parts, the more extensive utilization of new types of effective materials and supplying the construction organizations with highly productive machines, mechanisms and transportation facilities.

At the November 1981 CC CPSU Plenum, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev identified capital construction as the decisive sector of the 11th Five-Year Plan. He pointed out that existing material and manpower resources, construction organization capacities and substantial volume of unfinished construction were taken into consideration in the formulation of the plan. He stated that we now have a realistic and better balanced capital construction plan, which provides the necessary conditions for normal work. The task now is to fulfill the plan steadily and to improve the organization of the production process systematically.

A Mandatory Prerequisite for Success

The comprehensive application of progressive production experience is a reliable means for the implementation of the plans and ensuring radical improvements in capital construction. At the November 1981 CC CPSU Plenum Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said that "There are many good collectives in the country. One of them is the Leningrad Glavzapstroy, which is completing its planned projects on time or ahead of time one five-year plan after another,

the construction and installation workers at the Novolipetsk Metallurgical combine and the builders of nonferrous metallurgy enterprises in the Ukraine and light industry enterprises in Belorussia. One can and must learn from such collectives."

It can be confidently said that the organized and efficient work done by the leading construction organizations is largely the result of the energetic and competent guidance of the party committees.

Party management of capital construction is not an abstract concept but the actual daily practice of party committees. It means resolving problems such as channeling capital investments, ensuring their efficient use, accelerating the completion of capacities and projects, upgrading the level of construction industrialization and labor productivity, developing stable collectives, upgrading manpower skills and utilizing internal reserves.

The party committees pay particular attention to cadre selection and placement and to the ideological-political, labor and moral education of sectorial workers. They try to develop firm unity among socioeconomic, administrative and cultural-ideological factors and to intensify their influence on reaching high end results in construction output. Efficient sectorial party leadership also means strict control over the implementation of decisions at all levels.

The CC CPSU studies the practical experience of party committees of republics, krays, oblasts, enterprises and organizations in managing construction work and disseminates it among all party members in the sector through its resolutions.

The Leningrad Oblast party committee for example leaves virtually no major problem the solution of which helps to improve the situation in the sector without attention. In order to improve the effectiveness of control over the state of affairs, the most important projects are assigned to senior oblast party committee, Leningrad gorkom and CPSU raykom construction department officials. The rayon and city party committees regularly report to the oblast CPSU committee on progress in construction.

The party obkom invariably demands of the party committees and bureaus of construction organizations to make use of their right to control administration activities, to take note of every single case of nonfulfillment of contractual obligations by economic managers and to take strictly to task engineering and technical personnel for failures in making production preparations and delays in opening work areas for the brigades.

The results of the work of the entire personnel in the construction system during the current year are critically analyzed and extensively summed up at the annual meetings of the party and economic aktiv of Leningrad city and oblast, and next year's assignments are issued. The socialist pledges of construction workers' collectives, client enterprises, and designers on speeding up the completion of the most important capacities and projects are discussed and taken at such meetings. Such matters are also regularly aired

at party gorkom and raykom bureau meetings and reflected in the socialist pledges of city and oblast rayons.

The party obkom has made considerable efforts to ensure the further improvement of the administrative structure in construction, the utilization of the experience of leading collectives and the concentration of forces and funds on the most important construction projects. The amount of funds per project increased by a factor of 1.6 and the number of simultaneously built projects declined by 35 percent during the 10th Five-Year Plan.

A system has been applied according to which worker cadres trained during the prelaunching period become extensively involved in installation and tuning operations, so that as construction draws to a close, the new capacities can be mastered and finished products manufactured. Major capacities were installed ahead of schedule at the Leningrad Armatures Plant imeni Lepse, the Fosforit Production Association in Kingisepp, the Kishinevteorgsintez Production Association in Kirishi, the poultry complex in Sinyavino, etc.

The Leningrad construction workers have raised the level of preassembled housing to 85 percent and all agricultural premises will be prefabricated in the immediate future. Leningrad is converting to housing construction based on standardized parts. Such housing is more comfortable and has a better apartment layout. Prefabricated parts are being used with increasing frequency in the construction of telephone exchanges, trade centers, hospitals, polyclinics and transformer substations. New types of construction materials are being widely used, as a result of which labor intensiveness is reduced. Great attention is being paid to the application of progressive labor and production organization methods. The entire volume of construction and installation work in many construction organizations is being performed through the brigade contracting method.

The Glavzapstroy collective of the USSR Ministry of Construction has acquired interesting experience in the use of economic and organizational and technical measures for reducing capital construction time. Despite difficulties, every year and one five-year plan after another, this large general contracting main construction administration is fulfilling its plans for the completion of projects with good technical and economic indicators. During the past five-year plan it completed 371 major projects, 97 of which ahead of schedule. The volume of unfinished construction was reduced by more than 80 million rubles. The main administration's collective fulfilled entirely its 1981 school, polyclinic and housing construction plan.

The CC CPSU, which reviewed the work of the party committee of Trust No 36 of this main administration approved its practices in the Gravzapstroy trusts.

Wide and interesting experience has been acquired here in the formulation of individual plans and assumption of stressed and economically substantiated socialist obligations. Workers meetings are regularly held in which managing and engineering and technical personnel of the trusts and the administration participate most actively. This makes the critical discussion of results and the formulation of specific measures for the elimination of detected omissions and shortcomings and the better identification of existing reserves

possible. This experience has been made available to the party organizations of all main administration trusts, so that the exigency regarding the fulfillment of planned assignments by the collective has increased.

The main administration's program calls for reaching high efficiency levels this five-year plan as well. By the end of 1985, the increased volume of marketable output will outstrip the volume of construction and installation work by 35 percent and the average amount of work per construction site will be increased by one half.

In its time, the CC CPSU discussed and positively rated the experience of the Bashkir party organization on the fulfillment of plans and upgrading capital construction effectiveness. The Bashkirskaya ASSR fulfilled the 10th Five-Year Plan for the volume of capital investments and commissioning of basic production capacities, schools, hospitals and other projects ahead of schedule. Many steps were taken to strengthen the production base in construction and to secure it with permanent skilled cadres.

The Bashkir party committees have made a thorough study of the production activities of construction organizations and industrial enterprises. They are energetically mobilizing their collectives to look for and make fuller use of reserves for reducing construction time and cost and upgrading quality. The party obkom is working hard to organize the extensive study and comprehensive application of the experience of progressive construction collectives.

The capital construction plans and project lists of enterprises are mandatorily considered by city and rayon party committees and party obkom departments. The main attention is focused on the concentration of funds and material and technical resources on the most important construction projects and reducing the number of new construction and unfinished projects. As a result, about 60 percent of capital investments for the construction of production facilities go to target projects. The republic has reduced the number of new construction project by a factor of four and the average size of capital investments per industrial construction project has increased. Positive changes have also been achieved in structure of capital investment.

Industrialized construction is being systematically developed here. The level of prefabricated construction in the republic increased by a factor of 1.8 during the 10th Five-Year Plan and the volume of prefabricated housing construction rose by 30 percent.

During the last 5 years alone the republic completed 30 large industrial enterprises such as the Neftekamsk dump-trucks plant, the chemical plant in Meleuz and the porcelain plant in Tuymazy. The "150" Rolling Mill was installed at the metallurgical plant in Beloretsk.

Naturally, major difficulties continue to arise during the fulfillment of the construction program. The party organization is surmounting them persistently and is mobilizing the thousands-strong construction worker collectives for efficient and organized work. Secretaries and senior CPSU obkom, gorkom and

raykom personnel regularly visit building sites, and actively help construction workers to resolve problems and to implement resolutions. Construction site staffs, which have been organized at all most important projects, are actively taking part in such efforts.

Many other party committees have gained great and interesting experience in capital construction management. This especially applies to the Moscow city and oblast party committees, the central committees of the communist parties of Belorussia, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan and Georgia, many Ukrainian obkoms, Stavropol'skiy and Krasnoyarskiy Kraykoms, Lipetsk, Saratov and other CPSU obkoms, and many party committees in construction trusts. Their experience convincingly proves that the energy of the party organizations is a decisive factor in the successful implementation of capital construction plans. Work efficiency and organization, unity of word and action and intolerance of violations of planning and work discipline, negligence and waste must become the main indicators of their maturity. The strict implementation of the state plan and the steady enhancement of production effectiveness determine the contribution of individual construction collectives to the fulfillment of the five-year plan, the level of party and economic management of capital construction and political and educational work with the people.

Systematic Improvements of the Economic Mechanism

A series of measures must be implemented this five-year plan to improve capital construction management, as stipulated in the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Improving Planning and Upgrading Production Effectiveness and Work Quality." Practical experience convincingly proves that construction organizations are successful wherever party principledness and persistence are displayed in the implementation of this decree. Construction workers in Moscow, Belorussia, Lithuania, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, Bashkiria and Leningrad, Saratovskaya and many other oblasts are taking effective steps to concentrate capital investments, to accelerate completion of production facilities and projects and to convert to new economic management methods. All of this is beginning to have a positive effect on the intensification of construction output.

Thus, the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Industrial Construction successfully conducted an economic experiment during which the attention of all participants in the construction process was focused on end results, improvements in the system for managing construction output and using the marketable construction output indicator, which were interrelated with profits and construction organization incentives.

The experiment made the concentration of capital investments and material resources and reduction to the legal limit the volume of unfinished construction possible. It ensured the completion of 4,380 different projects during the 10th Five-Year Plan, or 37 percent more than in the Ninth, and the building of 75,000 square meters of housing more than during the preceding 5-year period. Construction time was reduced by an average of 13 percent in the republic and 17 percent in industrial construction. The Belorussian construction organizations earned 370 million rubles during the 10th Five-Year Plan.

The republic has formulated and is successfully implementing a system of steps to upgrade organizational and technical construction standards. The industrial enterprises are using their internal reserves to produce technological and minor mechanization equipment, standardized equipment sets and manual tools.

The amount of unfinished construction in Saratovskaya Oblast has been reduced by nearly 300 million rubles and lowered to the acceptable level while maintaining a high level of technical readiness of newly constructed enterprises. The number of construction projects in the oblast has been reduced by almost one half and funds allocated for target projects have been increased.

The growth of marketable construction output of Galvmosinzhstroy averaged 43.6 percent and the volume of construction and installation work increased by 10.5 percent in 1978-1980. This is the direct result of the concentration of resources on target projects. During that period, construction time was reduced considerably and labor productivity increased by 7.4 percent.

The Lithuanian SSR Ministry of Construction, which has been systematically applying new economic management methods, successfully fulfilled its assignments on the completion of projects and production capacities in 1980. It lowered the volume of industrial construction and fulfilled its plan for the growth of labor productivity.

The USSR Gosplan and Gosstroy and the ministries and departments have essentially completed the drafting of the necessary legal, methodical and instruction materials on improving the planning, financing, crediting and economically stimulating capital construction. This has made possible to convert to capital construction planning based on new indicators in 1981, which oriented the participants toward end economic results and a new procedure for crediting outlays of contracting organizations, based on the unfinished share of construction and installation work, and settling accounts between contractors and clients on the basis of the estimated cost of marketable construction output. Preparations are currently under way for laying a cost-normative base for the gradual conversion to planning labor productivity in construction and installation organizations on the basis of normative conventional-net output in the course of the 11th Five-Year Plan.

However, we must admit that the remark voiced by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the November 1981 CC CPSU Plenum to the effect that "the decree is being applied too slowly and half-way" fully applies to construction as well.

The conversion to planning and assessment based on the indicator for normative net output of all industrial enterprises of construction ministries and the USSR Ministry of Construction Materials Industry is scheduled for completion in 1982. Tremendous work lies ahead, bearing in mind that only 530 construction and construction materials industry enterprises and associations had converted to the new planning and production evaluation system by the end of 1981. The share of pioneers of the new system has remained extremely low, averaging no more than 20 percent of the total number of enterprises and associations.

The experience of the construction and construction materials industry enterprises, whose work is now being planned and rated according to the new indicator, confirms its positive effect on end production results. Material- and labor-intensiveness of output drop. Production variety plans are being implemented more strictly. This substantially improves the availability of structures, items, parts and semifinished goods needed by construction sites. Labor productivity raises faster, outstripping the growth of average wages.

Under the new system, the USSR Ministry of Construction has reduced metal outlays per cubic meter of reinforced concrete items, improved deliveries to construction sites and reduced completion time. The USSR Ministry of Industrial Construction is systematically improving the implementation of the variety plan, which is being updated by 10 percent annually. Wage overruns have been eliminated.

The ministries are still sluggishly converting construction and construction materials industry enterprises to planning and assessing production activities on the basis of the normative net output indicator. The study of available progressive experience in this area has been insufficiently organized.

The power of inertial thinking is being felt also in the use of progressive new developments by customer ministries. Many of them avoid including the volume of marketable construction output in their plans. As before, they focus their main attention on the volume of contracted work. As a result, the capital construction plans of many customer ministries and departments include volumes of construction and installation projects which are substantially higher than the volumes of marketable construction output, as a result of which the plans remain imbalanced.

The conversion to new economic management methods currently under way in construction raises a number of practical problems to be resolved.

Many of them are related to the introduction of the new crediting system. The use of bank loans instead of customer advance payments, the increased responsibility of contracting organizations for the specific-purpose use of the loans and the stricter penalties imposed in cases of delinquent repayment of loans granted for unfinished construction work are important levers in upgrading the effectiveness of construction output. However, we can also understand the concern of the construction workers who have adopted the new crediting procedure. Under the new conditions they are frequently forced to pay for unfinished work done by related industries, such as delayed delivery of equipment by customers or materials and structures by producers. Ensuring the actual equal responsibility of all participants in the construction process for the timely completion of marketable construction output is an important factor in upgrading economic management efficiency. Together with the construction workers this problem must be resolved by the central planning-financial and juridical organs acting as customers and producers of construction items.

The conversion of construction projects to the comprehensive procurement of materials by the territorial material and technical supply organs, based on requirements defined in plans and cost estimates, is also too slow. This supply method was used by 575 most important construction projects and sites to the amount of 12 billion rubles in 1980 and 900 projects to the amount of 13 billion rubles in 1981.

At this stage of application of the new economic management methods the USSR Gosstroy must energize its work considerably and provide greater methodical aid to ministries and departments. Together with them it must analyze the situation and make a thorough study of the way the indicators of normative conventional-net and marketable construction output and the settling of accounts for completed projects affect the efficiency of construction output (the completion of projects, increased labor productivity, etc.). It is also important to determine the way the new instructions and norming documents operate in practice and, if necessary, to refine and work on them further.

The conversion to the new planning and economic incentive system in a complex economic sector such as capital construction involves substantial difficulties. For this reason, the construction ministries should assign specific organizations, associations, trusts and house building combines in the individual areas and oblasts on the basis of which all problems related to the application of the new economic management methods could be worked out, organize the training of specialists in these methods and share experience. To this effect it would be also expedient to convert a large republic construction ministry, the Belorussian Ministry of Industrial Construction for example, to operate according to the entire set of measures listed in the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree on improving the economic mechanism. The development of the new procedure for capital construction planning and economic incentive on a republic scale would considerably facilitate its comprehensive application.

The further intensification and expansion of the application of cost effectiveness is an important measure which could substantially increase work effectiveness and quality at all construction management levels. We must gradually develop a cost effectiveness system which would extend to all construction organization levels, from the labor brigade to the republic construction ministry and territorial main construction administrations.

The 26th CPSU Congress drew particular attention to the need of further improving cost-estimate work throughout the country, in accordance with which the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers passed a decree. It is based on measures which ensure the timely and profound study of all problems related to the justification and location of new construction projects. This will enable us drastically to reduce planning time, improve the supplying of construction sites with cost-estimate documentation, design projects in accordance with the latest achievements of scientific and technical progress and prevent construction cost overruns.

Even this very partial list of problems related to improvements in the economic mechanism indicates the great increase in the complexity of the problems which face capital construction today.

At the present stage of development, which is characterized by the high pace of scientific and technical progress and profound qualitative changes in production economics and the nature of labor, cadre economic retraining is an important prerequisite for upgrading the scientific level of economic management and the growth of the working people's initiative and activeness in production management.

Starting with 1981, construction ministry and department management personnel and specialists have been taking a course on "Improving the Economic Mechanism in Construction." The construction ministries and their economic training councils have assumed the main role in raising the quality of this course and retraining the specialists. A great contribution to this project could be made by STROITEL'NAYA GAZETA, Stroyizdat and the sectorial journals, which should publish more materials on the economic training system, describe the work done in the sector to improve the economic mechanism and publicize more energetically the experience of frontranking collectives. Furthermore, Stroyizdat should ensure the efficient distribution of official documentation on the implementation of the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree on improving the economic mechanism.

The CC CPSU considers efforts to improve the economic mechanism a major political task of the entire party and the national economy. In order to implement it successfully, the party committees and all party members in ministries, departments, construction organizations and design and scientific institutions must never lose track of this work. They must efficiently organize the implementation of the entire set of planned measures, and always look for the most efficient ways of exerting party influence on reducing construction time and fulfilling state assignments on commissioning production facilities and projects.

Success Depends on People

Shock labor and the honest and conscientious work of every working person are the guarantee of the successful implementation of the 11th Five-Year Plan.

In recent years a great deal has been accomplished by the construction ministries and departments to implement the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures for Further Improving the Training of Skilled Cadres and Retaining Them in Construction," and a number of important social problems have already been resolved.

During the last five-year plan, 162,000 people were released and the working conditions of 1.5 million people were improved. A total of 35 million square meters of residential area, 2.5 million square meters of comfortable hostels and facilities for 145,000 preschool children were built and provided by customers. Cafeterias totalling 200,000 seats were completed. Suitable eating facilities were organized at the construction sites of the Belorussian, Estonian and Lithanian SSRs, Leningrad, Novosibirskaya, Ryazanskaya and Lipetskaya Oblasts, etc.

Let us emphasize that a real way to improve supplies to workers cafeterias is the development of auxiliary farms. The Chelyabmetallurgstroy, Magnitostroy

and Lipetskstroy Trusts and a large number of enterprises of the RSFSR Ministry of Construction Materials Industry have gained practical experience in the creation of such farms. The sector as a whole has set up 350 auxiliary farms. However, many economic and trade union organs are still not sufficiently involved in developing auxiliary farms and do not make full use of local opportunities for increasing food production.

Extensive work is also under way in the sector to improve medical and sanatorium-resort services to the working people. A total of 45 sanatorium-prevention facilities and polyclinics, which can handle 60,000 visits daily, were completed during the 10th Five-Year Plan. The cost of sanatorium-resort services increased by 16.8 percent, which made services to another 350,000 working people and 500,000 children possible.

Housing facilities and greater availability of children's preschool institutions, a better organization of health care and consumer services, better working conditions and seniority bonuses to construction workers in Kazakhstan, the Nonchernozem Zone, Siberia and the Far East (such bonuses will be paid on a countrywide basis starting in 1983) have reduced cadre turnover somewhat and broadened the scale of their vocational and practical training.

In his address to the 26th CPSU Congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: "It is understandable that people work better and more willingly when steady concern is shown for improving their working and living conditions." It is important always to see the people behind production concerns and to create all the conditions necessary for highly productive work. The CC CPSU approved the experience of the Lipetsk construction workers in retaining cadres and creating stable labor collectives. With the support of the local party organizations, the Lipetskstroy Trust party committee has seen to it that here any new construction project begins with building suitable living premises for the construction workers. Public catering has been properly organized thanks to the creation of an auxiliary farm. The annual decrease in cadre turnover in the trust, which is now half the average for the USSR Ministry of Construction of Heavy Industry Enterprises and one third that of the sectorial average, is the direct and tangible result of such concern for the people. Here the number manual workers has declined considerably.

During the 10th Five-Year Plan, the collective of the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Industrial Construction Belotserkovskiy House Building Combine outstripped the enterprise's planned capacity by 7 percent; labor outlays per square meter of general housing area declined by almost 30 percent and the number of workers per million rubles of construction and installation work declined from 73 to 61. Labor productivity increased by 28 percent and the cost of construction and installation work decreased by 13 percent. Housing construction time was shortened by 1-2 months compared with the norm. All housing delivered by the combine is rated excellent.

Not least among the reasons for the success achieved by this collective is the fact that the enterprise management and social organizations pay great attention to improving the working, living and leisure time conditions of the

workers. Here, as in many other leading house building combines, the working people are better provided with housing, children's preschool institutions, houses of culture, resting centers and amenities at construction sites.

We already mentioned the successes achieved in capital construction in Bashkiria. The republic's construction organizations are actively working to improve the housing and living conditions of construction workers and to provide them with everything they need for highly productive work. Each construction trust here has its clubs, Pioneer camps, prophylactic institutions and polyclinics. All of this helps to retain the cadres and lowers personnel turnover, which accounts for no more than 5-8 percent in the leading republic trusts.

Each ministry and department has its comprehensive plans for improving working conditions and labor safety and sanatorium-treatment facilities for the duration of the 11th Five-Year Plan. Over the next 5 years the working conditions of 276,000 workers will be improved and 132,000 people will no longer perform work under conditions hazardous to their health. Sanatorium-preventive care institutions for 8,298 people, boarding houses and other rest institutions for 6,087 people will be built for the workers in this sector.

The construction workers must answer the steady concern shown by the party and the state with shock labor and high quality work. The five-year plan calls for increasing labor productivity in construction at a high rate. By the end of the five-year plan, it must be 15-17 percent higher in the leading construction ministries. This can be accomplished only if the party and all other social organizations comprehensively promote the development of the creative initiative of the working people and channel it into the utilization of all production reserves. As the CC CPSU, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol decree "On the All-Union Socialist Competition for the Successful Fulfillment and Overfulfillment of the Assignments of the 11th Five-Year Plan" stipulates, the initiatives of workers and kolkhoz members on the formulation of counterplans, application of technically sound labor norms, brigade cost effectiveness, individual thrift and quality accounts and implementation of the stipulated amount of work with less people must be supported and disseminated.

Reducing the number of people performing manual work is a major reserve in upgrading labor productivity in construction. So far, this is being carried out sluggishly in the sector.

The share of workers engaged in manual work declined quite insignificantly -- from 50.1 to 49 percent -- between 1976 and 1979. The share of manual labor even increased in the most labor-intensive professions, such as plastering, house-painting and facing, from 70.6 percent in 1975 to 72.5 percent in 1979. Currently more than 700,000 people are practicing these skills.

However, the progressive collectives in the sector are resolving the problem of reducing manual labor successfully. Thus, the construction workers at the Glavarkhangel'skstroy of the USSR Ministry of Industrial Construction have acquired valuable experience in lowering labor outlays in loading and

unloading operations. Working in close cooperation with the Material and Technical Procurements Administration of Severo-Zapadnyy Rayon and procurement enterprises of the Ministry of Construction Materials Industry, they applied a container utilization system and raised the level of mechanized loading and unloading operations to 94 percent, as a result of which labor productivity in such operations increased by a factor of 2.5 compared with the average sectorial indicators.

Long practical experience convincingly proved that the use of the brigade contracting method provides considerable opportunities for improving labor productivity in primary collectives. The method is being successfully applied at Glavsreduralstroy, Glavmurmanskstroy and Glavul'yanovskstroy, the Uzbekshakhtostroy Trust and the construction organizations in Lithuania, Estonia and Voronezh. Estimates prove that the use of this method saves the work of 12 men per million rubles of construction and installation work.

The use of the brigade contracting method combined with the initiative of the Sverdlovsk construction workers, which calls for "Fulfilling the Five-Year Plan With Smaller Brigades" is yielding high results. The CC CPSU approved the initiative of the leading Sverdlovskaya Oblast brigades and recommended to the party, soviet and economic organizations to undertake extensive organizational and political work among the collectives of construction and installation organizations for the dissemination of this valuable initiative aimed at finding and using internal reserves for upgrading labor productivity. This patriotic initiative is already being applied by more than 44,000 brigades, as a result of which about 50,000 people have been released and 3,500 new brigades have been created.

The "Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990" call for creating conditions for the comprehensive dissemination of the continuous related brigade contracting method based on raising the level of engineering preparatory work and complete production and technological sets. By the end of 1985, the volume of construction and installation work done with the use of the brigade contracting method will reach 55 percent of the total amount, compared with 37.2 percent in 1980.

Improving the use of the working time is another major reserve for improving labor productivity. Unfortunately, intrashift working time losses have not been declining in recent years. A selective study made by the USSR Gosstroy shows that they average 8.5 percent of construction working time. Adding to this the unproductive labor outlays which include working time losses caused by faulty work, inefficient placing and storing of materials, production technology violations, and errors in blueprints and changes made in them during construction, the total working time losses become even greater.

The economy must be economical, as stipulated by the 26th CPSU Congress. Every construction worker or member of the construction materials industry must participate most actively in the struggle for economy and thrift.

Capital construction is one of the highest material-intensive economic sectors, and materials account for about 60 percent of the total cost of construction and installation work. Every year, the construction industry uses about 20 percent of the rolled metal, 20 percent of the industrial timber, 80 percent of the cement, 70 percent of the soft roofing and about 60 percent of the window glass produced in the country and millions of cubic meters of sand, gravel and many other resources. Reducing such outlays by a single point would be the equivalent of saving 360-380 million rubles. This proves the existence of substantial possibilities of adopting a thrifty and economical approach to the use of mechanisms and transportation facilities and metal, cement and timber.

The construction organizations have gained substantial experience in skillful economic management and economical utilization of material resources.

The creation of services providing complete production-technological sets greatly contributes to the conservation of such resources. The creation of such a service drastically reduced turnover costs at Glavmosstroy. Tar, glass, flooring and other finishing material losses declined by 3-8 percent. The use of complete production-technological sets by the Belorussian construction trusts has sharply increased the concentration of material and technical resources on target projects and shortened the duration of the work. The republic's gosstroy is conducting an interesting and promising experiment in reducing construction material- and labor-intensiveness through the wider inclusion in working plans of the achievements of science, technology and progressive experience. A set of measures will be implemented also aimed at upgrading the economic incentive of the personnel of design and contracting construction and installation organizations to apply the most economical designs.

However, so far no substantial changes have taken place in terms of improving the use of resources at construction sites.

Today the prime duty of all construction management units and party, trade union and Komsomol organizations and all working people is to engage in a decisive struggle for production efficiency, strictest possible observance of labor discipline, all-round reduction in working time losses and conservation of material resources. In the course of this struggle firmer social and disciplinary measures must be applied against violators of labor and production discipline and those guilty of negligence. In this area brigade leaders, foremen and workers can and must play a great role.

Particular attention must be paid to increasing educational work with young people, strengthening sponsorship relations with vocational-technical schools and base enterprises, improving individual and collective tutorial methods and the training of tutors. Young people must become more actively involved in the social life of the collectives, in scientific and technical creativity, amateur arts, physical culture and sports. Educational work and the organization of the leisure time of young people living in hostels must be improved considerably. All the necessary conditions for upgrading the general educational level of the workers and their skills must be created in all construction organizations.

One of the most important obligations of the party organizations is to be always concerned with cadre training and education, making maximal use of the experience of the old and experienced workers and promoting young specialists. The CC CPSU is always concerned with improvements in this area.

In 1978 the CC CPSU made a study of the work with cadres at the USSR Ministry of Construction and formulated steps to improve it and to upgrade the skills of management and engineering and technical workers in the sector. It was noted that the ministry's organizations suffered from high cadre turnover, an unwarranted high percentage of replacement of managers and specialists and the staffing of engineering jobs by a large number of workers with practical training only and that the level of the ministry's work with leading and engineering and technical cadres failed to meet the stricter assignments in capital construction. The major shortcomings in their selection and training are one of the reasons for the nonimplementation of the state plan and the violation of deadlines for the completion of many projects and production capacities. The CC CPSU called upon the ministry to enhance the feeling of responsibility of the managers for their assignments and the observance of state and planning discipline and to put an end to the tolerance shown to some of them who fail to implement construction assignments and to take the necessary steps for the effective utilization of material-technical and labor resources.

In the course of implementing the CC CPSU decree the collegiums of contracting ministries and the managers of the territorial organizations formulated and implemented a number of measures to keep engineers and technicians on the job. As a result of the work accomplished by the contracting ministries, the qualitative structure of engineering and technical personnel improved and their turnover and replaceability declined.

At the USSR Ministry of Construction for example, compared with 1977 the number of graduate specialists in 1980 was higher by 13,000, 5,000 of whom were university graduates and 8,000 graduates of secondary specialized schools. During the same period of time the number of practical workers employed at the ministry's construction organizations as managers and specialists dropped from 16.5 to 13.6 percent.

Similar positive changes took place in all construction ministries.

Steps were taken to further improve the system for retraining and upgrading cadre skills and improving training facilities and quality. Thus, the USSR Ministry of Construction has organized a widespread system of schools for upgrading construction worker skills and a Central Interdepartmental Skill Improvement Institute has been organized at the Moscow Engineering and Construction Institute imeni V. V. Kuybyshev.

Improving the management structure, strengthening the brigades and the engineering support they need in their work and the systematic application of a scientific organization of labor impose stricter requirements to brigade leaders. Their duties have become more difficult and the time they must spend on resolving organizational problems has increased considerably. Here

success depends on the brigade leader -- the production organizer, teacher and educator. That is why party organizations which make brigade leaders members of party committee, as was done at the Vinnitspromstroy Combine, act correctly. Let us point out that the use of a system of planning, complete production-technological sets and accountability of production outlays directly on the level of the consolidated brigades in this combine created conditions for the conversion of all brigades to the contracting method. In turn, this had a positive effect on the overall combine indicators. The extensive popularization of this initiative offers a great opportunity for upgrading the efficiency of construction output.

The leading collectives have acquired exceptionally valuable experience in resolving the difficult and responsible problems which face capital construction today. The profound study and extensive application of progressive experience is an important sector in party work. It greatly depends on the purposefulness of the party organizations, their energy and persistence and the activeness of the individual party members.

The program for constructive work for the 1980s reflects the basic vital interests of all Soviet people. It is triggering the tremendous creative energy and broadest possible initiative of the masses. Together with all working people in the country, the construction workers are concentrating their efforts on the successful implementation of the historical resolutions of the 26th party congress and the further strengthening of the power of our homeland.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

ECONOMIC MECHANISM AND ECONOMIC LEGISLATION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4 Mar 82 pp 47-55

[Review by V. Alekseyev of materials received by the editors]

[Text] In our country economic activities are legally controlled through economic legislation. Economic laws regulate horizontal and vertical relations among separate units in the economic mechanism. Therefore, legal control is an intrinsic element of the economic mechanism in the socialist society.

The party pays great attention to improving economic legislation. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, has said that "A great deal remains to be done...to improve legal control of economic activities. Our laws in this area must ensure more efficiently quality improvements and savings. They must counteract more effectively attempts to cheat the state, figure padding, theft of socialist property, manifestations of parochialism, etc."

1

The journal received a number of responses to V. Laptev's article "Economic Mechanism and Economic Law" (No 16, 1980). Virtually all of them agree with the author's assessment of the existing situation in economic legislation.

The impression in the area of practical legal work, writes B. Stepankov (Moscow), is one of the lack of a "pivot," of a kingpin holding together the entire economic legislation system. It is annoying that this most extensive, complex and important area of Soviet legislation, which is as old as our state and expresses its most important economic and organizational function, has still not been accepted as a separate branch of the law and is still forced, like "a poor relative" to "lease space" from codifying and other laws in related but quite different areas, such as civil and administrative law, and mainly from the Foundations of USSR and Union Republic Civil Legislation and the republic civil procedure codes. This is not astounding when we bear in mind that laws in this area have been neglected and left unsystematized. They are excessively cumbersome, suffer from internal contradictions and major gaps and are lagging behind economic requirements.

Current economic legislation frequently encourages managers to ignore the stipulations of the laws which they violate in the course of decision making,

writes A. Petrosyan (Tbilisi). It is indeed difficult to develop respect for economic legislation when its norms are imperfect and conflicting and lag behind the requirements of economic life. This is one of the reasons for a kind of legal nihilism which has unfortunately spread among economic workers. The authority of and respect for the law must be enhanced.

The large number of laws passed by various departments on similar matters complicates the work of enterprises. The absence of uniform legislation provides opportunities for some departments to abuse their rights and for unfairly improving economic indicators of some departments at the expense of others. V. Zadorozhnyy and Ye. Vinokur (Rostov-na-Donu) cite a specific example in this connection. The production of dry bleach requires zinc oxide, which is supplied by the Achisay Polymetals Combine. The less lead the oxide contains the higher the quality of the bleach. However, the raw material manufacturer is not interested in this fact, for according to the approved price list (which was adopted with the participation of the USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy) the purchasers of zinc oxide pay not only for the pure product but also for the metallic admixtures, including lead. Therefore, the more lead the raw material contains the lower its quality and the higher its price. Naturally, the quality keeps worsening. This contradiction is possible only because of the lack of uniform economic laws.

Each economic sector creates its departmental laws. Dozens of Special Conditions Governing Deliveries of Products and Goods have been and are being issued. However, since they are drafted by different departments, identical problems are not always resolved identically. Thus, some special conditions call for issuing payment instructions for reusable containers after they have been entered in the books, while others require receipts. Why not establish a uniform procedure? The lack of standardized legal norms applicable to all sectors complicates the work, hinders the acquisition of knowledge and experience, leads to labor and time waste in the endless search for the proper departmental regulations and harms the national economy.

The current state of economic legislation, writes A. Yanchuk (Zaporozh'ye) is such that even a number of central state organs fail to show the necessary respect for its norms. Unconcerned with legal consequences, the Gosstandart has converted cargo pallets from the category of returnable containers to that of packing facilities, thus eliminating the possibility of levying fines for failure to return them. In 1978, without waiting for the passing of a law on the procedure governing the conversion of packing facilities, the USSR State Committee on Prices abolished the making of deposits for pallets, i.e., it abolished one more rule mandating the return of pallets. The Zaporozhstal' Plant tried to ensure the return of pallets on a contractual basis, but the USSR State Arbitration Authority refused to consider the precontractual disputes between the plant and enterprises which were either unwilling to return the pallets or were willing to do so under conditions extremely unfavorable to the plant. As a result, in 1979 alone, Zaporozhstal' was unable to secure the return of 171,500 pallets, i.e., it irretrievably lost about 4,000 cubic meters of packing lumber, not counting the loss of labor.

The multiplicity of laws and the disparities and contradictions they contain result in a variety of errors in economic activities. Even State Arbitration specialists frequent find themselves trapped by such contradictions. For example, the steel smelters produced a different brand of steel compared to specifications (this does occur). This time, however, it was of better quality (semiskilled instead of rimmed). In order to fulfill its contract, the plant shipped the steel to the consumer, who used it according to his specifications. Meanwhile, the Zaporozh'ye State Arbitration Authority sued the plant for an "unordered" metal shipment and demanded a fine equalling 100 percent of the value of the metal. It is clear that in this case such a feeling of responsibility has nothing in common with the struggle for strengthening state discipline. Furthermore, it lacks the element of economic expediency.

A. Yanchuk agrees with the author of the article in that it is necessary to ascribe uniform responsibility to enterprises and organizations in different sectors. In practice we encounter paradoxical cases. For example, failure to receive natural gas in January 1976 caused the plant damage totaling 130,000 rubles. However, it could claim from the gas supply organization no more than 510 rubles, i.e., a sum less by a factor of 255.

Current legislation on the delivery of goods does not protect the interests of consuming enterprises satisfactorily. It is universally acknowledged that the purpose of the production process is consumption, for which reason the end result must meet the consumer's interests. In practice, however, it is the consumer that is the victimized party. It is urgently necessary to include in the legislation a basic stipulation on granting the consumer priority rights, naturally within the limits of the supplier's production and economic potential.

As jurists who work in industry, G. Linenburg (Moscow) writes, have become convinced after many years of practical experience of the stupidity of attempts to control economic legal relations through civil legislation norms, our economic legislation continues to acquire "scrappy" bits of legislation, such as those issued by the Gosnab, the USSR Ministry of Trade and other departments which, as they issue general laws, never forget that they are responsible for their work sectors, for which reason they do not forget to include in such laws rights which benefit their own systems compared with the rights of the other participants in the legal relationships.

Let us also consider the question of the head ministries. If we consider carefully the interpretation which some departments give to this term, their desire to shift the major and difficult volume of work for which they were created to the sectorial ministries becomes obvious. The question of formulating regulations on the head ministries has been raised frequently but in vain. The problem is that some departments have no intention of relinquishing their rights.

According to A. Bykov and P. Lakhno (Moscow), the consideration of legal regulations as an element of the economic mechanism presumes a profound theoretical study of the problems which arise in this connection. In particular, it is a question of effectively supporting public production and work quality and achieving end national economic results through legal means. The article leads to the conclusion that the solution of such problems should be comprehensive and omnisectorial.

I. Zamoyskiy (Donetsk) and A. Yevtikhiev (Krivoy Rog) believe that the application of juridical civil law structures, which regulate property relations of a commodity nature, to economic relations which closely combine planning-organizational and property relations leads to breakdowns in the work of the legal mechanism of the socialist economy. This is convincingly confirmed by economic practice. Relations between industry and the railroad transportation system exemplify this fact.

As we know, the press has frequently raised the question of the lowered feeling of responsibility shown by the personnel of the Ministry of Railways. Let us emphasize, however, that even on the rare occasions when the responsibility of the railroad and the enterprise is balanced, the objective of encouraging the railroad to carry out its contractual obligations properly and to make full compensation for the losses suffered by the enterprises by its fault is not achieved.

In this respect, the experience of economic relations between the Krivbassruda Production Association and the railroad is quite indicative. Between 1978 and 1980 the railroad failed to haul 150,000 freight cars as planned. As a result, the association was deprived of a profit of 755,000 rubles. Meanwhile, because of nonfulfillment of the plan for the delivery of freight cars by the railroad, the association asked for a compensation of 5.2 million rubles, or 7 times the amount of the profit which it failed to earn!

In reality, however, the association's collective experienced a major loss. Because of a shortage of freight cars, ore worth 6.9 million rubles could not be delivered to the consumers. Since the economic incentive and bonus funds of the association's workers are based on the fulfillment of delivery obligations, withholdings for the material incentive fund were lowered by 190,000 rubles. Furthermore, the production bonus of the association's workers was lowered. In 1980, as a result of nonimplementation of assignments and obligations on production deliveries, payments to the workers were reduced by 217,500 rubles.

We see, therefore, that even if the railroad were to pay a fine exceeding several-fold the amount of the losses, the damage caused to the cost effectiveness interests of the association cannot be compensated. This is no accident. The earning of profits cannot be the main objective of the production-economic activities of a socialist enterprise. Such activities are assessed above all on the basis of the extent to which the interests of the socialist society are met and the profits earned by the enterprise cannot compensate for the reduced output.

Consequently, liability in economic relations cannot be based on the "classical" examples of civil law obligations in which compensations for property damages essentially resolve all problems.

As we know, it is only under socialism, with production socialization on a national economic scale and the assumption of planned production management by the state in the interests of the entire society, that the necessary

prerequisites develop for including the rules of economic management in a separate branch of the law--economic law. By denying this, although realizing the inability of civil and administrative law to regulate and control a considerable area of economic relations (intereconomic above all), the opponents of economic-legal concentration are forced to assume an "orthodox"-nihilistic viewpoint and to deny, as V. Laptev points out, the legal nature of relations among enterprise subunits and even among production units within an association on the grounds that such relations are not of a commodity-monetary nature. However, in being impeccably orthodox, they should equate capitalist with socialist enterprises (associations) and ignore the inviolable Marxist-Leninist stipulation that one of the main characteristics and greatest advantages of socialism as a phase of the new socioeconomic system is the new possibility that the entire governmental-legal and juridical superstructure may influence the economic base, including production relations which develop within structural production subunits at all levels. It is understandable for a capitalist to build a big wall around his private domain and to try to prevent anyone, including the state, from entering. However, if the director of a socialist enterprise opposes the legal regulations governing the production-economic relations of this enterprise carried out by the owner--the people's state, obviously such a director would not remain in his position for a single day. Such a formulation of the problem would make extremely clear the groundlessness of the views held by the supporters of the civil-administrative interpretation of economic legislation and economic relations and their total inability to explain basic phenomena in our economic life.

Nevertheless, how do we explain the fact that problems related to improving economic legislation and upgrading its effectiveness, whose time has come, are being resolved so slowly?

One of the main reasons, Yu. Tolstoy (Leningrad) writes, is the fact that so far major differences in defining the limits of economic legislation and the optimal means for streamlining it have not been surmounted.

Two objective economic laws--the law of the planned and proportional development of the national economy and the law of value, subordinate to it--interact within the socialist economy, which is based on the socialist ownership of productive capital. The result is that the planning-organizational and property-value relations which develop among socialist organizations (vertical and horizontal) are operating together and interpenetrating. This circumstance must be properly reflected in legal regulations. Administrative and civil legislation is unable to provide a legal way to coordinate such relations, for both are based on the fact that they must be regulated separately: administrative law regulates vertical relations while civil law regulates horizontal relations. Meanwhile, the socialist economy, which has developed as a single national economic complex which covers all levels of social production, distribution and trade in the country, calls for the regulation of relations precisely as an integral system, without separating planning-organizational (vertical) from property-value (horizontal) relations.

It is precisely such regulation that is provided by economic legislation, the subject of which is relations developing among socialist organizations in terms of managing economic activities, i.e., relations which are both

vertical and horizontal. Relations involving the participation of the citizens, even if taking place in the area of the socialist economy, must not be the subject of economic legislation.

The critics of economic law, points out S. Zinchenko (Rostov-na-Donu) the sectorial regulation of economic relations because, in their view, they are heterogeneous and are a set of property and administrative (power) relations. We believe that the nature of economic relations is different and that their unity is based on the common ground expressed through deliberate economic policy, which includes both property and organizational-planning elements. Each of these elements cannot be considered as an independent phenomenon, although the property element is predetermined in the final account by the law of value, while the planning-organizational element is based on the law of the planned and proportional development. The actual blending of these laws leads to planned "marketability" which, on the legal level, can be shaped into a single economic mechanism in which management processes develop together with relatively autonomous processes and vice versa. V. Laptev proves precisely that such a mechanism should rest on a specific legal foundation.

The legal norming of the economic mechanism is not a question the discussion of which can be used to sharpen the arguments of the opposing sides but a matter which affects the efficiency of social production to a tremendous extent.

K. Yegorov and K. Lebedev (Leningrad) point out that economic law is inherent only in the socialist legal system as a separate sector. Its appearance is determined, among other things, by the strengthened economic role of the socialist state of the whole people, the concentration of the command positions in national economic management in its hands, the strengthening and enrichment of state ownership as the basic form of socialist ownership, and the subordination of individual units of the single national economic complex to state planning, with the combination of centralized management with the economic autonomy and initiative of enterprises, associations and other organizations.

3

In the next few years a great deal of work will have to be done in streamlining and updating economic legislation: to begin with, the current legislation must be coordinated with the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of union and autonomous republics; secondly, new summing-up laws must be drafted and included in the USSR legal code and the legal codes of union republics; thirdly, laws which were passed in the 1960s must be updated in accordance with the new economic management conditions and improvements in the economic mechanism. All of these main directions in the efforts to improve juridical norming of economic activities presume the establishment of an economic legislation system. The USSR Economic Code, which will contain norms mandatory for all subjects of economic law, will be the binding nucleus here, whereas the legal regulation of sectorial economic relations will be covered by other legislative acts passed in the course of the development of the code. With such a legislative system, the USSR Economic Code will become an important legal base for economic management and its norms will have a direct regulating impact on economic activities.

The existence of a system of law enforcement organs, aimed precisely at the utilization of existing economic legislation and controlling its observance, is a prerequisite for law and order in the national economy. No such system exists today. The numerous controlling and auditing organs do not cope with their assignments adequately, and the number of economic delinquencies is not declining. This is adversely affecting the functioning of the economic mechanism. We must also consider the further broadening of the functions of the State Arbitration system and the creation of a special organ under its jurisdiction (something like an economic prosecutor's office), which would have the right to fight economic delinquencies.

L. Golebo (Zaporoz'ye) also favors the adoption of a USSR Economic Code. This would represent a comprehensive legal act which would not only provide basic solutions but stipulate a procedure for the passing or amending of legal acts based on the fundamental law (the code) and logically interrelated. This is precisely the principle followed in criminal, civil and other legal branches. There are no reasons for allowing the exclusion of economic law.

Most of our readers favor the soonest possible drafting and adoption of a USSR Economic Code, which could become an important milestone in the further advancement of the economic mechanism of developed socialism.

A. Petrosyan draws our attention to yet another aspect of the problem--the psychological. We have criminal codes, labor codes, etc. The lack of a code in the field of economic legislation has created the view shared by some enterprise managers that existing legislation need not necessarily be obeyed in the area of economic management.

Let us also take into consideration the fact that the codifying of economic legislation is of major political significance. Article 9 of the USSR Constitution points out that the further development of socialist democracy, which includes strengthening the legal foundations of governmental and social life, is the basic direction to be followed in the development of the political system of Soviet society. The adoption of a USSR Economic Code would not only indicate a qualitatively new stage in strengthening law and order in the field of economics but would contribute to upgrading the level of organization and discipline in all areas of our life. Let us recall in this connection that at the very beginning of the Soviet system, earmarking the ways of socialist construction in our country, V. I. Lenin pointed out that together with material production and enhancement of the educational and cultural standards of the working people, upgrading of discipline is a prerequisite for economic upsurge and that "the success of socialism is inconceivable the victory of proletarian conscious discipline..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 36, p 189).

The importance of the code is obvious. It is based, first of all, on the efficiency of the sectorial (in terms of a legal sector) system of norms; secondly, the fact that all other sectorial legal laws will be subordinated to it; thirdly, the fact that code amendments and supplements will be mandatorily published in the VEDOMOSTY VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSSR, which will be a great convenience for all authorities and individuals; fourthly, the great accessibility, universal validity and simplicity of interpretation.

S. Oganesyanyan, A. Garibyan and O. Nersesyan (Yerevan) agree with the view that the legal regulation of economic relations within a single branch of the law will help to eliminate contradictions and will ensure internal coordination among respective legal norms. Many new legal phenomena become theoretically explainable from the positions of economic law (such as the intrasystem delegation of rights among economic organs). Finally, this concept makes it possible to cover legal phenomena which under the existing legal regulations system remain outside the jurisdiction of civil and administrative law (such as the status of internal units within enterprises and structural units in production associations as juridical persons).

Currently relations between the enterprise or association and the ministry are regulated on the basis of administrative legislation, writes A. Novikov (Gor'kiy). However, the ministry is not simply an administrative organ but the center of an economic system. As to intraeconomic relations, including those within an association, they are regulated neither by civil nor by administrative legislation. This situation is intolerable, for relations which develop here are of great importance. They are included within the uniform system of cost effectiveness relations, both vertical and horizontal. All of them must be regulated on the basis of a uniform USSR Economic Code.

The adoption of a summing-up law, points out L. Dzhomardzhidze (Tbilisi) will make economic legislation entirely consistent with contemporary economic requirements and new forms and methods of economic management, the development of which has been restrained by the unsatisfactory condition of the legal regulation of the national economy.

Yu. Tsimerman (Moscow) emphasizes that improvements in the management of the national economy and the creation of industrial and production associations, as manifestations of the objective process of production concentration and specialization, triggered changes in terms of centralization and decentralization within the system of industrial ministries. He believes that in the course of the further improvement of the legal status of different organs in the national economy the current trend toward decentralization in resolving operative problems of centralization in dealing with basic problems of the development of the economic system must be strengthened. It is particularly important for this process to be more intensive in production associations. That is why, taking the various factors into consideration, such as the scale of the production unit, the number of working people, territorial distance, and others, the ministries should draft recommendations for the associations in terms of centralization and decentralization on the basis of the best possible allocation of obligations and rights within the specific associations.

This is the practical solution to the problem. However, it requires a theoretical summary. This is complicated by the fact that in the organization of studies aimed at combining centralized plan management with economic autonomy of associations and enterprises, centralized management is considered as the subject of one legal branch while economic autonomy is the subject of another. With such an approach, the problem of combination no longer exists. It finds itself in the "no man's land" between different legal branches.

The problem of the economic contract in a socialist economy, posed by V. Laptev, is also quite topical. The contract has truly become a form of joint planned decision, which determines the production program of the participating economic organs. However, this process suffers from a number of shortcomings, which considerably limit the organizing role of the contract. One of them is the fact that both the legislator and the economic management organs underestimate the role of the contract as a specific means for the planned solution of economic problems. The legal regulation of contractual relations is frequently unrelated to planning processes. Cases of releasing enterprises and associations from responsibility for the nonfulfillment of contracts have become quite frequent in recent years. Such occasions are particularly frequent among sectorial ministries. This truly reduces responsibility for the implementation of the plan although, conversely, such responsibility must be enhanced. Traditional liability, expressed in terms of fines and penalties, plays a major role but planned value sanctions, which combine liability for the nonfulfillment of the plan with that of the contract, are becoming increasingly important. This is particularly significant, for they influence the size of economic incentive funds and, consequently, mobilize the production collectives for the fulfillment of plans and contracts. Such sanctions are entirely consistent with the nature of economic relations and are one of the effective levers used to strengthen contractual discipline in the national economy.

A similar view is expressed by V. Chernyayev (Izhevsk). The author of the article, he writes, believes that the role of the economic contract as a planning instrument is explained by the fact that in any plan we find problems the solution of which is assigned to the partners themselves. Such problems must be resolved jointly rather than unilaterally, by signing an economic contract. We agree with this entirely. However, this practice is far from always applied. For example, relations between intersectorial enterprises engaged in industrial transportation by rail (MPPZhT) and the customers they serve are based on 3-year economic contracts and the volume of services to be performed is determined on the basis of the requests annually submitted by the customers. The juridical power of such requests is insignificant. They are not binding upon the MPPZhT, which can amend the amount of services unilaterally. This does not help to improve transport services to industrial enterprises and construction projects.

V. Laptev deals extensively with problems of improving economic legislation and the drafting and passing of a number of new major economic laws. However, we must also take into consideration that the improvement of economic legislation covering various matters of economic activity can and must take place by improving already existing consolidated legal acts. For example, to this day legal regulations governing the activities of intersectorial industrial railroad transportation are on the departmental level, although there is a USSR Railroad Charter.

V. Vedyushenko (Ryazan') believes that different procedures for the conclusion of economic contracts exist though there is no particular need. Practical experience calls for legal norms codified in regulations governing deliveries,

liability for avoiding or delaying the conclusion of delivery contracts and the possibility of determining contractual liability on the initiative of either of the parties, to be extended to all economic contracts. V. Laptev points out quite accurately the inadmissibility of differences in legal regulations, taking as an example production associations in industry, construction and agriculture, as a result of which the nature of the production association is frequently distorted and the principles on the basis of which it functions become undermined. Such shortcomings are based essentially on departmental trends, the desire to gain certain advantages, the exaggerated emphasis on the specific nature of the sector, etc. On the other hand, proper attention is still not being paid when departmental laws or draft decrees of the USSR Council of Ministers are formulated, to their maximum standardization, in particular by using decisions already passed on similar or identical problems of production organization and economics (or economic activities) in other sectors.

Conversely, N. Vedenin (Moscow) considers as controversial the author's suggestion of the adoption of a standard procedure for controlling the activities of production associations in different sectors, as is already the case with state production enterprises. First of all, substantially greater differences may be found between production associations in industry and agriculture compared to state enterprises; secondly, the experience with a unified regulation applicable to the state enterprises themselves is also far from ideal: legal experts in agriculture are still objecting to such a procedure, for the regulation on the socialist state production enterprise does not take into consideration the specific nature of the sovkhozes as agricultural enterprises or the features of their legal status under circumstances governed by interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration and the conversion of agriculture to a modern industrial base.

Although he rejects the idea of the legal regulation of the organization and activities of production associations on the basis of a single set of rules, N. Vedenin does not reject the need and expediency of a certain standardization of legal status. He agrees with the author of the article on the need for the formulation of a general regulation on production associations. However, this regulation must be emphatically general, equally applicable to production associations in industry, agriculture, transportation and other economic sectors. Consequently, there should be no analogy here with the regulation on the socialist state production enterprise, and the status of the production associations in the individual sectors should be defined both by the general regulation which calls for a certain uniformity in the legal status of production associations in different sectors and sectorial regulations adopted on the basis of the general regulation, which take fully into consideration the characteristics of their legal status.

V. Kim and Ya. Kovalerchuk (Tashkent) raise the important question of the interrelationship between sector and territory. They write that the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree on improving the economic mechanism gives union republics the right to obtain, and the converse obligation of USSR ministries and departments to submit, control figures and basic indicators of the draft plans of associations and enterprises located on their territory. As we know, such information is extremely necessary in planning the comprehensive

development of the area. However, in violation of the law such information is not always submitted, or else it is late and incomplete. Item 30 of the decree on the economic mechanism, according to which the USSR Gosplan must return to ministries and departments draft 5-year and annual plans which fail to meet the stipulations of the decree for further work, is a positive example of the legislative strengthening of said rules. In this case, it is a question of the USSR Gosplan refusing to accept from ministries and departments draft plans without proof that such plans have already been sent to the union republics. Shortcomings in supplying union republics with information on draft sectorial plans greatly hinder the rational combination of sectorial with territorial planning.

V. Ostrovskiy and L. Sobolev (Moscow), who support many of the stipulations expressed by V. Laptev, disagree with his conclusion that there is a need to establish material liability for failure to request economic-legal sanctions. Naturally, no legal system can operate without sanctions. However, they consider inexpedient penalties for failure to file mandatory sanction requests. This could result in the development of a chain of consecutive sanctions which would conflict with the main developing forms of economic incentive. If we intend to make systematic use of objective laws and features of economic incentive (individual and collective), it would be more logical for the difference between the amount of requested and paid penalties to be deposited in full into the economic incentive funds, on top of withholding for such funds or to subtract such a difference from profits earned. In such a case a penalty for failure to demand the payment of sanctions would become unnecessary.

G. Mergelov (Moscow) writes that the author of the article has raised the question of establishing legal guarantees for the exercise of the economic rights of sectorial ministries and subordinate cost effectiveness production units at the proper time. Such a problem really exists. The extensive experience acquired by the Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment and Control Systems in operating on the basis of total cost effectiveness has proved that the application of economic norms in the distribution of profits between the sector and the budget (norms which are essentially the elements of the plan) is one-sided, for they are mandatory only in the case of the ministry. As to the planning organs, they systematically violate norm stability.

Unfortunately, departmental legal regulations issued in accordance with the 12 July 1979 CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree are not entirely consistent with its stipulations (as is the case with the instruction on the procedure for settling accounts with the state budget in the matter of profit payments), unjustifiably harming the interests of associations and enterprises.

N. Konyayev (Kuybyshev) agrees with the need to develop the system of economic laws but considers that some of V. Laptev's suggestions require additional studies because of their equivocal nature. This applies to the cost effectiveness of the central ministry apparatus, for administrative activities cannot be assessed in terms of money, even on a conventional basis, and without it there could be no cost effectiveness. The cost effective economic system of the ministry consists of self-financing, i.e., the implementation of planned economic activities which will ensure sectorial profits sufficient to cover sectorial outlays and ensure the further development of the sector

and payments to the state budget. The introduction of material incentives for workers in the central ministry apparatus does not mean that the apparatus itself must be converted to a cost effectiveness system. The fact that it must organize activities within its own ministry in such a way as to make it truly cost effective is a different matter.

5

Many authors actively support V. Laptev on the need to upgrade the level of legal training of economic cadres. A. Shokhin calls for the introduction of the subject of economic law in the curricula of economic and engineering-technical VUZs. I have attended, he goes on to say, many meetings of certification commissions at plants and have repeatedly seen how superficial is the knowledge of engineering-technical and economic personnel in the area of legal control of economic relations. This naturally leads to errors in the application of legal norms. The specialist enters the production process with virtually no knowledge of economic legislation. Such knowledge is subsequently acquired with the hit-or-miss method, with "lumps and bruises." Is the cost at which this training is acquired not excessively high, because of the moral and material harm this causes to society and the state?

Is it not strange that economic law is not a basic subject in the curricula of law schools but only a subject of specialization for students going to work in the national economy? Obviously, those who drafted such curricula considered that knowledge of economic law is not mandatory for prosecuting and investigating personnel. This is an obvious error for which graduates pay in the course of their practical work, which suffers similarly owing to this condition.

V. Mamutov (Donetsk) expresses the opinion of our readers that scientific-pedagogical cadres must be trained to teach a course in economic law. There are few chairs of economic law in the more than 40 law schools and university departments. Although the list of scientific specialties includes "economic law and arbitration process," and despite the urgent need to increase the training of cadres precisely in this area, there are only three councils on the defense of dissertations on economic law in the country. This artificially restrains the training of scientific-pedagogical cadres in economic law and directs the candidates to convert their dissertations in such a way as to adapt or classify them under other legal specialties, for the number of councils on such specialties in the various parts of the country is far greater, which makes it, naturally, simpler to defend a dissertation.

All of this leads to the fact that the teaching of economic law and other subjects in the area of economic law, introduced in VUZs in 1976, has still not resulted in the training of sufficient cadres. The position which the respective personnel within the higher education system hold on this matter could be explained only in terms of subjective reasons: since the decisions which were made on the basis of long years of discussion disagree with their own viewpoint, they are in no hurry to implement them, and seek loopholes which will hinder their implementation. In other words, to call things by their proper name, we are faced with obstruction on the part of individuals whose viewpoint was refuted in the course of the debates and who lack today the courage to acknowledge this fact.

A similar view is held by M. Kleandrov (Dushanbe). The special course on economic law, he writes, is ridiculous, for a graduate specialist in the law is unable to develop even basic economic legal documents such as claims, requests, answers, economic contracts, etc (bearing in mind the type of "attention" paid to the allocation of time for the teaching of this subject, it would be naive to expect anything else). Is this not a profanation of higher education? Naturally, one could answer that economic law as the basic subject is not introduced in the VUZs because there are no lecturers; there are no lecturers because specialists are not being trained and specialists are not being trained because there are no jobs for them, for the institute curricula do not include a basic course in economic law. The circle is thus closed. However, the national economy remains in great need of a large number of university-trained specialists in economic law. Consequently, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education should address itself to the needs of the national economy and break this circle.

N. Astakhov (Kazan') discusses the legal training of economic cadres. He writes that curricula for the course on Soviet law as taught in economics VUZs were recently redrafted. However, they invariably show a critical attitude not only toward economic law but economic legislation as well. One may support or oppose economic law as a branch of science but economic legislation must be included in the curricula. The future economist or engineer should be familiar above all with economic legal norms.

The current curriculum for Soviet law taught in economics VUZs does not call for teaching the subject of economic contracts separately. The section on civil law covers the various types of contracts, such as purchase and sale and delivery contracts, consumer contracts, capital construction contracts, etc. It is methodically inaccurate to put together contracts involving the participation of citizens and contracts concluded among socialist organizations and enterprises. They are different not only in terms of their nature but in their significance. The legal regulation of such economic relations varies as well. We favor the study of purchase and sale and consumer contracts and contracts covering property relations involving citizens. However, we must remember the main thing: we are training specialists for the national economy. The importance of the studied discipline is determined by the extent to which it is related to the future practice of the young specialist. Economic relations among socialist enterprises and organizations should constitute a separate section of the curricula for the course in Soviet law taught in economic and engineering and technical VUZs.

So far, V. Martem'yanov (Moscow) writes, the instruction has been based on the old theory of civil and administrative law. The separation among VUZ disciplines has resulted in the fact that many legal phenomena affecting our economy (legal forms of planning and incentive, legal status of units within the national economy) which do not involve any commodity turnover are not taught. The training of jurists for the national economy has fallen behind present-day tasks. This is caused by the obsolete theory of the "dualistic" approach taken by legal experts toward our economy.

S. Zinchenko as well expresses concern for the state of the training of specialized legal cadres for the national economy. Such training is offered only

at the Sverdlovsk and Saratov juridical institutes. He believes that the quality of training of economic legal experts must be enhanced above all by radically improving their economic training, for without a profound knowledge of economic processes no accurate legal decision can be made.

K. Yegorov and K. Lebedev also discuss the need to improve training in economic law.

V. Korol' (Kiev) writes: "Jurists (particularly those who hold two jobs) are frequently unable to truly appreciate the strategy of economic managers, while the latter rarely have adequate legal knowledge for the making of optimal management decisions which regulate economic relations. Furthermore, we should bear in mind that production managers face economic situations which sometimes require immediate decision making. In this sense as well the organization of the study of economic law not only in juridical but also in engineering and technical VUZs would present significant opportunities for improving legal work in the national economy as a whole which, naturally, would compensate for the additional expenditures."

Many readers have raised the question of intensifying educational work in connection with upgrading the quality of legal training of specialists in the national economy. It is true that it is only on this basis that success could be achieved in the struggle for enhancing social production effectiveness and strengthening discipline and socialist legality in economic relations.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

MILITANT MATERIALISM -- THE PHILOSOPHICAL BANNER OF COMMUNISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 56-68

[Text] Lenin's work "On the Significance of Militant Materialism," plays an exceptional role in the history of Marxist philosophical thought and universal philosophy, science and culture. In developing the ideas contained in his previous works on philosophy, "Materialism and Empiriocriticism" and "Philosophical Notebooks" above all, Lenin interpreted the nature, role and significance of materialistic philosophy during the period of building socialism. The new social functions of materialistic philosophy as an instrument of revolutionary construction also determined the formulation of the new theoretical and practical tasks which jointly provided an expanded program in the struggle for the triumph of the communist outlook.

Written in March 1922, apparently at the request of the journal POD ZNAMENEM MARKSIZMA, the article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism" became a document which defined the content and program of all work done in the country on the dissemination of a dialectical-materialistic outlook and methodology in scientific research and essentially during all stages in building a communist society. This work, which was Lenin's last in which he addressed himself directly to philosophical problems, is justifiably described as his "philosophical legacy," against which each new generation of Leninist philosophers has compared its activities.

However, this does not exhaust the historical and topical significance of Lenin's brilliant work. In reflecting on the significance of militant materialism to the socialist reorganization of the consciousness of the millions of working people building a new society, the ways to resolve the huge and tremendously important problem of shaping a scientific outlook in all Soviet people and strengthening the conscious interest of every working person in basic problems of philosophy, atheism and the strategy and tactics of the struggle against bourgeois ideology and religious prejudices, Lenin concretized the conceptual and methodological tasks of the party's ideological and political-educational work during the new epoch. His article retains to this day the importance of a party-wide programmatic political document, which defines the direction of the work not of the party's philosophy cadres alone but of every party member who must be a militant materialist, i.e., an active fighter on the conceptual front, clearly aware of the organic relation between the "great concepts" of our philosophy and the

solution of specific economic, organizational, sociopolitical and cultural problems facing the contemporary stage in the building of communism.

The international significance of Lenin's work has even increased in terms of the ideological activities of the ruling communist and workers parties in the countries of real socialism and the entire global communist movement.

Historical experience has confirmed most clearly that the struggle for a new life is inconceivable without the systematic, flexible and uncompromising class struggle for a scientific outlook, against idealistic views, philosophical reaction and the traditions and mores of bourgeois society and that accepting a "peaceful coexistence" between the scientific ideology and an ideology alien and hostile to it conceals a real threat to the accomplishments of socialism. The communist party cannot implement its leading role effectively and consistently without ideological support, without creating and improving the mechanism for ideologically and morally influencing the masses on a daily and even hourly basis, without having mastered the ideological situation and without countering the intrigues of enemy propaganda with a flexible and comprehensive system of measures in the struggle for the people's minds, without consolidating on a principled scientific-materialistic platform and leading all healthy intellectual forces in society and anyone who cherishes the ideals of social progress, democracy, science and education. The most correct policy is the one based on principle. Such a policy can be formulated by the party only on the basis of a consistent, i.e., a dialectical materialistic and Marxist-Leninist scientific outlook.

Lenin's militant materialism was and remains the philosophical banner of the revolutionary struggle and the building of communism of all true revolutionaries firmly standing on class-proletarian positions. The entire historical experience of real socialism clearly proves that the revolutionary vanguard of the truly viable and progressive class cannot perform its leading role by allowing the existence of dualism in politics and world outlook and by losing its awareness of the connection between the class interests and class position of the bourgeoisie in politics and economics, and its support of all forms of philosophical obscurantism, whether old or most recent. In the latter case, it will inevitably clash with the lack of political understanding on the part of the masses, whose consciousness was shaped in the course of centuries of spiritual oppression. Lenin's "materialistic theory of politics" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 21, p 223) presumes the efficient scientific understanding of the profound and close interrelationship between conceptual foundations and class objectives in the activities of communist parties. Only a policy based on purposeful materialism can be a purposeful communist policy.

This feature must be considered particularly seriously today, in the face of the persistent efforts on the part of imperialist ideology and revisionism to dissolve the very idea of communism in the acid of conceptual, methodological and sociopolitical pluralism and relativism. The struggle against capitalist economic and political domination and for socialism is inconceivable without the steady exposure of "all contemporary 'diplomaed lackeys of religious superstition,' regardless of whether they act as representatives of official

science or as free-lancers, who describe themselves as 'the democratic left or as ideological-socialist' publicists" (Ibid., Vol 45, p 25).

The struggle for communism is inseparable from the struggle for a scientific outlook and against all kinds of idealism, metaphysics, and mysticism.

This conclusion, which sums-up not speculative scholastic studies but our party's tremendous practical experience since the beginning of the socialist reorganization of life, remains to this day the initial premise for a truly communist-minded way of thinking and acting.

In the same way that Marx' famous 11 theses on Feuerbach were a program for revolutionary change in philosophy, "On the Significance of Militant Materialism" includes an expanded program for revolutionary change in the minds of the multi-million strong toiling masses to be implemented by a party acting under the banner of militant materialism. The essence of the new social function of philosophy, which was to introduce a scientific-materialistic and subsequently a scientific communist awareness among the masses involved in the building of socialism, was to engage in specific and comprehensive propaganda and education work among the masses, not only among the workers but also the peasants and the artisans. This was one of the bases for the party's tremendous creative activity, the result of which was the adoption by all working people of the ideological and sociopolitical positions of the working class.

For the first time in history, from an outlook which could be narrowed and suppressed, was not aimed at the masses and was accessible only to the most highly educated "elite," materialism was to become the outlook of the masses, the dominant outlook operating in terms of broad social and political categories. From an outlook persecuted by the authorities it was to become an outlook which applied its power to the liberation of the people from age-old spiritual oppression, and to ensure the comprehensive progress of science and culture and the free and harmonious development of the individual. Lenin countered the hypocrisy of bourgeois ideology and boastful declarations of freedom of conscience in a "democratic society," which concealed behind the screen of political indifference and "nonpartisanship" the actual dependence of the spiritual life of that society on the diktat of capitalism and the powerful propaganda machinery of the exploiting state, which manipulated the consciousness of the people closely tied to the church, the school, university science and the official and voluntary "lackeys of religious superstition" with a truly democratic concept of the use of power not for the spiritual coercion and manipulation of the mind but for awakening and persuading the masses and enhancing their spiritual needs. Militant materialism and atheism were the foundations of the great educational mission of the Soviet system.

"These masses," Lenin wrote, "must be supplied with all possible data on atheistic propaganda. They must be exposed to facts in a great variety of practical areas and approached in such a way as to develop their interest, to awaken them from their religious slumber, to shake them up thoroughly and with all possible means, etc." (Ibid., p 26).

Lenin considered the defense and dissemination of scientific knowledge among the masses a national task and one of the essential ways of governing liberated Russia. He believed that underestimating this aspect of the matter was "one of the many proofs that seizing the power in a revolutionary period is by far easier than the skill to use this power accurately" (Ibid., pp 25-26). In his article he ascribed an absolutely equal social and political significance to the defense, dissemination and creative development of the philosophy of dialectical materialism during the new historical epoch.

Lenin's article became the program for the assertion of a communist outlook through extensive ideological cooperation between communist philosophers and noncommunist materialists, materialistically thinking natural scientists and atheists and all forces of reason, science, culture, progress and cooperation which opposed the forces of obscurantism and reaction.

In substantiating his idea, the great proletarian revolutionary proved the significance of militant materialism in the various categories of the political struggle. He considered this work in terms of outlook and philosophy as a specific refraction of proletarian revolutionary strategy and tactics. As an irreconcilable enemy of all sectarianism and narrow-minded doctrinairism, Lenin believed that one of the tasks of Marxist philosophy was to create and head a powerful alliance between communists and non communists, which could mount an aggressive struggle against philosophical reaction and fideism. He considered the creation of such a combat alliance a most important political task. "...The success of any serious revolutionary work," he wrote, "demands the understanding and implementation of the fact that the revolutionaries can be only the vanguard of a truly viable and progressive class. The vanguard can perform its specific tasks only if it can maintain its leadership of the masses and truly lead them forward. There can never be a question of any successful building of communism without a comprehensive alliance with the noncommunists. This equally applies to the task of defending materialism and Marxism undertaken by POD ZNAMENEM MARKSIZMA" (Ibid., pp 23-24).

Lenin's statement on the need to wage an open, systematic and uncompromising struggle against all types of bourgeois outlook or any concessions to it, whatever scientific, moral and esthetic garb it may be wearing, seems particularly topical and meaningful in the present aggravation of the ideological struggle in the international arena and the intensifying attacks mounted by the reaction against real socialism. Guided by the principle of communist party-mindedness, the Marxist philosophers must intensify their offensive, involving in the struggle against world reaction all contemporary progressive, democratic and peace-loving forces, using to this effect the full humanistic power of the intellectual and moral potential of militant materialism and its reliable influence on the minds and the hearts.

In drafting the program for the victory of the materialistic outlook, Lenin ascribed particular importance to involving in this work the scientific intelligentsia and the specialists in the various natural sciences, who are the natural allies of philosophical materialism and the equally natural enemies of the religious-idealistic outlook.

The possibility and need of such an alliance between the supporters of dialectical materialism and natural scientists inclined to accept materialism were theoretically defined by Lenin as early as in "Materialism and Empirio-criticism," in which he analysed the nature and trends of the revolution in the natural sciences and the spontaneous inclination of the natural scientists to accept the dialectical-materialistic interpretation of revolutionary change in science. However, such an alliance could operate as a conscious cooperation between Marxist philosophers and scientists in the natural and technical fields only under the conditions of the building of socialism. "We must remember," Lenin pointed out, that both major and petty reactionary philosophical schools and trends will be precisely the result of the drastic changes in the contemporary natural sciences. That is why awareness of the problems created by the latest revolution in the natural sciences and asking the natural scientists to contribute to a philosophical journal is a problem without the solution of which militant materialism can be neither militant nor materialistic" (Ibid., p 29).

In the worsened international situation, caused by the provocative actions of U. S. imperialism, which is waving the nuclear stockpile, Lenin's idea of an alliance between Marxist philosophers and natural scientists has acquired new features related to the struggle for the prevention of a thermonuclear catastrophe. Today imperialism makes both practical and ideological use of science as a spiritual and material force in its misanthropic policy. Materialism has always treated science as a creative force. Modern bourgeois ideology views it as a destructive force. The task of militant materialism is to consolidate the efforts of the true scientists -- the scientists-humanists -- in the struggle against imperialist reaction, which is destroying the altruistic life-asserting nature of science.

The alliance between Marxist philosophers and noncommunist natural scientists, most of whom belong to the old school and are quite cold to the ideals of scientific communism because of social origin and education, was believed by Lenin to be the most important prerequisite for successful struggle against idealism and fideism and for the creative development of dialectical materialism itself and the conceptual-methodological rearmament of the natural sciences and therefore, their future blossoming in the socialist society.

Life has confirmed the fruitfulness of this Leninist idea, which is one of the cornerstones of the party's policy in science. The systematic study of conceptual and logical-methodological problems of contemporary natural science has widened the front of philosophical studies, enriched the subjects of dialectical materialism and its conceptual apparatus and improved the effectiveness of materialistic arguments in the struggle against the modern varieties of idealism and agnosticism. The mastery of the dialectical-materialistic outlook and methodology by the natural scientists has contributed to the enhancement of the creative potential of science.

Naturally, the historically specific sociopolitical content of this alliance has changed with time. However, the conceptual, methodological and ideological meaning of cooperation between philosophers and natural scientists has remained unchanged. A new system for training scientific cadres was developed during the building of socialism. It gave the country hundreds of

thousands of skilled specialists in the natural and technological sciences, many of whom have made Soviet science famous with their outstanding discoveries and inventions. The outlook of the new generations of Soviet scientists in all fields of knowledge was shaped on the basis of the conscious mastery of Marxism-Leninism. The overwhelming majority of our natural scientists have become conscious supporters of dialectical materialism and active propagandists of communist ideology.

The developed and strengthened ideological and sociopolitical unity of the Soviet people further strengthened the alliance between philosophers and natural scientists in its new forms of practical cooperation covering the broadest possible range not only of conceptual and methodological but of sociophilosophical, sociopolitical, economic, organizational and other specific problems. The building of a developed socialist society in our country, the intensification of the scientific and technical revolution, the priority given to comprehensive tasks and the aggravation of the international ideological struggle have made the task of further strengthening the interaction among social, natural and technical sciences and improvements in the system of creative interaction among scientists particularly topical.

Regardless of the importance of the individual aspects of this cooperation, its ideological-conceptual and principle-methodological foundations and historical mission as an instrument of militant materialism play a prime role.

The development of social practice and scientific knowledge over the past 60 years proved convincingly that dialectical and historical materialism is the only philosophy consistent with the nature and standards of contemporary science. It took centuries to develop the scientific cadre potential and structure of the capitalist countries. Soviet science caught up with and even surpassed them in a number of areas within an extremely short time. Any impartial observer is bound to conclude that this leap is closely related to the deep penetration of dialectical-materialistic ideas into the creative laboratories of the natural scientists and to the new socialist structure of science, a conclusion reached by impartial Western scientists as well.

In recent years, bourgeois ideology and propaganda have tried particularly hard to present the theory and practice of the alliance between materialistic philosophers and natural scientists in a distorted light and to plant the virus of doubt not only in the mind of the scientific Western public but in the Soviet scientists as well, particularly in the young, who have an insufficiently accurate and specific idea of the actual historical circumstances which led to such an alliance, and to discredit the idea itself. By depicting dialectical materialism as a kind of "science of sciences," which dictatorially imposes on the natural scientist "special" and "definitive" philosophical truths, the bourgeois philosophers are trying to ascribe responsibility for certain negative facts in the history of Soviet science, related to a nihilistic attitude toward the theory of relativity, genetics and cybernetics to Marxist-Leninist philosophy as such. By resorting to "historical arguments," they are trying to plant in the minds of the young Soviet philosophers the seeds of some sort of "inferiority complex" or "cybernetic syndrome" and to create feelings of uncertainty and fear of contemporary science, thereby creating the moral and psychological

prerequisites for the rehabilitation of the positivistic outlook and the old thesis to the effect that science "itself is philosophy."

The scientific, academic and VUZ public and our readers have pointed out that such views have met with a certain response among some Soviet philosophers and scientists in other fields. Sometimes the very fact of a principled party action related to conceptual and methodological blunders and errors detected in some scientific works is considered a manifestation of "diktat" and "violation" of the freedom of research and judgement and of the "sovereignty" of science. Unquestionably, such actions must be competent and based on the accurate and thorough understanding of the specific nature of the specific field of knowledge; it is equally certain, however, that the conceptual and methodological problems of the individual sciences acquire a philosophical status. Consequently, both such problems and resulting judgements are of wider significance than individual problems.

Nor could we ignore deviations in another direction -- cases of spoilt dilettantism, as noted in the press, and views which, to say the least, are inaccurate, expressed by some natural scientists in discussing philosophical and social problems long resolved by science. Strict attention must also be paid to the fact that along with valuable scientific information we also receive "conceptual contraband" which is occasionally published by researchers engaged in popularizing science and editors who either lack a feeling of responsibility or are incompetent.

We must struggle against such phenomena firmly, like Lenin. Soviet philosophers, natural scientists and science historians must rebuff the intrigues of hostile ideology here as well. They must provide a theoretical explanation and prove tangibly that the negative facts in the history of our science were caused not only by natural scientific but philosophical lack of professionalism and a non-Leninist understanding of the nature of the alliance between philosophers and natural scientists.

Freedom of thought implies responsibility. Such freedom has never been the self-seeking aim of science but only a means for the detection and expression of the need for scientific knowledge. The transference of pluralistic concepts of freedom to the realm of science and philosophy destroys the foundation of knowledge. Science cannot develop without healthy criticism and self-criticism, which apply to conceptual problems as well. The party spirit of such criticism is a specific manifestation of the spirit of militant materialism.

Dialectical materialism is the only possible militant materialism today. In his "philosophical testament," Lenin gave the Marxist philosophers the task of comprehensively developing and disseminating dialectical materialism as the philosophy of science. He also indicated the main road leading to this objective -- "the systematic study of Hegelian dialectics from the materialistic viewpoint, i.e., the dialectics Marx used in "Das Kapital" and in his works on history and politics..."(Ibid., p 30). Lenin asked the philosophers to study, interpret and disseminate Hegelian dialectics and to analyze it with the help of Marxian dialectics. The editors of and contributors to *POD ZNAMENEM MARKSIZMA* should become a society of materialistic friends of

Hegelian dialectics" (Ibid.). Lenin was confident that in that case the natural scientists as well will find in the materialistic interpretation of Hegelian dialectics the answer to many questions posed by the revolution in the natural sciences.

The Soviet philosophers have accomplished a great deal in the course of honoring this behest. Hegel's works were translated and published; major scientific works were written on the materialistic application of dialectics in Marx's "Das Kapital" and Lenin's philosophical, economic and political writings; work was done on problems of dialectical logic, and fundamental studies on the theory of dialectics are nearing completion. In a word, much has been done. However, even more work lies ahead if we take into consideration the fact that in recent years the number of studies and publications on Hegelian dialectics has declined substantially, although the wealth of ideas it contains is far from being exhausted. In analyzing Hegel's works from the current level of development of the natural sciences and mathematical logic, some philosophers point out only the weak sides of his dialectics, thus narrowing the task of its materialistic interpretation. According to Lenin, such interpretation should include criticism without being reduced exclusively to it. Unfortunately, sometimes such underestimating of Hegelian dialectics is applied to dialectical materialism as well.

Lenin considered the attitude toward the classical philosophical and atheistic heritage a most important aspect in the struggle for a scientific outlook. Materialism cannot become militant without the use of the tremendous potential acquired by philosophy throughout its entire history. Lenin ascribed particular importance to the materialistic and atheistic traditions of progressive Russian and universal philosophy. In his "philosophical testament" he mentioned N. G. Chernyshevskiy and G. V. Plekhanov and the bold, animated, talented and witty political journalism of the old 18th century atheists who openly attacked the ruling religious superstition.

In his view, *POD ZNAMENEM MARKSIZMA* was to be the organ of militant atheism and to engage in tireless propaganda and struggle.

The party has accomplished a tremendous deal in honoring his behest. We can describe with complete justification the society created in our country as a society of atheists. Militant atheism has won a decisive victory. However, we must not forget that religious ideology remains active in the capitalist world, conceptually as well as politically, and that it is trying to extend its influence on the socialist world as well and to regain its lost positions through the use of both the coarsest and most refined propaganda means and methods. It would like to have science itself promote fideism. For example, whereas a familiar satirical-humorous character polemically challenged the priests with the statement that "There is no God! This is a medical fact!", today some Western physicians, who are pursuing profitable popularity, are already proffering "medical" proof of the existence of a "shining being" and the immortality of the soul. Lenin's advice is that we cannot "ignore such phenomena" and that "we must understand that without a firm philosophical substantiation no natural science or materialism can withstand the pressure of bourgeois ideas and the restoration of the bourgeois outlook. In order to withstand and carry this struggle to its victorious end the natural scientist

must be a modern materialist, a conscious supporter of the Marxian type of materialism, i.e., he must be a dialectical materialist" (Ibid., pp 29-30).

Fiction plays a particularly important role in atheistic propaganda, for today, unlike the time when Lenin wrote his work, religion turns less to darkness and ignorance than to the moral-psychological way of life of the individual. For this reason, today not only scientists but writers, journalists and literary critics must be active fighters on the front of militant materialism and atheism. Another essential feature is that religious beliefs firm not only conceptual but nationalistic prejudices, for which reason the struggle against them is a mandatory prerequisite in educating the masses in a spirit of proletarian and socialist internationalism.

In this respect we cannot ignore God-seeking themes found in some literary-artistic works. Mystical topics have appeared in science fiction as well. The esthetic features of religious characters and church leaders, the belabored romanticizing of "olden times" and the identification of national traditions and ceremonies with those of the church are phenomena which openly clash with Lenin's view of the significance of militant materialism and atheism in our society.

Lenin absolutely opposed any scholastic theorizing. One of his most important behests was to strengthen the ties not only between philosophy and science but also between it and the toiling masses and the building of communism. He believed this to be the purpose of work in philosophy and also the main idea underlying his concept of militant materialism, which also determines the purpose of such work in the developed socialist society.

Soviet philosophers have done a great deal to implement Lenin's behest. To paraphrase Lenin's statement on literature, we can say about work in philosophy today that it has become a "small cog and bolt" in the single great communist "mechanism which brings into motion the entire conscious vanguard of the entire working class" (Ibid., Vol 12, p 101).

We have a large army of skilled philosophers and a developed system for training them. The science of philosophy has acquired a broad structure. Scientific research has been developed in many new directions, in width and in depth. Cooperation in this field has become more varied. Unfortunately, however, we can still not claim that this "cog" is always performing as required. Today not only have its role and revolving speed increased but its role and interrelationship with the building of communism as a whole have changed qualitatively. The social significance of militant materialism has increased correspondingly, for which reason the philosophers' responsibility to the party, the people and history has become greater.

Unquestionably, the unparalleled broadening of the social base of militant materialism is an essentially new phenomenon. The fact that our country has millions of people trained in philosophy, who are not only consuming spiritual products but are clamoring for their production, makes us to pay serious attention to the content, form, organization and style of philosophical work. This fact makes the interrelationship between professional institutionalized

work in philosophy and mass nonprofessional activity in philosophy one of the decisive basic aspects of such activities.

"The conditions in which which all of us live and work have changed considerably of late," the CC CPSU accountability report submitted at the 26th party congress stated. "The Soviet person has changed. His knowledge and erudition have increased and his spiritual requirements have become considerably stricter." Their increase in philosophy can be judged by demand for good philosophical publications, among others, requested in letters to editors of journals and newspapers. Readers who are not professional philosophers are not only asking serious theoretical questions but are providing answers as well. Some such materials could seriously compete with professional works.

However, it would be naive to assume that this process has positive consequences only. As we know, maturity has both advantages and difficulties. Unless paralleled by an intensified purposeful ideological and educational influence on our part, a higher level of spiritual and intellectual activeness can and sometimes does result in what we describe as conceptual omnivorousness, lack of discrimination and ideological spinelessness.

The overall system of collectivistic social relations in developed socialism cannot be improved without upgrading the level of the conceptual and methodological standards of the working people and without broadening the area of conscious interest in basic problems of Marxist-Leninist outlook. This is the primary current task of militant materialism.

Lenin wrote in 1922 that "The most important thing -- most frequently forgotten by our allegedly Marxist but actually Marxism-spoiling party members -- is to be able to have totally undeveloped masses acquire a conscious attitude toward religious problems and conscious criticism of religion" (Ibid., Vol 45, p 27).

Our current starting premises have changed radically. The ignorance and darkness of the toiling masses disappeared long ago. The old ideological monopoly held by religion was eliminated during the building of socialism and as a result of the cultural revolution. Although the tasks related to atheistic education remain, their share among other conceptual problems of communist education has changed.

Persistent efforts must be made today to increase the interest the masses in adopting a conscious attitude toward problems of materialistic outlook and methodology as a whole, and problems of dialectics, logic and the theory of knowledge in particular, toward the philosophical problems of the contemporary natural sciences, the scientific and technical revolution, the building of communism and the global revolutionary process, ethics and esthetics, the conceptual and methodological aspects of interaction between society and the natural environment, and the struggle for the prevention of a global thermonuclear catastrophe. The range of tasks facing militant materialism has never been broader, and the development of conceptual requirements has kept pace with the developed socialist society.

Today the satisfaction of these requirements is hindered by the fact that philosophic research remains locked within the circle of its own long familiar abstractions, its inadequate openness to new facts and problems traditionally considered nonphilosophical, using them exclusively as illustrations of general ideas and concepts, and its inability and occasional unwillingness to study the specific nature of phenomena. All of these are characteristics of scholastic theorizing, which weaken the ties between philosophic research and reality. The other extreme is equally widespread: the intensified study of special problems, which leads to the loss of a theoretical viewpoint. In the course of such studies, which concentrate on a narrow specific problem, occasionally the tool of abstraction is abandoned and buried under figures and all kinds of "data." As to the use of abstractions, the specific target, the specific "theorem" to be proved with their help is frequently ignored.

Scholastic theorizing is most frequently related to enthusiasm for work on precisely general abstract problems. However, this is not to say that such theorizing can be justified by the use of ties with reality and practice only as specific data with which to saturate a philosophic study. At best, such data are used as examples and illustrations. At worst, such "ties with reality" lead to the actual abandonment of a strictly philosophical approach, as a result of which the research topic changes, and the scientist simply moves on to the next scientific area which seems to him to be of greater "practical" value. All that is left of philosophy is the terminology used in the specific text. This eliminates the possibility of both philosophical and specifically scientific criticism. That is why the effective criticism of scholastic theorizing must be accompanied also by criticism of creeping empiricism and bare practicalism.

One of the important characteristics of contemporary social development and scientific and technical progress is the fact that the distance between the abstract and the concrete, between the general and the specific, is becoming steadily shorter. With increasing frequency, the logic of life itself forces us to translate specific practical problems into the language of "broad concepts" of philosophy, politics and economics. Conversely, conceptual and philosophical problems must be posed and resolved as specifically practical. The connection between research in philosophy and the practice of building communism cannot be strengthened without the use of such dialectics. In this connection, Lenin's ideas on dialectics as the logic and theory of knowledge and the enhancement of the level of dialectical standards of thinking are of tremendous importance. Materialism cannot become militant without resolving this problem as well.

Life continuously faces man with complex and difficult conceptual problems. The people have the right to expect the help of philosophers and theoreticians in resolving them. However, the philosophers frequently bypass them or else try to extricate themselves by answering them with generalities.

Let us take as an example the negative phenomena in our life, such as money grubbing, parasitism, attempts to stealing public property, recurrences of a consumerist mentality and political infantilism, which becomes oddly combined with good education and a proper level of information. Such phenomena cannot

fail to concern us both on the practical and theoretical levels. Mature socialism is developing on its own basis and the social roots of petit bourgeois mentality have been extracted from society. Nevertheless, such recurrences continue to appear. This not only triggers the indignation of the Soviet people but creates a certain puzzlement as well, which it is the duty of the social scientists -- sociologists, psychologists, economists, jurists and above all philosophers -- to resolve. However, the percentage of theoretical studies of such subjects and paradoxical relations between consciousness and reality is depressingly small. This occurs precisely when the scalpel of philosophical analysis fails to reach the most delicate structures of the social organism and when knowledge does not rise from the abstract to the specific.

All of this proves that when we speak of the high duty of Soviet philosophers we must apply the familiar conclusions of the 26th congress on the need to reorganize many sectors and areas of ideological work to philosophy as well.

Essentially, this must be a question not simply of improving the content, methods and means of philosophical education. Educational work alone, reduced to sharing knowledge, is no longer sufficient. The level of education reached by the masses today is such that it must be a question of setting a new standard of social relations among people, a new web of mass social and organizational relations in the areas of spiritual production and consumption. This means that the professional philosophic institutions and organizations -- the academic institutes and VUZ chairs and the USSR Philosophical Society -- must work not only on the growth of philosophic knowledge but on improving this social relation and ensuring the combination of professional with nonprofessional activities in philosophy. They must take part in the purposeful shaping of the higher spiritual requirements of the masses.

The importance of this work is obvious, for the shaping of a scientific outlook is the most important component of the building of communism and the education of the new man. The philosophers must never forget that the "material" with which they work consists not only of laws, concepts and categories but of people, their perception of and attitude toward the world, their thoughts, values and ideals. This "material" is no longer merely the passive subject of educational influence. It is acting with increasing willingness as an equal partner who should not be talked down to, polluting one's vocabulary with a professional jargon aimed at the "congnoscenti."

Actually, there are cases in which even a philosophical "education" is helpless without the use of a foreign language dictionary. We read in a book which criticizes anti-Marxism that "...The denecessitation, hazardousness and relativization of dialectics encompass their internal components, aspects and subjective-idealistic gnosiologization and singularization and, inevitably, the deineffectualization of dialectics." Yet, to judge by its very topic, the purpose of this work is to assist militant materialism.

In speaking of the form and style of philosophizing, Lenin mentions the "boring, dry...retelling of Marxism, which predominates in our literature and which (let us admit it) frequently distorts Marxism" (Ibid., p 26).

Unfortunately, this statement is still valid, both as regards dry retelling and distortions. In this connection, we cannot fail to be concerned about a certain popularity not only in research but in popular science of a scornful and snobbish attitude toward the basic truths of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Some of our philosophical concepts were proved a long time ago and there is no need to prove them again. However, it is equally inadmissible to ignore them, for a new idea can be proved only with the help of these truths. The fault of proving something which was proved long ago has another side -- "proving" that which has long been rejected. In turn, this can result in the reanimation of clearly reactionary ideas.

Willingness and ability to allow the reader, listener or collocator to feel and appreciate the greatest intellectual and moral worth of the truths reached by Marx, Engels and Lenin is the primary professional duty and matter of honor of Marxist philosophers -- to allow the feeling and experiencing of the exciting edge of the creative moment -- the "moment of truth" -- and to help others to realize that Marxism-Leninism must not only be but has always been a "trip into the unknown"...

The importance not only of the materialistic view of nature but the materialistic understanding of history and man, the social philosophy of Marxism-Leninism, the sociophilosophical problems of labor, the future of scientific and technical progress and the problems of scientific humanism have increased sharply at the developed socialist stage, when the problems of the transition to communism are being directly resolved. Whereas in the first quarter of the 20th century the sharp edge of the struggle between materialism and idealism consisted of problems of gnosiology, followed by those of logic and methodology of the natural sciences, today priority is given to the meaning of scientific activities, their objectives, the responsibility of scientists for the fate of civilization, the social premises and consequences of the scientific and technical revolution, its interaction with the social revolution, the interaction between society and nature and the problem of war and peace. The development of an accurate understanding of these problems and, consequently, an active attitude toward them can be achieved only if we are guided by Lenin's ideas of militant materialism.

No other philosophy or outlook can provide us with a proper orientation in the complex, contradictory and dynamic world of today. "Natural-scientific materialism" cannot provide such a guideline. All that it can do is to sanction the position of the observer who stands aside, farming out the essential problems of human life to religion and idealistic ethics. The task of militant Marxist-Leninist materialism is not only to interpret the world and to provide us with a theoretical picture of life, which is strictly consistent with natural scientific data, but also to scientifically substantiate the objectives, values and ideals of toiling and struggling man and to shape his active life stance on this basis.

The philosophy of militant materialism is the philosophy of the communist reorganization of the world, for communism is not only a socioeconomic concept but the central category of our entire materialistic outlook and supreme practical guideline.

This target-orienting function of contemporary materialism, which has deprived religion and idealism of their next to most important trump card, has expanded under current conditions. The purpose of militant materialism is to help us to combine our knowledge of nature with our knowledge of society and man. It must ensure the conceptual and methodological synthesis among the social, natural and technical sciences, the harmony among truth, good and beauty and the blending of knowledge, convictions and actions. The only way to achieve this is by strengthening the ties between scientific research and life. The link between philosophy and the experience of building communism and the revolutionary change of reality is the starting point the development of which gave materialism its new concept, and the general idea to which our philosophy owes its existence.

Lenin taught that the main aspect of Marxism is to clarify the universal and historical role of the proletariat as the builder of the new society. We have reached an important stage in the building of this society today. This is the main thing and the thesis on which all links within the single system of the communist outlook, all "cogs and bolts" of our work in philosophy must work in one way or another. Communism is the specific idea derived from the entire system of principles and concepts of militant materialism. Militant materialism was and remains the philosophical banner of communism, a banner which the Leninist party is holding firmly.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

SCIENTIFIC AND POLITICAL PROBLEM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 69-70

[Article by Lucien Seve, a Marxist philosopher engaged in the study of the social and theoretical aspects of the problem of man. Among his works, the book "Marksizm i Teoriya Lichnosti" [Marxism and the Theory of Personality] (Progress, Moscow, 1972), which has been translated in many foreign languages, is the one with which the Soviet readers are most familiar]

[Text] I read with great interest the article by Academician N. Dubinin "Biological and Social Inheritance, published in KOMMUNIST No 11 (1980--ed.), which defends and illustrates Marx' basic tenet that "...Man's essence is the sum of all social relations," and his critical view of concepts which biologize the social nature of man to one degree or another.

I am not a geneticist, a biologist or a psychologist. As a Marxist philosopher, however, I believe that this problem is of a more general nature, both theoretical and practical, and exceeds by far the framework of the constant arguments exchanged by specialists on a complex matter such as the specific ratio between man's biological and social facets. It is from this viewpoint that I consider important and topical the contribution to the better understanding of the decisive importance of historical materialism in adopting a correct approach to such problems and struggling against reactionary ideology, which is trying to put genetics on the service of its interests and, on a broader level, biology as well, in order to present all types of social inequalities as an inherent part of nature.

No one living in a country such as France could fail to be amazed at the scope of the offensive mounted on an international scale in the capitalist world on the idea of biological inequality, consistently supported by the mass information media and the big newspapers, and in books. It was especially in the 1970s, starting with the writings of people such as the American Jensen and the Briton (Isenck), that an exceptionally intensive campaign aimed not only at the specialists but at the broader masses was mounted. Its purpose was to remove what the Marxist concept of man had gained in the course of a hard struggle. The connection between this campaign and the efforts of big capital aimed at preventing a democratic and revolutionary solution of the crisis experienced by capitalist society requires no particular proof.

This "explains" school segregation, which painfully beats the theory that some are "gifted" and that intellect is "80 percent genes, 20 percent education" into the children of the working class. This is a forceful attempt to mount a campaign of ideological support of racism, which threatens the struggle against crying social injustice, in the name of sociobiology. An effort to provide this kind of interpretation of the crisis in capitalist society was made by Valery Giscard D'Estaing, who described it as a "biological shortness of breath of the human race" in a December 1979 interview.

In this context, the idea of making the sum of social relations in historically developed mankind the true basis for the development of the individual becomes exceptionally important. It does not reduce the role of genetic or, in the broader meaning of the term, biological determination in the least, but allows us to realize that they no longer play a fundamental role, as they do in the animal world; this viewpoint is exceptionally important.

We find in the various publications, which are promoting the idea of the biological foundations of social inequality, efforts to cite Soviet authors in order to create the impression that such a thesis has a universal scientific base. That is why I ascribe such great importance to the fact that a prestigious journal such as KOMMUNIST has published articles by noted and universally famous scientists proving the precise opposite.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

DEFINE AND DEVELOP HUMAN CAPABILITIES MORE FULLY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 70-72

[Article by Dr of Medical Sciences A. Milokhin, head of the Laboratory on the Development of the Human Nervous System of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences Institute of Human Morphology]

[Text] I read the article "Biological and Social Inheritance," in your journal with great interest. I consider it exceptionally important from a number of viewpoints, for which reason I would like to share with you some considerations on the ideas it contains.

As a trained physician involved in the study of the development of the human nervous system, I am particularly sensitive to the problem of the interrelationship between human biological and social factors and the endless debates on this subject which, despite their great variety, have a specific social base.

I believe that to a neurobiologist, who supports the concepts of dialectical and historical materialism, the concept of the social nature of the human individual is entirely clear. It is precisely this thesis that is convincingly supported in Academician N. Dubinin's article. Furthermore, even the most thorough and accurate comparative studies of the structural organization of the human brain, its cortex in particular, have failed to prove any national or racial distinctions.

But why are such concepts of the genetic basis for the development of the human intellect, etc. so durable?

It seems to me that to a certain extent the origin of such errors lies in the misunderstood (or deliberately unmentioned) relations between the development of the nervous system, its higher functions in particular, and the influence of the social environment on the processes of its individual organization in human ontogenesis.

Actually, it is well known that the children of parents belonging to different social levels, races or nationalities, who find themselves in a specific set of social circumstances in childhood or are raised in the families of other nationalities acquire the psychological features typical of the new social conditions. The level of their intellectual development will

be generally consistent with the conditions of the social environment in which they are being raised. Perhaps the most striking example of this is that of children "raised" by animals. It has been consistently proved that they are unable even to understand human speech. Consequently, the social conditions in which a child is raised determine and shape his personality to a decisive degree.

However, there exist even finer relations between the social environment and the development of the human individual, which the nonspecialist would find difficult to detect. I am referring to the influence of the complex set of conditions governing the life of the mother on the fate of the child growing in her womb.

Studies conducted in our laboratory and in many other scientific centers, have proved that in the human embryo the formation of specific ties among nervous cells -- the so-called synaptogenetic process, which is the basis for the development of functional systems within the nervous system and, consequently, in the final account, the material foundation for the development of the intelligence -- begins in prenatal ontogenesis quite early -- according to our data, during the fourth week of intrauterine development or, according to Japanese researchers, slightly later.

We also know that in the process of the establishment of these interneural ties, the nervous system is quite sensitive in the course of its development to the effect of a variety of adverse factors, such as alcohol and nicotine intoxication, the mother's malnutrition, permanent or long stress situations and many others, which are clearly determined mainly by the mother's social living conditions. Their influence, which may not be noticeable at the birth of the child and during the first years of his life, begins to have a fatal influence when the body matures and when nervous and, particularly, so-called mental stresses increase sharply. All of this frequently creates wrong ideas concerning inherent predetermination or, in other words, the genetic determination of the intellect.

In this connection, let me especially consider the concept formulated in the article on the need for undertaking the education of the child at the earliest possible time. I would even extend that to the need for a scientific elaboration of a system of measures aimed at the maximal development of the human mind and the need for a comprehensive program covering the entire process of the individual development of the human nervous system, from intrauterine ontogenesis through the termination of man's professional training. Sufficient scientific prerequisites exist in this case as well.

I consider this even more meaningful than attempts to create a so-called "artificial intelligence." Naturally, I have no intention of belittling the strictly technical importance of developing means which enhance the working possibilities of our brain and which model individual functions of intellectual work which can be algorithmized. However, when various technocratic speculations based on rather vague and confused philosophical concepts of some specialists start hiding themselves behind the problem of the nature of

the human mind the result is the same as the substitution of biological to social inheritance.

We already mentioned the importance of the earliest stages in the development of the nerve cells in terms of the entire subsequent process of the individual development of the human nervous system. It has also become apparent that roughly during the 6th-7th month of intrauterine life the human brain cortex reaches such an advanced stage of development that, in terms of morphophysiological parameters, it is unquestionably capable of actively processing data input. This being the case, we must find means and develop a method for directing the development of this capability in the unborn child.

Initially this may seem somewhat strange. However, it is supported by proof and examples taken from the history of various cultures. We are quite familiar with the fact that the cult of motherhood and the great concern for pregnant women exists in many cultures, and that this includes many suitably thought-out measures which help to protect the health of the future child. Some of them may seem mystical, such as listening to cult music, poetry, ritual dances, etc. However, if we take into consideration the sufficiently developed level of the embryo's brain in the final 3 months of pregnancy we would see that all of this has an unquestionably materialistic base, for by that time the child carried by the mother can perceive certain information from the outside, even if it is only in the guise of a specific rhythm. Consequently, the core of such influences lies in developing (at a very early age) the ability of the brain to perceive and process data, i.e., in the final account, to accelerate the morphofunctional prerequisites for intelligence in the developing person.

Amazing though it may seem, something similar exists in animal life as well. It has long been known, for instance, that naturally hatched chicks are substantially more adaptable than those hatched in an incubator. The reason is that in the last days preceding the hatching, the setting hen begins an active exchange of specific and accessible information signals with the chicks by tapping on the shell with its beak and making specific sounds, something which is naturally not available to chicks hatched in an incubator. Therefore, naturally hatched chicks prove to be better prepared (more "able") to receive and process incoming data and, therefore, to be better adapted to their living conditions.

We can assume that in similar cases greater and as yet almost unused possibilities of exerting a guided influence on the accelerated development of the human mind and the maximal determination of its possibilities exist.

These are merely some of my considerations triggered by this very timely and important article. However, I am writing this not only in order to express my high appreciation of the obvious theoretical and practical significance of this article carried by your journal, but also to raise the question of the extreme need to create a broad research program for the study of all existing possibilities leading to the maximal development of the human intellect. A certain basis has already been laid to this effect. Such studies call for the development of extensive theoretical studies and active efforts to apply

already acquired knowledge regarding their practical use in protecting the health of the future generation and, naturally, its mental health. The time has come to undertake the proper study of this important social problem, the solution of which will require the joint efforts of specialists in various fields (genetics, neuromorphology, neurophysiology, gynecology, pediatrics, hygiene, psychology and philosophy) and corresponding institutions of the USSR Academy of Sciences, USSR Academy of Medical Sciences and USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. The need to ensure its fastest possible resolution most clearly stems from the programmatic documents of the 26th CPSU Congress.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

ONCE AGAIN CONCERNING THE POSITIONS OF THE PCI LEADERSHIP

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 73-92

[Text] Following publication in the USSR of two detailed articles in response to a polemic initiated by the PCI leadership, PRAVDA carried a short reply that expressed the CPSU's attitude toward the Italian comrades' reaction to the above-mentioned articles and said that it was not interested in continuing the polemic.

But E. Berlinguer shortly afterward again gave two interviews to L'UNITA and also appeared in other press organs summarizing and, in places, accentuating the attacks against the CPSU and against the socialist system that actually exists. Not, alas, on the basis of facts about the Soviet reality, with which Italian communists have long been afforded the broadest opportunity to familiarize themselves directly, but on the basis of the hackneyed cliches and tittle-tattle of Western "Sovietology," the journal RANASCITA came out with a pretentious critique of Soviet society's development over the last 20-plus years.

For more than 2 months now the PCI has been mobilizing all of its potential to turn the main front of the ideological struggle against the CPSU and the socialist community. And this at a time when Italy's workers movement is confronted with a mass of urgent internal problems, which are becoming increasingly acute, and when imperialist reaction headed by U.S. imperialism is stepping up the militarist hysteria against the USSR, Poland and other socialist countries with every passing day, taking increasingly dangerous practical steps to unleash a new round in the arms race, now including chemical weapons, virtually sabotaging the SALT II talks and the Geneva negotiations and blocking the Madrid meeting.

For all of these reasons, the CPSU considers it impossible not to react to this stream of public statements.

Whatever the PCI leaders may say, their entire ideological activity recently has shown that they are deviating increasingly from the theory of scientific communism and that their activity is targeted at denial of the tremendous progressive role of victorious socialism and the experience of its development and its international significance. In the area of foreign policy, efforts are being channeled into calling in question the peace-loving nature of the socialist states. E. Berlinguer's interview "Thoughts on Peace and the Third Way" (L'UNITA 21 Feb 82), which expresses in concentrated form a negative

attitude toward the socialist system that has been established and is developing in a number of countries on three continents, is also couched in this spirit.

Socialism and the Attitude Toward It

In the course of his studies in philosophy at the time of World War I, V.I. Lenin, summarizing Hegel's fundamental work "The Science of Logic," formulated 16 elements of the dialectics and methodological principles of genuinely scientific and thought leading to the truth. The first of these principles he termed objectivity of consideration.

It is this that the PCI leadership is lacking when it now declares its attitude toward the socialism that has been built. In its opinion, "the point of departure for reflection on a society of a socialist direction... refers to the harm from the adoption of a single model--the model of the Soviet type--in the East European countries: both in the sphere of the economy and also, and mainly, as far as the political system is concerned." At times the Italian comrades' statements apropos a "model" acquire a passionate ring. But the trouble is that this entire fervor is stoked by nothing other than the most out-and-out myth, of what bourgeois propaganda, incidentally, has invented many.

The point being that the CPSU has always believed and continues to believe--and its opinion is shared by the other communist and workers parties--that there is quite simply no Soviet or any other "model" of socialism. It was precisely on the CPSU's initiative back in 1957 that the Declaration of the Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers Parties of the Socialist Countries recorded: "Marxism-Leninism requires the creative application of the general principles of socialist revolution and socialist building depending on the concrete historical conditions of each country and does not adhere to the mechanical copying of the policy and tactics of the communist parties of other countries. V.I. Lenin warned repeatedly of the need for the correct application of the basic principles of communism in accordance with the specific features of a given nation and a given national state."

What in reality our party and other communist and workers parties have is not some kind of "model" but, first, Marxist-Leninist teaching on socialism, which is, undoubtedly, capable of implementation dissimilarly under the specific conditions of different countries, and, second, several decades worth of actual experience in building socialism and communism, which is international property.

This was well put, in our view, by A. Cunhal, general secretary of the Portuguese Communist Party, who said in an interview with the newspaper DIARIO DI LISBOA on 18 February:

"We are prepared to approve any plan (of the transition to socialism--Ed.) if it is based on the experience of the world revolutionary movement and the building of socialism and not on armchair deliberations and speculation. As far as Portugal, for example, is concerned, the path to the building of socialism has to be different from that in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Poland, Yugoslavia, Cuba, Romania, the USSR and so forth. This will be a

Portuguese path, but with regard for the general laws of social development and with obligatory scientific knowledge for an analysis of the reality and the experience of other revolutions in the sphere of the role of the state. We counterpose our plan not to the reality of the socialist countries but to that of the capitalist countries. Socialism in Portugal will be Portuguese, but we want this to be true socialism."

And now we hear what a veteran Polish communist had to say on this score in conversation with a group of Soviet journalists in the summer of 1981 in Warsaw:

"The Soviet 'model' of socialism in Poland?!" our companion shook his head with unconcealed bitterness. "Far from Soviet, unfortunately! Of course, there was your example, that of the world's first state to achieve a socialist revolution. Here, too, as in your country, power was taken by the working people. Former workers became ministers. They took to their ministerial chairs, and their bones began to ache--from being unaccustomed to sitting at a desk. Like you, we dreamed of building socialism. There was no experience other than yours. But our conditions were different. And the practice of building socialism proved quite, quite different. We still have far to go here. A few days ago a cardinal was buried. Our television covered this funeral for 5½ hours!... This is the Soviet 'model' of socialism?! And to blithely take out loans from Western banks without thinking that they might lead to economic and, subsequently, political dependence on capitalism--these are Soviet methods of building a socialist economy?! And the neglect of ideological work among the masses in recent years--this is the Soviet 'model' of socialism?! And indecisiveness in the struggle against the ideological enemy--this is the Soviet experience?! Corruption in the party's upper strata--this is some alien experience that someone brought in? No, dear sirs, it is our own 'model' and our own experience, to our great regret...."

What is socialism? This question can only be answered scientifically and only by proceeding from the objective trends and reality of the society that preceded socialism, that is, the capitalist society. Marxist-Leninists deduce socialism not from arbitrary abstract "models" or good intentions but from the real law of the socialization of labor and production revealed by K. Marx, which operates under capitalist conditions and serves as the main material basis of the preparation of conditions for the transition to socialism. The economic essence of socialism is logically in conformity with this: the transition of the main means of production to public, nationwide and collective ownership and the property of the socialist state and the substitution for capitalist production of production in accordance with a common plan in the interests of the working people.

It is possible to speak of whatever liberal designs one wants without recognition of this fundamental feature of the society that replaces the bourgeois society, only not about socialism.

It is wrong, however, to think that in regarding the role of the socialization of labor and production in this way Soviet communists and other Marxist-Leninists reduce socialism "merely to a change in production relations and the nature of ownership" (L'UNITA 21 Feb 82). The ideals of democracy and social

equality and the freedom of the personality and its harmonious, all-around development and creative self-assertion are just as dear to us, but we know that their realization is impossible in the soil of private-ownership relations and that they must be based on a permanent material foundation. Our entire practice, and not just ours, of many decades corroborates Lenin's concise conclusion: "...Freedom, if it is contrary to the liberation of labor from the oppression of capital, is a fraud" ("Complete Works," vol 38, p 346).

What has completed socialism given the peoples? Socialism has done away with man's exploitation of man. Only following our retaliatory statements in the course of the polemic that they unleashed did the Italian comrades appear to agree with this. Yet this is a fundamental question and epoch-making, world-historical fact testifying to the solution in the countries that have built socialism of the agonizing contradictions between labor and capital in favor of labor. The elaboration of "new, innovative and concrete proposals" that the PCI leaders are talking about does not, unfortunately, proceed from the need for the solution of just this problem first and foremost.

Socialism has created all the conditions for the working people's masses' confidence in the future. It has achieved this by the organization of the plan-oriented ascending development of the economy, which is subordinated to the general task--satisfaction of the population's growing material and spiritual requirements. On this path socialism has demonstrated an unprecedentedly high rate of production development over a number of decades. The alpha and omega of CPSU policy is concern for the good of the man of labor. It is common knowledge that the USSR has had no unemployment for more than half a century. Yet unemployment has again swept over 10 million in the Common Market countries alone. Why do the PCI leaders forget that real socialism has provided free medical service for the USSR population? According to law, all workers, employees and kolkhoz members and members of their families have a right to retirement and disability pensions. Such universality of pension coverage at a lower eligibility age is unknown under capitalism.

And, finally, concerning housing. There are no homeless people, no impoverished neighborhoods and no apartments standing empty because of their expensiveness and no one would dare to even think of throwing a person onto the street in the USSR. The right to accommodations is enshrined in the USSR Constitution and it is observed unswervingly. Rent here remains the lowest in the world.

Socialism has accomplished a genuine revolution in the people's spiritual makeup, having created unprecedentedly favorable conditions for familiarization of the masses with the achievements of national and world culture. And this is secured not least by the completely free educational system.

Could all these achievements, and we are forced to limit ourselves here merely to a mention of them, really have been possible if the working people had not taken over the means of production?

And what kind of socialism, in the opinion of the Italian authors, does Italy need? A tremendous number of words has been spoken on this score, and as a

rule, their talk centers around measures of a secondary, tertiary and, for the most part, superstructural nature implemented by way of reforms within the framework of the bourgeois-democratic system and by way of its "varnishing," without touching the foundations. "...The idea of socialism," E. Berlinguer declared in the interview with L'UNITA on 21 February, "...is a very rich and complex idea." But what does he include in it? According to him, "a socialism that corresponds to the current era and current requirements" presupposes such benefits as 1) "employment" 2) "health care" 3) "education" 4) "protection of the rights of children and the elderly" 5) "nature and environmental conservation" 6) the "complete emancipation of women" 7) "the working people's unimpeded right to participate in trade unions" 8) "labor productivity and the efficiency of the economy" 9) "political pluralism" 10) "freedom of information, cultural and artistic activity and so forth." As we can see, the PCI general secretary links his "model" with phenomena not of a fundamental but a derivative nature. The question, however, arises: is socialism, this "rich and complex idea," conceivable without the liberation of labor? And who would have power? According to the whole essence of this interview, it would remain in the hands of monopoly capital. In any case, there is not a word in this "new socialism" of the removal of large-scale private ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange, which is an indispensable feature of true socialist revolution. The PCI leadership arranges social priorities in its own fashion, and predominant among them is undoubtedly not the substitution of public, socialist ownership for private-capitalist ownership of the means of production, as has always been the case with Marxists, but allegiance to the bourgeois-parliamentary political system.

Persistently, from document to document, the Italian comrades insist on the need for combining socialism with democracy, making it appear that some Marxists dispute this need. In fact, it is a question here of an elementary primordial principle outside of which socialism cannot even emerge. The creation as the result of the October Revolution of the world's first worker-peasant state signified a giant step toward genuine democracy. However, it is precisely today's socialist democracy of all of the people that is being most bitterly attacked. Understanding the reasons for such behavior on the part of supporters of the omnipotence of the monopolies is difficult, but how can we understand the supporters of socialism who essentially support them!

Polemicalizing with PRAVDA, L'UNITA poses, from its viewpoint, the irresistible question: "At what party meeting, at what trade union or production meeting, at what soviet session (if we do not count debate and criticism addressed to particular aspects of a practical or organizational nature) is a communist who is not in agreement or a citizen who is not in agreement on general political questions able to express this disagreement of his and when has this been reported publicly?" It is merely necessary to know our press and to follow it daily for the simple answer to be found: what disturbs L'UNITA happens constantly and systematically. At the time of discussion of drafts of the most important laws and directives of party congresses, any communist and any citizen has the right to express himself "pro" or "con" on any question under discussion. Agreement and disagreement with both particular and general, including political, questions are expressed in Soviet newspapers and journals. We have already drawn the Italian colleagues' attention to such general political

debates as the discussion of the draft USSR Constitution and dozens of the most important official bills. In the course of these discussions, which were illustrated in the press, not to mention the thousands and thousands of verbal statements at both party and nonparty meetings, the most diverse viewpoints, frequently nonconforming and opposed, were expressed. But as distinct from what is evidently desirable for the PCI leaders, a sensational character is not imparted to these disagreements and they are expressed, as we say here, in the interests of the cause and dictated by a concern to rectify shortcomings, improve work for the general good and strengthen socialism in the interests of the entire people. Unfortunately, the Italian communist press writes virtually nothing about this. There was an occasion when, by way of creative cooperation, the editorial staff of the CPSU Central Committee journal KOMMUNIST to prepare an article on the nationwide discussion of the draft USSR Constitution for publication in Italy. This article was prepared and sent to Rome, but did not see the light of day here. The information did not suit the Italian comrades, evidently. And this was not the only such example.

Yet such manifestations of the democracy engendered by the new system as the socialist labor competition of millions, the inexhaustible spring of popular initiative, the pride of the production collectives in their achievements and the honor and nationwide respect with which the Soviet people who are building communism, surround labor pacesetters! It was no coincidence that only a year ago RINASCITA noted "the privileged position of the working class" and the domination of "the ideology of labor as a value" in Soviet society. "The worker (the figure of the skilled worker is popularized always)," the journal wrote, "is the symbol of labor itself and the foundation of the socialist society. The image of the worker may be encountered everywhere. He continuously establishes the ethical canons of the socialist state and thus aspires to evoke a sense of duty and loyalty to socialism." But none of this is now of much interest to the comrades in the PCI leadership. Their thoughts lie in a different direction.

A most important form of the expression of public opinion here are the citizens' (individual or collective) letters to the organs of state power and administration, the party committees, including the CPSU Central Committee, the newspapers and journals and public organizations. Hundreds and hundreds of thousands of such letters are received every year. They are examined obligatorily by the bodies to which they have been addressed. Concrete measures are obligatorily adopted with respect to them. In the period between the 25th and 26th party congresses, the CPSU Central Committee alone received more than 3 million letters from the working people. The opinions and proposals expressed therein are carefully considered in all of the party's work, is systematically collated by the Central Committee and special rulings are made with regard to the most significant of them.

If the comrades in the PCI leadership and the L'UNITA editorial office were to take the trouble to attentively and impartially investigate this practice of ours and recognize the mass and obligatory nature of the citizens' active participation in the solution of urgent questions of our life and social development, they would probably understand the entire groundlessness of L'UNITA's "irresistible" question. But an objective approach to matters evidently is not to their liking.

And, indeed, was this what L'UNITA had in mind? The comrades in the editorial office almost certainly know that businesslike criticism is an integral feature of our way of life and work style. Thus, what do they want? "Dissident"-type criticism and freedom for unbridled defamation of the socialist system on the part of individual renegades? But there should be complete clarity on this score: We will, naturally, never agree to the popularization of such statements. Let this not be expected of us by the PCI leaders, who themselves, incidentally, are highly selective when it comes to the publication of material.

On the basis of what has been said earlier, we permit ourselves to also reject as baseless the assertions concerning "constant and serious infringements" of rights and freedoms in the USSR and the "absence" of the population's active participation in management. These assertions, which were once passionately boosted by Mr Carter, are refuted by the daily practice of Soviet society and the very atmosphere and tenor of the socialist way of life. Our Italian friends also participated earlier in this refutation, incidentally. "The Soviet political system," RINASCITA wrote, "has an extensive, diverse and all-encompassing mechanism for enlisting the masses in management.... It is a question of participation and consensus, accessible to absolutely everyone who avails himself of this mechanism...."

It is only necessary to sometimes read our newspapers, journals and books to be persuaded that Soviet people are more aware than anyone in the world of the shortcomings of economic and cultural building in the USSR and the difficulties of the growth of a new, collectivist social system. As R. Arismendi, first secretary of the Uruguayan Communist Party Central Committee, correctly said: "The Soviet Union is not 'paradise.' It is a victory over the hell of imperialism and capitalism..." (R. Arismendi, "Leninism--Banner of the Revolutionary Transformation of the World," Moscow, 1979, p 147).

Our party states openly that far from all of the problems concerning, for example, agriculture and provision of the country with food have been solved in the USSR. And it does not simply state this but is drawing up and implementing concrete measures consolidated in an all-embracing, comprehensive food program. Despite the harsh natural conditions, the production of agricultural products in the country increased by a factor of 2.5 in the period 1941-1945, and the production of grain here increased almost twofold. The USSR now produces more wheat than the United States. Nonetheless, much still has to be done, and the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress orient the people toward this. We are still importing a certain amount of the products we need. There is nothing unusual in this. Some commodities the USSR purchases, others it sells.

PCI figures have spoken repeatedly of the unacceptability for Italy of the socialist system in the form in which it emerged and is developing in other countries. "The youth, even the part of it that recognizes the historic significance of the proletarian, people's and national revolutions accomplished since the 1917 October Revolution," E. Berlinguer declared on 10 May 1980 in Madrid, "is not attracted by the paths by which the building of socialism has proceeded up to the present."

But this is what L. Longo once said on this subject:

"Let us put the question: Who is the more free, the Italian working people who are unemployed and trembling at the fear of losing their jobs or the working people of the USSR, who have guaranteed jobs and do not even know what unemployment is? Are young people who remain without jobs or who cannot continue their studies, although they wish to and have the capabilities and minds for it, more free or is it Soviet youth, to whom all paths to labor and culture are open? Are the hundreds of thousands of Italians who are annually forced to leave their homeland and their families in search of work abroad, which they cannot find at home, really more free? Who is freer, the women and girls dismissed from Italian factories or the millions of Soviet women, to whom the highest and most skilled work in all spheres of production activity and in all spheres of social life is accessible? Are the Italian doctors, teachers and scientists oppressed by decrepit practices the freer or are the scientists of a country where science and creative quest have been able, thanks to the socialist system, to achieve a level unprecedented in the world?" (L. Longo, "Selected Articles and Speeches," Moscow, 1975, pp 564-565). This is why we permit ourselves to doubt the substantiation of the judgment expressed by E. Berlinguer on behalf of Italian youth. Or, perhaps, there was a cardinal improvement in its situation under the most acute crises of the 1970's?!

No one is forcing the Italian Communists to enage in imitation. On the contrary, it is their inalienable duty to formulate paths of socialist transformations corresponding to Italy's conditions and traditions, taking account of available experience. It is possible that the new life in this country will be built with greater facility and fewer sacrifices, but this will be precisely because of the existence of the world socialist system and the powerful community of socialist countries. The form of a society cannot be mechanically transferred from one country to another. It is difficult, however, not to conclude that the PCI is in fact being "scared away," as Lenin used to say, from the truth about socialism and its successes and that the masses are being intimidated with the socialist system.

In disparaging the reality of the socialist countries, the leading figures of the PCI are, as it were, locking their country's working people in the capitalist home, inviting them to be content with its "values" and to merely contribute to its decoration. What a narrow and pessimistic view! And absolutely no prospect of a transition to socialism.

Problems of the Theory of the Revolutionary Process: The "Third Phase" and "Third Way"

The main "innovation" in this sphere is the idea of the shift of the center of the struggle for socialism to West Europe. A new periodization of the world revolutionary process and a "three phases" theory constructed on the basis thereof are proposed to justify this idea. The "first phase" was termed in E. Berlinguer's report at the PCI Central Committee and Central Control Commission January Plenum "the socialist and social-democratic phase of the struggle...." It allegedly began at the end of the last century with the emergence of the large-scale economic, trade union and political organizations

of the workers' movement. The October Revolution started the "second phase." This phase, in the opinion of the Italian theorists, has now "exhausted its motivating force." The transition to the "third phase" is now being completed. "Lending impetus to and opening new horizons before the struggle for socialism in West Europe," the PCI document on the situation in Poland says, "is essential in order to begin the new phase for socialism worldwide and contribute to the democratic renewal of society in East Europe."

We object to the artificiality and, to be plain, extreme pretentiousness of this entire "three phases" theory and its isolation from a concrete analysis of the real content of the modern era.

Despite the entire complexity, diversity and contradictoriness of this era, which was initiated by October, its main content and main direction of development are obvious: the transition from capitalism to socialism universally.

How from this perspective to evaluate the division of the world revolutionary process into "three phases?"

We will not dwell on the "first phase." We would observe only that at that time also there existed two confrontational trends in the workers movement: reformist and revolutionary--which the Italian theorists prefer not to mention. As a result, the continuity of the revolutionary movement of the pre-October stage and the revolutionary era of October is denied. And at the same time "the social and social-democratic phase of the struggle" are, as it were, imposed on the "October phase." This itself wittingly or unwittingly slurs over the fundamental and qualitative frontier that the Great October Socialist Revolution was for mankind. The PCI leaders do not deny the role of the October Revolution in history. But this role, as they conceive it, is manifestly applied to the past and the initial period of the world revolutionary process that it began. But the main purpose of the concept is to be found in the "third phase." As E. Berlinguer said, the West's workers movement is becoming "the epicenter of the new phase of the struggle of socialism."

It is obvious, first of all, that the "three phases" theory has pretensions to expunging the socialism that actually exists in the world from the revolutionary transformation of the world that is under way in our time and converting the experience of October and the experience of the building and development of the socialist society into a mere "part of historical property." The main contradiction of the current era, which provides the clue to an understanding of the mechanism of the class struggle in our time, also finds itself thrown overboard by the "third phase" together with the socialism that has already been built. Yet the events of recent years confirm even more graphically that the main axis of contemporary world development is the contradiction between socialism and capitalism. It imbues and ultimately determines the entire content of world politics and, of course, also leaves its imprint on relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact Organization.

In spite of their "three phases" theory, the PCI leaders themselves have frequently been compelled to recognize the decisive role of victorious socialism in the world. Thus, E. Berlinguer said in his closing remarks at the January plenum: "In the system of the present world balance, the Soviet Union represents a counterweight to the strength and aggressiveness of American

imperialism." But having said "A," we need to say "B." If the Soviet Union, a country that has built socialism, is a counterweight to imperialism, this means that it is primarily socialism that is the guarantor of the world revolutionary process' ongoing development. Can we really talk seriously about the prospects of a stable peace, the victory of the workers movement in the main citadels of the capitalist system and the successes of the peoples' struggle for national and social liberation while ignoring the socialism that actually exists and even engaging in discrediting it?

We do not need to be persuaded that the solidarity of the working class of the capitalist countries with the peoples struggling for their liberation is an essential political force. But we should also realize that the chances of the national liberation revolutions would be extraordinarily slight were it not for that same "counterweight to imperialism" that the world socialist system represents and were it not for its economic sociopolitical and military might. Speaking at the 24th French Communist Party [PCF] Congress on the socialist countries' role in the modern world, PCF General Secretary G. Marchais correctly emphasized: "...These states are the bulwark of the liberation struggle being waged on the planet, particularly the struggle for national liberation."

This is a fact of contemporary reality that is ignored by the "three phases" theory. Of what forecasts of the world revolutionary process can we speak if the impetus of the socialism that already exists in the world has been exhausted? On what then are the hopes for a new "phase" in the struggle for socialism based? The analysis of the reasons for the supposed shift of this struggle's "epicenter" to West Europe in E. Berlinguer's report at the January plenum appears extremely naive and unconvincing.

Here is the list of these reasons. West Europe represents the "pinnacle of world culture." European capitalism is a high point of the system, where its profound crisis is combined with the activity of influential trade union and political organizations of the working class. Two military-political blocs confront one another directly in Europe, and it is it that is primarily threatened by a nuclear conflict.

Even if we turn our attention away from the certain tinge of "Eurocentrism," the enumerated features testify to the importance of the tasks confronting the workers movement of the West European countries and its revolutionary vanguards.

The breaching of the capitalist system in its, as the Italian comrades put it, "high points" would undoubtedly accelerate the world revolutionary process considerably. But if we proceed from the facts, which our opponents call for us to do, we cannot yet, unfortunately, speak about a revolutionary breakthrough in the "high points" of capitalism.

We would like to ask the Italian comrades on what their conclusion as to the "practical development of socialism" in the European capitalist countries is built and what is meant by socialism "in all its historical-political concreteness."

If it is meant that the industrially developed capitalist countries are objectively ripe for socialism, Lenin said this about 70 years ago. If the reference is to capitalism's inability to resolve the problems it itself has engendered, this is what is asserted by the CPSU and many other communist parties. But this is still insufficient. The maturity of the subjective factor of socialist revolution is also necessary for a transition to socialism. We would recall that Marx, Engels and Lenin connected--given the initial objective conditions--the idea of the shift of the center of the world revolutionary process precisely with this factor, with the readiness and capability of the working class and its allies to accomplish socialist coup and with the scale and depth of the mass movement for socialism.

But the demands on the subjective factor of the socialist transformation of society are particularly high in the developed capitalist countries. In fact, in the main citadels of capitalism the working class is opposed by the strongest adversary--the experienced and well-organized monopoly bourgeoisie, which relies on a ramified state, socioeconomic and ideological machinery that has a rich arsenal of means of influencing the workers movement and diverse and subtle methods of integrating opposition forces into the existing system. A principal beachhead of the international economic, political and military alliance of the imperialist powers' monopoly bourgeoisie is situated in West Europe.

Opposing such an adversary and fighting him is not easy, and we understand this full well. We also understand and value highly the fact that, despite this, the communist and workers movement in France, Portugal, Italy, Greece, Finland and a number of other West European countries has scored considerable successes since the war. But as yet the social-class battles of the working class in the West European countries are developing, by virtue of evolved conditions, with few exceptions at the distant approaches to the "practical development of socialism."

It is not out of line to recall in this connection the danger of that same provincialism to which P. Togliatti pointed. He saw this danger in the emergence of an opinion that "could lead to the point where one considered oneself the center of the universe and believed that one had been entrusted with the mission of subjecting to superficial criticism the remaining parts of the movement, without making any effort to acquaint oneself in depth with the conditions of their development" (P. Togliatti, "Selected Articles and Speeches," vol 2, Moscow, 1965, p 661).

Ever increasing signs that the world revolutionary process is entering a new stage have indeed been revealed on the eve and at the outset of the 1980's. Overcoming difficulties of growth, real socialism is being elevated to an even higher level of progress. Considerable qualitative shifts are occurring in the emergent countries. The reformist strategy of capitalism's adaptation to the new situation is experiencing a profound crisis, and the explosive energy of mass protest is building up in its interior and increasingly breaking through to the surface in various forms. The shoots of profound revolutionary changes are maturing.

New possibilities and paths of struggle for socialism are now opening up to the workers movement of the West European countries. This is not a local, national phenomenon but the result of fundamental shifts on a world scale.

For this reason, it would be disastrous to struggle for the use of these possibilities from the standpoint of a denial of the gains of the socialism that already exists. The path toward the upsurge of the revolutionary workers movement in the West European countries is that of international solidarity with all of the present-day revolutionary forces and, of course, with the socialist countries and the socialist community.

Since the war, the theoretical thought of West Europe's communist movement has persistently sought an answer to the question of what the approach and transition to socialism in the developed capitalist countries should be. This theoretical work corresponds to Lenin's conclusion concerning the diversity of forms of the transition to socialism. And it has produced certain interesting ideas. However, some of the propositions that have been advanced are of a hypothetical nature and are in need of verification and more in-depth substantiation. "This is understandable," L.I. Brezhnev said. "Search is search. It is only important that it proceed in the right direction."

It is from these standpoints that we also approach an evaluation of the "third way" concept. It has to be stated that this is not a continuation of the theoretical search begun by A. Gramsci and P. Togliatti but movement in the opposite direction.

What is meant by "third way?" The Italian comrades do not give a clear answer to this question; it is evident from PCI documents and the speeches of representatives of its leadership that for movement by a "third way" the foregoing experience of revolutionary struggle of the working class and the experience of real socialism are of only negative significance. Nonetheless, the PCI leaders call for "all forces of the European workers movement" to embark on the as yet very nebulous path that they recommend.

At the center of the "third way" concept--just as in the evaluation of real socialism--is the idea of the organic unity of democracy and socialism. We repeat: in itself this idea is not new; Marxists have long considered it axiomatic. In the PCI documents, however, it is a question of something else.

And the question again arises: For what kind of democracy is concern being displayed? After all, in a class society democracy always acquires a class character. Democracy for whom? For a handful of "little rich men," as Lenin said, or for the majority of the population and the working people? The PCI leaders, however, conceive of democracy not as class-based but as national.

The PCI documents also speak of the struggle of the working class. But it is precisely the point that the idea of "national consensus" contradicts the characteristics of the class struggle. The closer and more real the transition to socialism, the more powerfully will the objective logic of class interests prompt the ruling classes to counteract revolutionary transformations. As Marx observed, as Lenin cautioned repeatedly and as we know from practice, revolution engenders counterrevolution. And from this, in turn, ensues the need for every revolution to be able, possessing all effective forms of struggle, to defend itself. The entire historical experience of the inception of the socialist societies indicates that the revolutionary process is inconceivable without intervention in power and ownership relations. Engels was

profoundly correct when he wrote: "Revolution is undoubtedly the most authoritarian thing possible" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 18, p 305).

Hopes for socialist transformations based on general consent and general justice and an underestimation of the deep-lying roots and inevitable aggravations of the class struggle in contemporary bourgeois society can be attributed to liberal notions of revolution and socialism.

Unfortunately, such ideas can also be discerned in the economic program "For Italy's New Development" (L'UNITA 13 Dec 81), which the PCI leadership has proposed for its country. "Italy," this document says, "is currently on the threshold, but has not yet passed through the door of the club of select industrially developed countries. And by the end of the decade or even earlier it may definitely find itself beyond this threshold. Thus the problem of national community arises on this path within the framework of a particularly acute political and state crisis."

So here, too, the idea of "national community" is moved to the forefront and, moreover, to join the "club of the select few." A conclusion is drawn from the exacerbation of the internal contradictions of state-monopoly capitalism concerning the need for concentration of the efforts of the entire nation for the purpose of securing for Italian capitalism the best place in the European Common Market. The task of inculcating "the nation's collective consciousness" is posed for the achievement of this goal.

Thus, the PCI's economic program does not reveal a socialist perspective and does not encroach on the main positions of the capitalist system. In the objective sense, it is aimed at the rationalization of capitalist production and the modernization of Italian state-monopoly capitalism, in which the working class might at best occupy more favorable positions only for the defense of its day-to-day interests.

True, E. Berlinguer observed in the L'UNITA interview of 21 February: "We not only want the genuine liquidation of capitalism but also, as I have tried to explain, we are convinced that it is essential...." Good intentions. But the objective sense of the proposed economic program is more important.

The proposition concerning the "practice of economies" (under capitalist conditions), which was addressed to the working people, encountered sharp criticism within the party on the eve of the 15th PCI Congress. This is why it is not in the program. But demands for a sober-minded approach, thrift, a re-examination of wage and pay strategy and so forth are put forward. The working people are called on to make sacrifices for the sake of the achievement of vague and ambiguous goals.

Of course, communists cannot be bystanders, indifferent to the economic troubles that capitalism brings down on the people of labor. Within the framework of the capitalist system, too, they are striving for constructive solutions to socioeconomic problems of a national character. But communists are revolutionaries. They always have the socialist perspective in mind and cannot and must not conduct operations to rescue and strengthen state-monopoly capitalism at the expense of the working class.

L. Longo described correctly the need for the organic connection of economics and politics. "The constantly growing interdependence of the monopolies and the state," he wrote, "makes the class nature of the state and its institutions increasingly apparent and raises the task of unitary struggle both against the monopolies and against the state" (L. Longo, "Selected Articles and Speeches," p 239).

Truly complex questions confront the theoretical thought of the communist movement in the developed capitalist countries. In what way can democratic transformations in the soil of the capitalist system lead to fundamental socialist transformations and what transitional economic and political stages and forms are required here? These questions can only be solved by way of a scrupulous Marxist analysis of the new phenomena and processes of bourgeois society and the verification and adjustment of theoretical conclusions in political struggle. Contrived schemes and far-fetched abstract constructions will not help here.

How many disputes there were surrounding the "historic compromise" concept! But it has now disappeared from PCI documents. The attempts at the practical implementation of the "historic compromise" led, as the PCI itself observed, to a blunting of the party's revolutionary appearance in the eyes of the population and to a weakening of its influence, particularly among the youth.

Will not such concepts as the "three phases," "third way" and so forth meet with the same fate? The more so in that these concepts are very indefinite and full of blank spaces. And it is reasonable to ask: Why counterpose so categorically as yet unshaped concepts to socialist practice that actually exists and the accumulated historical experience of the coming into being and development of socialism?

Now a few words about the developing countries that have opted for the path of socialist orientation. Their distinctive and diverse experience represents a great contribution to the world revolutionary process. The breaking of the chain of imperialist domination in this zone confirms once again the presence of universal objective conditions for fundamental social transformations with a socialist perspective. And the change in the correlation of world forces and the strengthening of the positions of the world socialist system figure prominently among these objective conditions. The victorious nature of the present-day national liberation struggle also confirms another important idea-- concerning the role of the subjective factor and the capacity of a decisive revolutionary vanguard for utilizing the readiness of the masses to lead a struggle in all of its forms until victory, relying on the effective international support and solidarity of other progressive forces, primarily the socialist states. In the light of what is now being said by the PCI leaders, it is particularly important to emphasize that the vanguard forces of countries of a socialist orientation are striving precisely for true socialism and attentively studying and utilizing its experience to solve their own urgent economic, social and cultural problems.

But what do the Italian theorists suggest for these countries? Also a kind of "third way," only even more vague: It differs from the "typical models of

the capitalist West" but at the same time must be protected "against those who endeavor to squeeze them into the outlines and ideologies characterizing the regimes of Eastern Europe" (L'UNITA 12 Jan 82).

Perhaps the PCI comrades have some theoretical "sesame" and universal experience capable of radically helping the peoples cast off the chains of social and national slavery? Alas, the PCI leadership possesses nothing of the sort. "We have no definite model," G. Pajetta confessed in his interview with the weekly L'EPOCA. "This is true. We reject both the Soviet model and the social-democratic model." Nonetheless, the PCI leadership considers it proper and possible for it to no longer talk about the "Italian way to socialism," on which it had insisted polemically for a long time. The proposition concerning the "Italian way" has now been replaced by the "third way" concept, which has a pretension to international significance.

Thus, the "new phase" means on the one hand a denial of what has been gained by other peoples in the struggle for socialism, that is, it is of an entirely negative and not constructive nature and, on the other, consists of requirements that do not go beyond the framework of the bourgeois-democratic system.

This, unfortunately, is the appearance of the fundamental "armament" of the PCI leaders, which is turned against Marxist-Leninist teaching on socialism and against the socialist system that actually exists, "armament" that may be defined quite accurately as ideological disarmament in the face of the class enemy. Indeed, this strange call "to nowhere" is addressed to the entire workers and liberation movement!

Let us now turn to the concept of the so-called new internationalism that has been propagandized for a number of years in documents of the PCI leadership.

The initial premise is the fact of the considerable broadening of the composition of the revolutionary and democratic forces in the modern world. But this position is then counterposed to proletarian, socialist internationalism--the proven principle of the workers and communist movement since the times of the "Communist Party Manifesto." Proletarian internationalism, G. Pajetta declares, contrary to historical experience and present-day practice, "was more restricted, was frequently based on an illusion and was in many respects marked by sectarianism."

The supporters of the "new internationalism" reiterate what the CPSU and many other communist parties have been saying for a long time (and implementing in practice), namely, that the present global problems go beyond the framework of the interests of the working class alone and concern the fate of all strata of the population and all peoples and that in our time international solidarity must encompass a broad range of democratic and progressive forces and be suffused with a content common to all mankind. But the conclusion by no means follows from this that proletarian internationalism is outdated and no longer necessary.

Proletarian internationalism is a historical concept that develops together with the international communist and workers movement and takes account of ongoing changes. The present expansion of the framework of international

solidarity and relations between revolutionary, democratic forces is also the further natural development of proletarian internationalism proving its vitality and its capacity for pulling increasingly new social forces into the orbit of the progressive class' liberating and transforming activity.

But the PCI leaders reduce proletarian internationalism exclusively to the solidarity of proletarians or even communists. But this is absolutely wrong. Even at the time of Marx and Engels proletarian internationalism was not some kind of barrier separating the working class from other strata of the working people. The meaning of this concept is that the working class, as the most progressive and, in its socioeconomic nature, internationalist class, rallying together internationally in the course of its struggle, sets an example and contributes to the development of the solidarity of all other exploited and oppressed categories of working people and all who aspire to peace, democracy and social progress.

The PCI document on the situation in Poland bluntly proclaims "obsolete the idea of a uniform communist movement isolated from all the forces of the international workers movement, that is, from the socialist, progressive and liberation movements."

We would note straight away that such exaggerated notions of a "uniform" and "isolated" international communist movement are not held by a single Marxist-Leninist party or, of course, by the CPSU. In easily refuting such caricature notions, the theorists of the "new internationalism" also reject together with them the very idea of the international communist movement and, moreover, call in question the very fact of its existence. Instead of this, they propose orientation toward the equalization of relations with all political forces of the revolutionary and democratic movement, irrespective of their class positions. And this means dissociation from the most influential, efficient and authoritative international movement of the day.

Fortunately, however, the PCI leadership is not competent to "close down" the international communist movement. To start now in all seriousness to prove that it exists would be to put ourselves in an absurd position. It is sufficient to point to the colossal anticommunist activity of the class enemy, the world bourgeoisie, which, of course, would not be expending so many forces and spending so much money if the communist movement did not represent a powerful international force.

The dangers concealed in the "new internationalism" in the Italian interpretation are graphically revealed in the PCI's international policy--in a weakening of relations with the communist parties of the socialist community countries and in the development of contacts with political forces of an anticommunist persuasion and with antisocialist figures and organizations, often contrary to the opinion of the communist parties of the corresponding countries. While paying lipservice to a readiness for dialogue with virtually everyone and on many issues, the PCI nonetheless refused to participate in the 1980 Paris meeting of European communist and workers parties, which was devoted to such an urgent question as peace and disarmament. All this harms the international solidarity and the struggle of the democratic and progressive forces.

The CPSU is guided consistently in its international activity by the principles of voluntary international responsibility to the world communist movement. At the same time, its international relations with other workers and democratic parties and organizations are far more extensive and, what is most important, more effective than those of the people who talk about the restrictedness and "sectarianism" of the principles of proletarian internationalism. The CPSU, for example, has bilateral relations and long-standing contacts with 20 socialist and social-democratic parties and 35 revolutionary-democratic parties of Asian, African and Latin American countries.

International Relations, Peace and Detente

PCI documents and the speeches of representatives of its leadership contain many correct words about the current international situation, its unusual seriousness, the danger of the arms race, which is pushing the world to the brink of nuclear catastrophe, the need for the banning of nuclear weapons and for a gradual balanced and controlled reduction in conventional arms and the urgency of negotiations on the most acute problems, primarily on problems of nuclear disarmament.

Although acknowledging the exacerbation of international tension, the PCI leaders put the blame for this simultaneously on the USSR and the United States and the Warsaw Pact and NATO. Together with irresponsible fault-finding in respect to the state of affairs in the USSR and certain other socialist countries, it has become a customary practice for the PCI leadership to distort and compromise individual foreign policy acts of our country and its foreign policy as a whole.

In spite of what is actually the case--and all peace-loving forces and objective people acknowledge and support the Soviet Union's decisive contribution to the process of detente and the struggle against the danger of war--the PCI leaders deny even this indisputable fact. "Since 1975 in particular," E. Berlinguer said at the January plenum, "we have encountered and continue to encounter political positions and concrete actions of the Soviet Union that have by no means represented and do not now represent a contribution to the peoples' struggle against imperialism. Moreover, they not only have not been conducive to the process of detente and the struggle for peace but, on the contrary, have impeded them."

It is simply incomprehensible when communists say such things about a state that is doing everything possible to prevent world war and putting forward specific proposals to accomplish this great task. It is primarily thanks to the Soviet Union that the European peoples have been spared war for 37 years now. We do not have a chance here to expound the entire history of the struggle of the USSR and all of the Warsaw Pact countries for peace. We would recall just the most recent initiatives and steps of the CPSU and the Soviet Government, with the full consent and support of the Warsaw Pact allies.

All of these initiatives are based on the Peace Program for the 1980's that was adopted by the 26th CPSU Congress and that provides for measures of both a political and military nature concerning the situation both in Europe and in the Near, Middle and Far East. The program concerns nuclear and conventional weapons and ground and naval and air forces.

The Soviet Union's political positions in the international arena are determined by the fact that it rejects most emphatically all "doctrines" proceeding from the permissibility of any "variety" of nuclear war." "...Only he who has resolved to commit suicide could begin a nuclear war in the hope of emerging from it victorious," L.I. Brezhnev emphasizes. And this position of the Soviet Union has the broadest international support, as was strikingly demonstrated by the adoption by the UN General Assembly 36th Session of the Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe, which proclaimed the first use of nuclear weapons a crime.

Of course, the Soviet Union, like every state, endeavors to reliably ensure its security. But it proceeds in this, as L.I. Brezhnev observed, from the fact that "in the nuclear age this cannot be achieved by gambling on winning an arms race." And the Soviet Union is proving in deeds its endeavor to halt this senseless race and turn it back. It was prepared to honestly fulfill the SALT II treaty. The USSR proposes that an accord be reached on a halt not only to each and every test of nuclear weapons but also to their continued production in order to limit and subsequently eliminate the stockpiles thereof entirely. The Soviet Union insists on the banning of the creation of all new types of weapons of mass destruction altogether and the banning and destruction of existing weapons--chemical, for example.

L.I. Brezhnev formulated a concrete and realistic plan for a cutback in nuclear weapons in Europe, whose goal is a renunciation of all nuclear weapons on the continent--both intermediate-range and tactical. In view of the West's unpreparedness for such a radical solution, the Soviet Union proposes for a start an accord concerning a threefold or even greater reduction in the present number of nuclear arms of intermediate range. The validity of the Soviet Union's political position is eloquently indicated by the fact that in seeking a solution of this now most serious question it intends to undertake far-reaching unilateral measures to lower the level of military confrontation. But the USSR will, of course, be forced to take steps to protect its vital interests if the United States adds a new twist to the arms race spiral.

The USSR does not contemplate building its well-being at the expense and to the detriment of the legitimate interests of other countries. "The freedom and security of other states," L.I. Brezhnev says, "are an essential condition of our own freedom and security. And at the same time, our freedom and security are an essential condition of the free and independent development of other countries."

Applying this fundamental principle in practice, the Soviet Union supports, for example, ideas for the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, declares its readiness to provide guarantees to any nonnuclear countries that do not allow the deployment of nuclear weapons on their territory and declares that it will never use such weapons against them. Soviet proposals on specific, just measures to reduce tension and remove centers of conflict over huge expanses from Central Europe to the Far East, including the Near East, the Persian Gulf area, the Mediterranean and the Indian and Pacific Oceans, also move in the same direction.

Essential significance in this respect is also attached to the appeal issued by L.I. Brezhnev on 27 April 1981 during the visit to the USSR of M. Qadhdhafi for all states to adhere in their mutual relations to the "code of behavior" embodied in the UN Charter, the Final Act of Helsinki and certain agreements of the 1970's between states with different social systems.

The USSR's constructive approach to international affairs is also expressed in its orientation toward the utmost development of political, economic, scientific-technical and cultural cooperation with other countries. Its efforts for continuation of the all-European process and successful completion of the Madrid meeting, its contribution to the work of the United Nations and much else also testify to this.

Honest, equal negotiations and the political settlement of all existing and emerging international problems--this is the constant and firm line of the USSR. The sole "prior condition" whose fulfillment the Soviet Union demands is, as L.I. Brezhnev said, that negotiations must "translate into the language of the parties' concrete commitments the principle of equality and equal security." And whoever thinks such a demand "impedes" detente is profoundly mistaken. An abandonment of this principle would by no means diminish the complexities in international affairs but merely complicate the people's struggle against imperialism.

All this objectively indicates that the USSR implements in practice its proclaimed policy: It threatens no one and does not aspire to confrontation with any state, West or East. The Soviet Union has not sought and does not now seek military superiority. It has not initiated and will not initiate new twists of the arms race spiral. There is no type of armament that it would not agree to limit and ban on a reciprocal basis, in an arrangement with other states. In other words, practice is the surest criterion of the truth and demonstrates more convincingly than anything, it would appear, the truly peace-loving goals and constructive realistic steps of Soviet foreign policy.

An increasingly large number of people in the world is convinced that the Soviet Union is struggling sincerely and consistently for detente and a reduction in and a halt to the arms race.

The USSR is a socialist country, and socialism is creation and construction. We have no classes and social groups interested in war and profiting from the arms race. We paid a monstrous price for the last war--20 million lives.

For our planet and for mankind there are no alternatives: lasting, reliable peace or nuclear catastrophe. The CPSU's position is clear: "There is currently no more important task internationally for our party, our people and for all peoples of the world," L.I. Brezhnev emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress, "than the defense of peace."

And it is said of this policy that it "is not conducive to the detente process." The main argument here is Afghanistan. A totally baseless argument. It has to be repeated for the umpteenth time. A limited Soviet troop contingent was committed there at the request of the Afghan Government, entirely in accordance with Article 51 of the UN Charter. It was an act of international assistance to a friendly people who had been subjected to an attack by

imperialism, which had hastened to the assistance of internal counterrevolution, aiming simultaneously at creating a further beachhead threatening the USSR's security directly on its southern border. Were the export of counterrevolution to Afghanistan to cease and the undeclared war against our peace-loving neighbor to be halted, Soviet troops would depart. The Afghan Government has called repeatedly for negotiations and a political settlement of the crisis, but it is a peaceful settlement that certain Western countries, primarily the United States, do not want.

The second argument--and this is even more surprising--is Poland. There is much manifest and incontrovertible evidence that the United States is concerned to maintain and kindle the crisis situation in Poland. The sanctions, prohibitions and restrictions in respect to this country are direct confirmation of this. As W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, said at the PZPR Central Committee February Plenum, Poland "is viewed as an instrument and a lever of pressure on the Soviet Union and the socialist community. The real interests of the Polish people and its border tranquillity and living conditions and the security of the state are of no significance in this game.... The role of detonator under the cover of peace, whose foundation are the inseparable agreements signed at Yalta and Potsdam, has been determined for it. The process of destroying the socialist community and of turning European history back an entire era is to begin with Poland."

In demanding the lifting of martial law in Poland, which, by the end of 1981, as the facts of an improvement in the situation in the country now show as clearly as can be, had become the sole possible means of preventing a catastrophe and bloodshed, the PCI leaders are in practice playing up to the plans of imperialist reaction. And it is by no means coincidental that numerous bourgeois politicians of various countries and rightwing newspapers and figures in Italy itself are lavishing praise on the PCI leadership in this connection. And why not! After all, it supported the utterly fraudulent version of Reagan and NATO concerning the Soviet Union's "responsibility" for the steps taken by the Polish leadership, which operated in an entirely sovereign and independent manner and on the basis of its country's constitution.

The purpose of introducing martial law in Poland was to stabilize the situation in a country situated in the center of Europe. Consequently, this was an act contributing to the preservation of peace not only on our continent but also worldwide. "The martial law in our country," W. Jaruzelski said at the PZPR Central Committee February Plenum, "has essentially become an antiwar law. It has deferred and today even reduced to a considerable extent the threat of confrontation. In solving its problems by its own forces, Poland was an immeasurably important, more a key, factor in the preservation of peace. History will probably say at some point that just as World War II began because of Poland, World War III did not begin thanks to Poland."

The introduction of martial law in Poland has not stopped, as the PCI leaders assert despite all the evidence, and could not have stopped the struggle for peace. The introduction of martial law is a temporary phenomenon, but the peoples' striving for peace will continue as long as the danger of nuclear war exists. Incidentally, the proposition of a PCI leader adduced above is

graphically refuted by the facts of the antiwar movement in the last 2 months: There has been a number of large-scale demonstrations in the West European countries concerning the resolve of influential political and public organizations and circles to prevent the deployment of new American missiles on their territories and the growing protests against the militarist orgy with which the United States is attempting to stifle everything positive in East-West relations. A mass upsurge of the antiwar movement has been discerned in Canada and Australia, and it is strengthening in Japan. There has been a stimulation of opposition to Reagan's policy of confrontation with the USSR in the United States itself. It is sufficient to mention merely the campaign for a nuclear weapons freeze that is gathering strength there.

E. Berlinguer's 21 February interview again touched on the question of so-called "bloc policy." The international class struggle, he teaches, cannot be identified with two military blocs, as if the CPSU had been guilty of such oversimplification. The PCI leadership does not tire of repeating that the source of all evil and disasters in current international policies are the "blocs"--NATO and the Warsaw Pact Organization--and moreover to an equal extent. The PCI leaders have much to say and write about "bloc logic," which they understand as an endeavor by the great powers to preserve and extend their spheres of influence by means of force.

Identifying the policy of the United States and the USSR and the activity of NATO and the Warsaw Pact distorts reality in the most flagrant way and demonstrates a departure both from a class position and an objective evaluation of the policy of the two military-political organizations. It is odd and dangerous when communists do not see the fundamental differences in the class essence of NATO and the Warsaw Pact and their directly opposite role in international relations. Only by completely ignoring the facts is it possible to ascribe identical aims and modus operandi to the aggressive NATO bloc and the Warsaw Pact Organization, which throughout its existence has been an effective factor in the prevention of aggression in Europe.

We would like in this connection to remind the Italian comrades, who call all the time for reliance on the facts, that it is precisely the participants in the Warsaw Pact who, since 1955, almost immediately after it was signed, have repeatedly proposed the simultaneous dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic pact and who, in 1966, proposed--at least as a first step--the liquidation of their military organizations.

The NATO members have not responded to this initiative once. They do not wish to hear even of the dissolution of the alliance, which so faithfully serves the military-industrial complex in the organization of the arms race against socialism and the reactionary forces in their struggle against democratic movements in the member-countries themselves and against the liberation movement in other continents.

It is not out of line to recall the evaluation of NATO made by P. Togliatti. "What does participation in the NATO military bloc signify today?" he asked, addressing the 10th PCI Congress in December 1962. "Declaring this to be essential for the purpose of security is mistaken.... This is no longer an

alliance but chains and a yoke leading the nation to forfeiture of the right to decide its own fate" (P. Togliatti, "Selected Articles and Speeches," vol 2, p 776). But what has changed in NATO since that time? If there have in fact been any changes, they have been for the worse. The militarist ambitions of this bloc's leaders have increased even more. Washington's diktat has become even more insistent. As far as Italy is concerned, in recent years it has repeatedly been the target of crude pressure and intimidation on the part of NATO, particularly for the purpose of preventing the victory of forces of the left in parliamentary elections.

Let us sum of certain conclusions.

The emotionally charged terms "superior court," "sentence," "anathema" and "separation" showed up in the Italian communist press in connection with the critical articles of PRAVDA and KOMMUNIST. In reality, it was nothing of the sort, and it is impossible to "separate" anyone from the international communist movement. This party or the other's membership in the communist movement is determined not at someone's instruction and not by the opinions of other parties even but by the nature of a given party itself, its program, goals and modus operandi, its policy and its fidelity to the ideals of the working class and the great revolutionary science whose founders are Marx, Engels and Lenin. Only the party itself can leave the movement and put itself outside of it.

Pronounced changes occurred in the 1970's in the PCI's ideological-theoretical positions. At first, its theorists reduced the essence of Marxism-Leninism to method (as if there could be method without theory). Then followed the abandonment of Marxism-Leninism on the pretext that it had become a "dogmatic system." Now the PCI leaders bluntly announce that the Communist Party has ceased to be a "party of ideology" defending "ideological pluralism." In other words, a communist party without ideology, that is, without a system of views expressing the fundamental interests of the working class.

PCI theorists have put a whole number of abstract concepts like "historic compromise," "third phase," "third way," "new socialism" and "new internationalism" into circulation. Their content is vague, eclectic and ambiguous. There is no single interpretation of them and disputes of many years' standing, sinking into the sand, about the true meaning of this concept or the other are being conducted in the ranks of the PCI itself. Why is this happening? The point is that these concepts are not constructed on the basis of a strict scientific analysis of the facts but arbitrarily, speculatively and privately. Serious theoretical analysis must not simply group facts into a general outline but reveal their political content. And this cannot be done by proceeding from everyday, surface phenomena. What is needed is a theory that reflects the experience of world history and, through it, the regularities of social development.

Marxism-Leninism is just such an integral theory, formulated by the international workers and communist movement and representing an organic blend of philosophical, economic and political ideas and research methods. As all historical experience testifies, abandonment of revolutionary theory leads

sooner or later to a loss of the correct reference points in politics and is fraught with great dangers for the working class and the people of a given country.

In conclusion, it should be said once again that the interests of the defense of peace and the security of the peoples imperatively demand the cohesion of all forces of the workers, communist and liberation movements and all to whom peace in this world is dear and active struggle for these great goals. It is here, against the aggressive acts and designs of imperialism, that the thoughts and actions of the masses need to be directed. The CPSU is not interested in a polemic with the PCI leadership. But incorrect, unobjective and often false assertions concerning the essence of the social system in the USSR and the CPSU's domestic and foreign policy will, of course, be rebuffed.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

'PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE' -- A SYMPTOM OF NUCLEAR PATHOLOGY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 93-104

[Article by L. Tolkunov]

[Text] The switch to the right in the policy of the ruling circles in the imperialist countries at the beginning of the 1980s was accompanied by a sharp escalation of anti-Soviet and antisocialist propaganda. Reliance on psychological warfare as a system of practical means of applying political and emotional pressure on the USSR and the socialist comity has become a permanent element of imperialist strategy in the ideological struggle against the new world. This fact is not disputed in the West.

It would be mistaken to believe that psychological warfare has reappeared today in Western policy in connection with its withdrawal from detente. During detente as well it was part of the imperialist arsenal, but in different forms, and was waged with the help of more flexible methods. It adapted itself to detente and its purpose was to adapt detente to the tasks of using in the interest of imperialist strategy specific detente phenomena, such as a more liberal exchange of information, increased contacts among people and intensification of economic, scientific and technical and cultural relations. In the present international situation, psychological warfare has not only been restored to its full scale but has reached an unparalleled degree of intensity.

The announcement of a new nuclear strategy, which legitimizes the waging of "limited" nuclear war, the formulation of plans for strengthening all parts of the so-called "triad" of strategic armaments (ground missiles and missiles aboard submarines and heavy bombers), NATO's decision to deploy American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe, the initiated production of the neutron bomb, attempts to take the arms race to outer space, the decision to undertake the mass production of new types of chemical weapons and other actions of a military strategic nature are receiving suitable political-psychological and propaganda support. In assuming the possibility of waging nuclear war for achieving its hegemonistic purposes, Washington is systematically heating up the atmosphere of military psychosis in the world. On the one hand, it tries to present the peaceful efforts of the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity and their struggle for the prevention of thermonuclear war as "weakness" and "retreat" in the face of growing U. S. power; on the other, it is trying to convince the peoples that the threat of nuclear war comes from...the Soviet Union. At the same time the

Western mass propaganda and information media are trying to convince their public of the "rightfulness" of the strategic concepts formulated by Washington, the development of new types of mass destruction weapons and the possibility of dealing a "first" nuclear strike.

Enemy propaganda is resorting to all sorts of tricks in its effort to slander the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union. The United States, the right-wing NATO circles and Beijing, which is now a steady partner of imperialism in the psychological warfare waged against the socialist countries, are persistently trying to promote among the Western European public the idea that Moscow wants to "drive a wedge between the United States and its allies and to split NATO." Washington and other supporters of the deployment of American nuclear weapons in Europe have mounted a slanderous campaign in the hope of compromising the antiwar movement. Its participants are accused either of being "supporters of communism" or of "groundless pacifism." In conjunction with the CIA the U. S. International Communications Agency is trying to concoct "data" which show that peace-supporting organizations in the FRG are receiving funds from "the Soviet bloc," and that demonstrations against the deployment of the new American missiles in Europe are "communist inspired."

A stable system of stereotypes and propaganda cliches is being used in the psychological warfare waged against the USSR and the other fraternal socialist countries, daily and insistently impressed on society by the mass information media. Most noticeable among them is the myth of the "Soviet threat," which, in the words of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, is "a worn-out bogeyman" which "should have been thrown out of serious politics a long time ago." The study of the "theoretical baggage" of the campaign based on this myth reveals that it contains nothing essentially new. "In order to justify the new armaments," V. I. Lenin pointed out, "efforts are being made to paint a picture of the dangers threatening 'the fatherland'" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 23, p 182). The same applies here as well.

This was the purpose of the pamphlet "The Soviet Military Might," with a preface by the U. S. secretary of defense and bearing the official imprimatur of his department, which came out in Washington last year. It was hastily translated into many languages and widely advertized in the American press. Everything indicated the intention of turning it into an extensive piece of propaganda. However, no sensational results obtained. Weinberger himself, the head of the Pentagon, was forced to admit that this "product of U. S. intelligence" contains some versions questioned even by American specialists.

The set of currently used stereotypes includes extensive assertions regarding the threat presented by the USSR to the very existence of the "free world." Such is the distorted interpretation presented by bourgeois propaganda of the objective laws of the global revolutionary process. Another aspect of this concept is that given the U. S. dependence on raw material imports, petroleum above all, "Soviet expansion," as the objectively inevitable similarity of views shared by the USSR and most developing countries on problems of global development is presented by the "Sovietologists," allegedly threatens the "vital interests" of the United States. Such interests are conceived in such broad terms as to make it entirely justified to speak of a rebirth of the ideology of so-called "Pax Americana," i.e., of U. S. global hegemony.

Strange though this may seem, the origins of such views always reside in features adverse to American imperialism, such as the trend toward the loss of its positions as the acknowledged economic leader of the capitalist world, the loss of military superiority over the USSR, and the deep crisis in the ideology of private enterprise and the Americanized system of spiritual and cultural values. It is precisely such circumstances that have strongly encouraged Washington's aspirations to energize the imperialist policy of hegemonism.

The anti-Soviet campaign mounted by the Western mass information media in connection with the charges levelled by the new American administration at the beginning of 1981, of USSR "involvement" in the "training, financing and equipping of international terrorism," also belongs to the old moth-eaten political instruments dusted off from the files of the cold war period and even from the 1920s-1930s. Even after more than one year's time the American government has been unable to submit to world public opinion any convincing proof of such "involvement." As the American press itself has admitted, some draft CIA reports on this matter seem "too weak." They have been so weak that the CIA officially announced that no new publications will be produced on matters of "international terrorism."

The position of the Reagan administration on this matter proved to be nothing but another trick for the use of the sociopolitical problem of terrorism, which has indeed become aggravated in the nonsocialist part of the world and which is the creation of modern capitalism, in the struggle against the socialist countries and the forces of national liberation. The organizers of this campaign intended to draw the attention of the world away from the fact that it is precisely imperialism which bears responsibility for innumerable international acts of terrorism aimed not only against sociopolitical movements and leaders but also against entire nations. In addition to genocide, which was practiced during its aggression in Southeast Asia, the United States is using new means of warfare which have led to the commission of a new crime -- ecocide -- the destruction of the human environment. Currently Washington is trying to legalize biocide -- the waging of war with the help of genetic and similar new types of mass destruction weapons. Manifestations of international terrorism also include Washington's decision to undertake the production of the neutron bomb, the deployment of military bases on foreign territory, the creation of a "rapid deployment force," the unrestrained selling of arms and ammunition and the use of mercenaries in the struggle against national liberation forces. Recent steps have included the decision to deploy new American nuclear missiles in some Western European countries. It is precisely those who have elevated violence, terrorism and diktat to the rank of state policy who are trying to defame our country and its peace-loving and humane policies.

In describing the current position of the ruling U. S. circles, G. Kennan, former U. S. ambassador to the USSR, writes with concern about the "virtually total militarization of the thinking and statements on the subject of Soviet-American relations which currently permeates the atmosphere in Washington and a considerable segment of our mass information media." He describes as "features of intellectual primitivism" actions taken by such circles, such as the "endless series of distortions and oversimplifications," the usual and standardized exaggeration of Moscow's military potential and assumed

maliciousness of its objectives," the "daily misrepresentation of the nature and positions of another great nation," and "the thoughtless use of double standards in evaluating the behavior of the Russians and of our own." In a 3 January 1982 article published in THE BALTIMORE SUN and THE BOSTON GLOBE, Kennan draws the conclusion that "total absorption with nuclear war...is an extreme pathological condition."

The psychological war against the socialist countries has now been mounted along the widest possible front and with the help of a variety of means. Anti-Soviet and antisocialist propaganda dwells extensively on "nonmilitary" problems, the development of the socialist economy in particular. The purpose of such speculations is not only to draw the attention of the toiling masses away from capitalism's internal problems but to help shape ideas on the uselessness and futility of the struggle for a social reorganization of life. For example, the thesis that the hardships experienced by the capitalist economy are also inherent in socialism, and that the ecological, inflationary and other capitalist crises are universal is being thrust upon the public.

Economic, political, ideological, propaganda and openly diversionary means are being combined in the psychological warfare waged against the socialist countries. Governmental institutions, mass information media, intelligence agencies, the corrupt trade union leadership and nationalist, religious, emigre and other groups are being recruited for the various campaigns. Different forms and methods of subversive activities are being used based on the nature of the specific socialist country. As to the indoctrination of the Western public, briefly stated, psychological warfare consists of the concentrated indoctrination of the people through manipulative disinformation propaganda in a spirit of political diversions aimed at encouraging a military psychosis and provoking conflicts and discord among peoples.

Today Poland is an important front in the psychological warfare waged by the West. The socioeconomic crisis in that country proves the high accuracy of the conclusion drawn at the 26th CPSU Congress: "Wherever errors and blunders in domestic policy are added to imperialist subversive activities, grounds appear for the energizing of elements hostile to socialism." The crisis which developed in Poland in 1980-1981 clearly revealed all the methods and means of waging psychological warfare by the reactionary imperialist circles against the forces of peace and social and national liberation. Among others, it became clear that the traditional distinction between "white" and "black" anticommunist propaganda had been virtually abolished and that governmental propaganda in the capitalist countries is not avoiding the use of the clearly provocative means which were once the domain of "yellow journalism" and "anonymous sources."

A "North American Center for Polish Studies," which was established on CIA initiative in June 1975, and whose actions were closely related to those of the Polish emigre "lobby" in the American Congress, and the emigre centers in Paris, London and Stockholm became the chief coordinating anti-Polish propaganda and intelligence operations center. Such centers, which are geographically closer to Poland, specialized in establishing contacts with visiting Polish students, young scientific workers and members of the creative intelligentsia ("unrecognized talents" in particular) and in

influencing them, speculating on the thesis of the "unity of European culture" and playing on extant nationalistic prejudices.

The arsenal of weapons with the help of which imperialist, particularly American, propaganda unleashed its psychological warfare against Poland included an increased number of Free Europe and Voice of America broadcasts, which were beamed at Poland virtually around the clock and flirtation with many members of the Polish intelligentsia, who were offered training facilities in the United States, and the use of cultural exchanges for subversive purposes. Refined treacherous methods were used to turn Polish youth strata, university students in particular, among whom petit bourgeois prejudices were kept alive, against the socialist system.

It was in an atmosphere of frenzied anti-Polish and anti-Soviet campaign, which Washington mounted after the Polish authorities put an end to the activities of counterrevolutionary groups, that the international television show provocatively titled "Let Poland Be Poland," organized on the initiative of the White House, was presented at the end of January 1982. This was a major propaganda diversionary action. In the worst commercial advertizing Hollywood tradition, this "show" was an attempt at open intervention in the sovereign affairs of the Polish people using a variety of modern technical devices, including communications satellites via which it was beamed to other countries. The organizers of this new type of international psychological act of warfare succeeded in involving the participation of many political leaders in the bourgeois countries alongside renegates and traitors of the interests of people's Poland.

Nevertheless, this expensive propaganda spectacle, which actually was a violation of accepted norms of international behavior and stipulations of the United Nations Charter and the Final Act of the Helsinki Agreement, which prohibit intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries, failed to rally the expected millions of viewers, having been refused by many of the largest television companies in Western countries. The only reason for this was the discrepancy between the intent of the producers and directors and the general sentiment of the broad public circles of these countries in favor of detente and international cooperation.

The present round of psychological warfare is characterized by the aim of the imperialist intelligence special services to penetrate more profoundly and thoroughly the economic and social structures of the socialist countries and to shift the battlefield to these countries. An active search is under way to find "vulnerable" spots in their economy, policy and ideology for the purpose of making concentrated attempts to destabilize the political situation of one country or another and to separate it from the socialist comity. This currently specific feature is manifested clearly in the aspiration to relate closely the policy of nuclear blackmail to political and economic actions against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The increasingly treacherous and refined activities conducted against the socialist countries and the use of the full complement of means of defaming and distorting in the eyes of the Western public everything which is happening in these countries and to try to turn the people away from socialist ideas while simulataneously "loosening up" and weakening the socialist world

show, so to say, the face of the psychological war. The reverse side is the desire to create a basis for the ideological "unification" of the capitalist society and to facilitate the conditions for the new stage in the offensive of monopoly capital against the interests of the broad toiling masses with the help of manipulative and disinformation propaganda and the development of anticommunist stereotypes in Western mass consciousness.

A number of organizational and financial steps have been taken within the American institutions working on the intensification of psychological warfare. According to spokesmen for the U. S. administration, their purpose is to formulate "a highly militant policy" with a view to the dissemination of information abroad with the avowed purpose of "opposing" the increasing support enjoyed by the peaceful Soviet foreign policy and the ideas of social progress and the definitive national liberation of all nations. The recent reorganization of the U. S. International Communications Agency (ICA) -- one of the most important instruments in the psychological warfare waged against the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity -- confirms the intention to continue to energize the pursuit of the traditional anti-Soviet and antisocialist course of American imperialist propaganda. Today the ICA maintains more than 200 missions in 126 foreign countries; it publishes 12 journals in 22 languages and employs 7,500 people. In the autumn of 1981, Reagan ordered that its previous name -- the U. S. Information Agency -- be restored. This was not the only case of restoration. "Everything is being turned back," a former ICA official has stated. "We are returning to the age of Truman, "America First" and the entire rhetoric of the cold war.

The real meaning of this reorganization is to link even more closely subversive activities abroad to official Washington's political and economic considerations aimed at fanning the antisocialist psychosis and maximally aggravating the entire international situation. Thus, in order to coordinate the efforts of all U. S. services involved in foreign policy propaganda one way or another, an "interdepartmental commission" is being set up. It will include, among others, senior State Department, CIA and Pentagon officials.

The regular activities of these services are based on "Project Truth" -- the pharisaic name given to an anti-Soviet and anticommunist program. Accordingly, Washington is already systematically disseminating throughout the world a monthly bulletin which includes provocative "Soviet propaganda warnings" and materials publicizing the "positive features of the capitalist society."

The radio stations are becoming increasingly active in all main directions of the psychological war. Although it publicly relinquished control of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, the CIA is continuing to direct their activities through the International Broadcasting Council, which was established on the suggestion of "former" CIA personnel in 1973. The fact that these stations continue to operate as CIA branches is confirmed by their so-called nonbroadcasting activities -- collecting intelligence data from the socialist countries for the special services. In the execution of large-scale psychological warfare operations these radio stations operate in conjunction with NATO organizations performing similar tasks.

Now the American administration intends not only to raise the subsidies received by these radio stations but to change their work style and methods.

For example, F. Nicolaidis, the new deputy director of the Voice of America, has called for dropping the tendency to broadcast all kinds of "sentimental rubbish" and for engaging in "effective" propaganda. "We must try to destabilize the Soviet Union and its allies and help to spoil relations between peoples and rulers..." is the way he conceives of the role of the Voice of America, passing off the unattainable hopes of the psychological warfare strategists as a realistic possibility. "Let us not be excessively soft towards the communists" and "let us become more sharp-tongued," are appeals taken as a manual for action, for the information provided by the foreign policy propaganda organs of the United States and to a certain degree the Western European members of NATO has lost the element of political restraint, which had been practiced during detente, and is currently distinguished by the embittered tone characteristic of the cold war period.

The so-called U. S. "intelligence community", mainly the CIA, has strongly urged greater intransigence in U. S. policy toward the USSR and the other members of the socialist comity and the heating up of psychological warfare. We know that during the 1970s the CIA steadily supplied the various administrations and the U. S. mass information media with forged "data" on the growth of Soviet military potential. The CIA is exaggerating Soviet power, the Stockholm Peace Institute has noted. The assessment of Soviet military spending made by the CIA on the basis of American prices should be considered as almost totally misleading. Nevertheless, such "data" are extensively disseminated through the press, radio and television. One third of the CIA budget goes to the "dissemination of information" abroad, i.e., on propaganda diversions and psychological warfare. The "empire" of mass information media under CIA control includes as many as 800 organizations in different countries. During the past 20 years hundreds of American journalists have carried out secret CIA assignments. They have engaged in espionage, recruitment of agents and dissemination of disinformation, and have carried out other assignments incompatible with journalistic ethics.

The Defense Department's Public Relations Agency has substantially contributed to the efforts of all those in Washington who rely on lies and slanders in the confrontation with real socialism. The Pentagon has at its disposal about 250 radio and 40 television stations throughout the world. It publishes anti-Soviet books, pamphlets, periodicals and newspapers totalling as many as 8 million copies per year, and produces about 1,200 motion pictures, 3,500 films for television and as many radio programs. T. White, the American historian, has described with full justification the Pentagon's propaganda machine as a powerful "brainwashing" system. Its efforts are confirmed by the steadily rising expenditures of the American Department of Defense for militaristic propaganda and psychological warfare: they totalled about \$300 million for the 1977-1978 fiscal year alone.

The bourgeois politicians consider subversive propaganda an instrument for mass influence, which requires efficient and powerful mass information media. No funds are spared in keeping it in a state of combat readiness. The American administration spends \$2.5 billion on propaganda annually. Ten years ago, the combined Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe budget totalled \$35 million. Today it is triple that. The 1973 MECA budget was \$200 million; it is \$561 million today. The cost of maintaining the British Council, which has a leading position in British foreign policy propaganda, is raising with

every passing year. The government of the FRG is generously financing the Goethe Institute, which is a most important foreign policy propaganda tool.

However, notwithstanding the reorganization of the foreign policy apparatus with a view to aligning it with the new broad tasks and the huge outlays of funds, manpower and energy for propagandizing the foreign policy of the American government, U. S. policies remain unpopular in many countries and areas. The overwhelming majority of Indian citizens who were asked "whose foreign policy do you trust most -- that of the USSR, the United States, Britain or China?" gave the USSR as their first choice rather than the United States. Information agencies are being set up in many parts of the globe to eliminate the American monopoly over the dissemination of information and to counter it with truthful and objective information, in order to put an end to the muddy stream of lies and slander coming out of U. S. propaganda centers.

The fact that the imperialist camp has no single center or general staff in charge of conducting psychological warfare hardly means that such activities are not internationally coordinated. The decision to create a so-called "information service" to coordinate the efforts on the "psychological front" within NATO was made as early as 1959. This service is still operating in close contact with the leading news agencies and the press, radio and television organs of the main capitalist countries. The very fact that major political and social figures and noted Western "Sovietologists" and political experts attend NATO symposiums and conferences is reason enough to consider the recommendations they adopt as fundamental, conceptual and applicable throughout NATO. They are subsequently taken into consideration by the information services in the capitalist world. Also indicative is the fact that the U. S. ICA maintains a permanent five-member staff of correspondents at NATO headquarters in Brussels. It is obviously no accident that NATO propaganda clearly uses identical stereotypes and "facts" and "arguments" usually produced in the United States.

There is also coordination within the EEC and the Tripartite Commission. It is mostly informal, taking place during consultations, and is concealed from the public. This is not astounding, for even major political decisions affecting the capitalist world are being made by its leaders through "quiet" diplomacy, during secret meetings with representatives of the monopoly elite and its experts. For example, it is a fact that virtually all annual conferences of heads of governments of the seven largest capitalist countries held in recent years have followed unpublicized meetings of the real owners of "big money." It is they who have resolved practical problems related to the use of such funds in the implementation of the strategy they recommend.

The "invisible rule" of international intertwined capital, as represented by the Bilderberg Club or the Tripartite Commission, for example, unquestionably extends to psychological warfare. Here again, its activities clearly prove K. Marx's idea that "the capitalists, who display such scant fraternal feelings in their competition among themselves, are also members of a truly Masonic brotherhood in the struggle against the working class as a whole" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 25, part I, p 217).

As antiwar and anti-American feelings mount in Europe, the ruling U. S. circles are trying actively to involve the members of NATO in the

indoctrination of Western European public opinion, to raise the feeling of hysteria on the subject of the "Soviet military threat," to support of the plans for establishing military superiority over the countries of real socialism, etc. In the footsteps of the Pentagon, the British Ministry of Defense published a guideline of sorts on the "growth of Soviet military superiority." Its authors reached the delirious conclusion that today the danger facing Europe from the USSR is greater than that of the fascist occupation in WW II. Numerous scenarios are being concocted in an atmosphere of military psychosis and with a view to indoctrinating the population. Their purpose is to prove that a new world war is not too far away. The BBC produced a program entitled "If a Bomb Is Dropped." In the United States, the television public saw the equally provocative film "First Strike."

Certain differences exist between the conduct of militaristic propaganda in the United States and in Western Europe. Differences exist in the psychological warfare approach to detente between the foreign policies of the United States and the Western European NATO countries. Whereas Washington is openly counting on the rejection of detente and its "destruction," the Western European capitals have manifested the wish to preserve the channels of mutually profitable international cooperation, economic above all, opened by detente. Nevertheless, the increasing use of various means and methods of psychological warfare has become reality not only in the actions of the United States but of the ruling circles of many Western European countries. The development of psychological warfare by imperialism, combined with increased military expenditures and plans for the development of new weaponry systems, is encouraging very dangerous adventuristic trends in the foreign policy strategy and tactics of the rulers of the capitalist world.

The formulation of psychological warfare plans is mainly the work of professional politicians and officials of the bureaucratic systems of the imperialist governments. The proimperialist members of Western academic circles play a great role in supplying them with "intellectual" support and doctrinal elements. Their influence on the political thinking of psychological warfare practitioners is as unquestionable as the fact that it is precisely the current concerns of the policy makers that frequently determine the interest and thoughts of the researchers.

Today the "brain trusts" of the Reagan persuasion in the United States and other capitalist countries play a particularly important role in formulating the strategy of psychological warfare and inflating the nuclear psychosis. Characteristically, even before the recent statements by U. S. leaders in defense of nuclear war, the journal FOREIGN AFFAIRS had published an article,

which stated among others that "The United States must plan for victory over the Soviet state at a price which will not prevent the rebuilding of the United States." C. Gray and C. Paine, its authors, are members of the Hudson Institute, a conservative "think tank," and are close to the Reagan cabinet. Recommendations are supplied to the White House also by organizations such as the Hoover Institution of War, Revolution and Peace, the Center for Strategic Studies of Georgetown University, the Institute for Political Studies of the University of Pennsylvania, the Heritage Foundation and the American Business Institute. According to the American press, today the funds of the largest corporations involved in the war business are flowing toward these "main

centers of conservative thinking," in the belief that the liberal ideas and programmatic concepts of Harvard University and the Brookings Institution, dating from the period of Democratic rule, no longer meet U. S. interests.

The dominant position of the American "research" centers within the system of Western "Sovietology" allows Washington to exert a guiding influence -- directly or indirectly -- on the propaganda centers of other countries and to impose its concepts on them, i.e., to implement its "Sovietological" expansionism, if one may describe it thusly.

Today the importance of all forces which oppose taking the world to the precipice of a nuclear conflict and the practical analysis of the arguments which represent a kind of "theoretical" foundation for the course of steady winding of the armament spiral, is self-evident. It is a question mainly of exposing the notorious myth of the "Soviet threat" in its various updated versions and criticizing the political concepts on which the principle of "peace through strength" is based. It is also a question of exposing concepts which emphasize the stimulating role of the war industry, which allegedly lowers unemployment and ensures economic growth, whereas in fact in the final account militarization reduces the possibility of accumulating capital and the solution of social problems.

It is precisely from this viewpoint that the arms race program adopted by the Reagan administration must be considered. This is not only a long-term program for stable and government-guaranteed profits to the military-industrial complex but also a program for robbing the working people. It is precisely they who are paying an increasing share of the taxes used on military expenditures and it is precisely they who must pay for the new and increasingly more costly military ordnance.

The military-industrial complex, which embodies the most distorted features of the capitalist production method today, has created a real threat to mankind through the unrestrained arms race, by hanging over it the sword of thermonuclear war. The roots of the current political course followed by the United States lie precisely in the energized activities of the military-industrial complex and its growing influence on the formulation of foreign policy guidelines. The sharp turn taken by U. S. imperialism toward preparations for thermonuclear war was taken under the conditions in which the military-industrial complex, which has always been interested in undermining detente and Soviet-American agreements on limiting strategic armaments, was able to win over on its side some other groups of the American bourgeoisie at the start of the 1980s -- the multinational monopolies, which

are clearly displeased by the processes of social change which were intensified in the developing countries with detente, and the bourgeois circles which, under the influence of factors such as the energy crisis in the United States, the seizure of hostages in Tehran, etc., were seized by a fit of chauvinism and unrestrained militancy.

The conclusion which may be drawn from the study of the class roots of Reagan's militaristic course is that the psychological preparations undertaken by the United States regarding the possibility of nuclear war are not circumstantial, and that attempts to exacerbate the military psychosis will

go on as the current American military programs are being implemented. It is equally obvious that along with its long-term objectives and with the active support of monopoly circles of the Western European bourgeoisie, which are closely linked with the United States, its purpose is to justify and substantiate Washington's intransigent and irreconcilable position regarding a dialog with the Soviet Union at the Soviet-American talks on medium-range nuclear weapons in Geneva or in the course of other contacts, in which the American side is showing a tendency to drag out the talks as long as possible while trying to blame the Soviet Union for this state of affairs.

Can the peaceful intentions of the United States be proven by the fact that it is the United States which holds the sorry record in the development of new types of mass destruction weapons? It is well known that the atom bomb was developed first by the United States in 1945 and then by the USSR in 1949; missile-carrying submarines were developed by the two countries respectively in 1956 and 1962 and MIRV missiles in 1964 and 1972. Medium-range missiles and atomic artillery also appeared first in the American and then, as a countermeasure, in the Soviet forces. The pamphlet "Who Threatens Peace?" recently published by the USSR Ministry of Defense, gives a convincing idea on the situation in the area of armaments, i.e., specifically on the existence of military-strategic parity between the United States and the Soviet Union and between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, and on the true objectives of the policy pursued by the Reagan administration, which is intensifying the nuclear arms race. The data cited convincingly prove the U. S. aspiration to acquire the potential for a first strike.

The facts prove that Pentagon planners are giving priority to the development of offensive nuclear missiles and delivery system, together with command, control and communications facilities which, it is believed across the ocean, provide an opportunity for the practical use of such armaments. This specifically applies to the Navstar global position system aimed at the suitable military use of man-made earth satellites. According to American specialists, it could be considered "aimed mainly at launching a preventive strike." This conclusion is based on the fact that the Pentagon now intends to put the new MX strategic missiles in the old silos, thus invalidating the notorious thesis of their "mobility," which was used as justification for their development. The new plans for their location convincingly prove that they are needed by the American military above all as part of its preparations for a first strike.

The arguments used to justify the expediency of deploying new American medium-range missiles in Western Europe equally fail to prove the defensive nature of American military doctrine. The 1,053 launching systems for ICBMs, the more than 570 heavy bombers and as many as 648 launching systems for ballistic missiles mounted on submarines, "targeted" on Europe, are scheduled to retain their essential strategic role. Powerful NATO theater nuclear arms are concentrated on the European continent and in adjacent waters (986 units). Another shock force is the large group of U. S. armed forces (336,200 men) permanently stationed in Europe. The question is why under such circumstances is it necessary to deploy new medium-range systems in Western Europe? The answer is simple: to back the aggressive ambitions of American imperialism.

The Pentagon's propaganda stir concerning an imaginary "imbalance" is merely a screen used to conceal measures aimed at increasing "theater" armaments in Western Europe. This is the only possible explanation for charges that the USSR is "disturbing the balance" with its SS-20 missiles, the deployment of which was known as early as during the SALT II talks.

The study of the programs which constitute the material base of the new military strategy of the United States indicates that in the long run they represent one more attempt by U. S. imperialism to channel historical developments into a suitable bed by force, ignoring the danger of a general nuclear catastrophe.

As in the past, major obstacles stand on the way of such attempts today. The overall ratio of forces in the world, which is changing to the detriment of the aggressive imperialist circles, and the military- strategic parity reached between the Soviet Union and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO reliably guarantee the prevention of military adventures which could prove fatal to the future of mankind. The truth regarding the real essence of the peaceful foreign policy of the USSR and the other members of the socialist comity its working its way through the fabric of slanderous fabrications. The peace program for the 1980s formulated by the 26th CPSU Congress is retaining its positive influence on the general state of international relations. It is energizing the foreign policy activities of countries supporting the preservation and consolidation of peace and is mobilizing the broad popular masses in the West to active antiwar actions. The psychological warfare unleashed by the militaristic forces of imperialism is not yielding the dividends expected by its promoters without, however, becoming any less dangerous because of this.

The propaganda measures, currently implemented by U. S. imperialism, are nothing but a psychological preparation for nuclear war. This is the core of the entire set of practical measures with the help of which the U. S. administration is trying to broaden the scale and to exacerbate the psychological warfare. The study of its objectives, forms and methods, its ideological or "intellectual" arsenal and above all its influence on the military and political decisions made by the White House indicates that the psychological warfare unleashed currently by Washington is not only a means for giving propaganda support to the foreign policy strategy of imperialism but an independent factor for the subversion of detente and exacerbation of tension. By targeting its weapons on the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity it presents a threat to the entire world. It could harm all continents, for which reason it demands of all nations to be particularly vigilant.

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

5003
CSO: 1802/10

SOME PROBLEMS OF CONSUMER GOODS PRODUCTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 105-108

[Letter to the editors by I. Motorin, candidate of economic sciences]

[Text] In our country great attention is being paid to increasing the production of cultural and household goods, the demand for which is increasing rapidly. The 26th CPSU Congress reemphasized the urgent need for increasing their production in the interest of improving the well-being of the Soviet people further.

During the 10th Five-Year Plan the production of consumer goods increased by 41 percent. Their variety and quality improved. In 1980 availability of individual durable goods per 100 families was as follows: watches, 518; radio receivers, 85; television sets, 85; refrigerators, 86; washing machines, 70; sewing machines, 65, etc.

Currently a specific complex has been developed for the production of such commodities by heavy industry which has a highly developed production system, modern equipment, the necessary material resources and skilled cadres. Several dozen industrial ministries and departments are engaged in their production in addition to their main activities. The share of the output of such commodities at heavy industry enterprises has reached almost 80 percent of their overall output, and even 100 percent in the case of some groups of items.

The task for 1980-1985 is to increase the production of consumer goods by no less than 40 percent. This will require a considerable improvement in quality and the steady updating and improvement in the variety of such goods. The production of technically complex durable items, distinguished by their new type of functional purposes and economy, improved consumer and esthetic qualities, and greater convenience, must be developed on an accelerated basis. Unfortunately, the variety of such items is being renovated extremely slowly, and some of them, which are needed by the population, are not produced in general. Many industrial enterprises are producing a variety of models of household equipment and appliances quite similar to each other. Sometimes this creates merely the appearance of variety, while actually hindering the true renovation of variety and quality improvements. Some producers frequently supply obsolete goods which are not in demand. This overloads the trade network while the need for many items is not fully met, although heavy industry has the potential for producing them.

Shortcomings in organizing the production of new consumer goods and updating their variety may be partially explained by the poor relations (particularly feedback) between manufacturing and trade enterprises. This leads to increased demand for one or another consumer item. However, this is not the main difficulty. Under the present planning, price-setting and management system, in order to reduce drastically or terminate entirely the production of goods which are not particularly needed or, let us frankly say, which are not in demand by the population, naturally the reduced volumes, both in terms of cash and variety, must be compensated for. In this case the enterprise is the first to decide and it is only then that funds and contractual obligations appear, i.e., that sectorial support is ensured. Providing that the development and production of new items at the enterprise has been efficiently organized, success is guaranteed and all outlays (particularly for improvements in the management structure) can be recovered within the expected period.

However, the solution to the considerable expansion of production and improving the quality of consumer goods is not limited to the enterprise. It is a question of raising the level of specialization, the significance of which rises as the scale of output expands. The use of highly productive equipment becomes economically justified, for the mass production of goods makes the full utilization of equipment in terms of time and capacity possible. The labor process is significantly better organized at specialized enterprises producing consumer goods, and their working time losses are lower. All of this, naturally, lowers material and labor outlays and, correspondingly, reduces production costs. This can be illustrated by data on the level of labor intensiveness and production costs of a 180-liter capacity refrigerator produced by enterprises on a different mass basis.

The annual production of 20,000 such refrigerators (model "Snayge") has a labor intensiveness of 16.9 norm/hours, while production costs come to 134.5 rubles. The respective indicators in the production of 150,000 units per year ("Yuryuzan") are 12.2 and 124.5; for 250,000 ("Minsk")--8.9 and 118.3; for 500,000 ("Orsk"), they are 6.5 norm/hours and 86 rubles.

We see, therefore, that in enterprises with a lower level of specialization labor intensiveness is higher by a 2.0-2.8 factor and production costs are 20 to 50 percent higher compared with the plant which manufactures "Orsk" refrigerators.

Ministries and departments must work hard to develop production specialization. Above all, they must eliminate the unjustified scattered nature of the production of identical goods by a large number of enterprises under different ministries. All of this inevitably leads to the creation of small shops and sectors, which greatly hinders the installation of comprehensive automation and mechanization facilities for production processes. This leads to low economic indicators.

Specialization in the production of goods in mass demand is directly related to upgrading the level of standardization of produced and newly developed items and technological processes. Of late, a number of industrial sectors have done some work in this direction. In our view, however, such efforts

should be pursued more energetically. Thus, today industry is producing 50 different models of radio receivers and radio phonographs, 40 different models of washing machines, 34 types of electric shavers, 15 types of meat grinders, etc. The time has come to introduce proper order in the variety of these and many other items, the more so since the customers have shown their preference for a limited number of models of refrigerators and washing machines produced.

Another subject of concern is the insufficient centralization in the development of new types of technically complex items. Currently more than 90 percent of such items are produced on the basis of engineering designs drafted at the enterprises themselves, while about 5 percent are based on models exhibited at the All-Union Stand of Best Models of Consumer Goods of the USSR Ministry of Trade, and only 2 percent are based on technical documentation drafted on a centralized basis by scientific research institutes and design bureaus of ministries and departments. Such decentralization also leads to an unjustified variety of items and, in particular, technological processes. An excessive variety of equipment and technological fittings is used and manual labor is extensively employed. All of this adversely affects the quality and production costs of these items.

In this connection, we believe it expedient to develop specialized design bureaus for specific groups of items, which will provide on a centralized basis the technological documentation to industrial enterprises regardless of departmental affiliation.

In addition to everything else, this approach would facilitate servicing of technically complex consumer goods. Such difficulties are caused above all by the perennial shortage of spare parts. According to partial data, this is the reason for the fact that up to 30 percent of household appliances are inoperative. Naturally, extensive commodity standardization would enable us to eliminate this negative phenomenon, for the interchangeability of individual assemblies and parts would increase sharply.

Optimal concentration must be added to production specialization. By ensuring the concentrated production of consumer goods mainly at the enterprises or at technically well-equipped subunits, it ensures the fullest possible utilization of the advantages of large-scale mass output.

The increased production scale of cultural and consumer goods would enable many sectors to lower substantially specific capital investments and lower costs per unit of installed capacity. This is characteristic of enterprises producing television sets, watches and other items. Here labor and material resources per unit of output are used more efficiently and material intensiveness is lowered.

However, despite the great advantages of production concentration, its current level in the production of said items cannot be considered adequate. A substantial quantity of consumer goods continues to be produced in small production subunits the output of which is low. Naturally, it cannot be considered normal when more than 70 percent of such enterprises have a gross output worth under 100,000 rubles. Such poor production concentration of identical

goods leads to unjustified costs and losses and slows down the solution of major problems in the area of scientific and technical progress and in upgrading production efficiency.

Improvements in planning offer great opportunities for increasing the production of consumer goods and improving their quality and variety in heavy industry sectors.

The variety of consumer goods planned on a centralized basis includes slightly more than 300 items. The remaining goods are classified in the "other commodities" group according to their value. The further breakdown of this group is accomplished at the lower management levels.

Bearing in mind the existence of specialized plants in the production of refrigerators, washing machines and other items, the production of which is included in the national economic plan in terms of physical units, in frequent cases the variety of consumer goods planned on a centralized basis for the remaining enterprises accounts for no more than 10-15 percent of their output. Most of the assignments are issued in terms of value only. Naturally, this results in unnecessary duplication in the production of similar items at different enterprises, unnecessary outlays for mastering their production and frequently unsecured sales over long periods of time. Furthermore, this situation enables the big heavy industry enterprises with skilled cadres and advanced equipment to fulfill their plans for the production of consumer goods by manufacturing the simplest possible items rather than producing technically complex scarce items. As a result, plans for the production of knives, forks, spoons and breadbaskets are overfulfilled while plans for the manufacturing of coffeepots, thermoses, cigarette lighters and other relatively more complex items remain unfulfilled.

The head ministries are scheduled to play an important role in planning the production of consumer goods. However, they frequently fail to cope with their assignments of supplying the population with goods in mass demand they are required to produce. The time has come, therefore, to hasten with the drafting of a new regulation on head ministries, which would define more clearly their rights and obligations in planning and organizing the production of consumer goods.

The current procedure for setting high-level indicators (labor productivity, production cost, etc) lowers the incentive of the enterprises to increase the production of consumer goods. For a number of reasons, labor productivity in the production of said goods is as a rule lower than for the main production, while production costs are higher. However, since all of these indicators are planned only for the entire plant, the increased production of consumer goods worsens such indicators. It becomes more profitable to sell the byproducts than to organize their utilization and thus to expand the production of goods in mass demand.

The topical task of increasing the production of consumer goods is still not being properly reflected in the material incentive system. This is manifested, for example, in the fact that in the shops and sectors engaged in the production of such items the average wage and bonuses are considerably lower than those in the main production facilities. This situation must be corrected.

The organization of wholesale fairs, which should contribute to the fuller consideration on the part of industry of the demand of the trade network and the population, must be improved further.

Currently the commercial organizations can purchase at wholesale fairs only commodities manufactured by enterprises within the territory of a specific republic. This procedure is justified only in terms of simple goods but is harmful in terms of technically complex items: demand for items which are clearly substandard in terms of quality, level of profitability, etc, compared with those produced in other republics, is artificially encouraged. This harms both the population and the state. A procedure must be established according to which technically complex items produced at enterprises not only within the republic but in other, essentially neighboring, republics should be exhibited at republic wholesale fairs.

Improving the planning of the production of commodities in mass demand presumes improvements in price setting as well. The wholesale prices of consumer goods are not being used in settling accounts with the consumers but are used in organizing the cost effectiveness system at enterprises and in settling the accounts between manufacturing enterprises and the financial organs regarding the turnover tax.

The formulation of such prices is hindered mainly by the great fluctuation of outlays for the production of identical goods at different enterprises. Thus, differences in the production cost of the same model refrigerator manufactured by plants which have been issued identical production programs may be as high as 50 percent; such differences may be as high as 70 percent in the case of washing machines. This is explained above all by the existence of different technical production levels. Under such circumstances, the setting of wholesale prices on the basis of average sectorial outlays inevitably results in drastic and frequently unjustified differences in the levels of profitability.

Enterprises engaged in the production of goods in mass demand have been granted broad rights in the area of price setting. Prices are frequently set without their subsequent approval by state organizations. Without infringing on the rights of enterprises, scientific recommendations should be drafted in such a way that prices would maximally stimulate increased output and improved quality without, however, lowering consumer demand.

It would be expedient for ministries and departments to set up a special centralized fund for stimulating the production of goods in mass demand and complementing items, assemblies, parts, and special types of raw and other materials needed for the production of such commodities with a view to increasing the interest of industrial enterprises and their personnel in increasing the volume of output, widening and improving variety and improving the quality and technical standards of consumer goods. Such a fund could be created, first of all, out of withholdings from the assets of the material incentive fund of ministries (departments), as stipulated in the annual plan and in amounts coordinated with an interdepartmental commission of the Gosplans of union republics; secondly, 25 percent of the additional profit and the turnover tax from the ministry (department) as a whole earned from increasing the volume of output of consumer goods, compared with the five-year plan assignments, could be added to this fund.

In our view, in order to improve the activities of all sectors, subsectors, types and groups of industrial facilities producing consumer goods, it would be expedient to create a system of centralized intersectorial management. Such a system would make it possible to plan and organize the production of commodities in mass demand more accurately. Its formulation is becoming increasingly necessary with the increased production of goods in mass demand, for the coordinating role of the head ministries is not always effective. Without the necessary legal and economic levers, one ministry cannot influence another in terms of the strict implementation of the recommendations regarding the creation of production facilities specializing in the production of items needed by the population, their timely renovation and stopping the production of items which are not in demand. Other departments do not always undertake to carry out the recommendations drafted by the head ministry on improving the organization of the production of their assigned groups of consumer goods. As a result, the process of their production remains poorly controlled. The lack of such coordination encourages individual rayons, sectors and departments to look for various forms of interaction with a view to the rational location of production facilities for the manufacturing of consumer goods, the cooperation and centralization of their production and improvement in the methods used in determining consumer demand.

The Baltic republics, Belorussia and Moldavia are trying to resolve problems related to intensifying the specialization and concentration in the production of consumer goods at heavy and local industry enterprises. They set up a coordination center in 1976, whose main task is the efficient location of facilities for the production of such items by individual sectors and republics. The task of the coordinating center would be to ensure the better utilization of the potential of the large industrial enterprises under union jurisdiction, which have powerful production facilities, a developed modern technology and highly skilled cadres but which...nevertheless are engaged in the production of simple items. Experience in shifting the production of such goods from heavy industry to local industry enterprises and the use of the thus released capacities for the production of technically complex items exists.

This practice should be expanded and similar coordination should be organized on a national scale.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

PRICE OF MISTRUST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 108-110

[Letter to the editors by A. Dunart, Nikolayevskaya Oblast]

[Text] I find proper and useful the fact that a theoretical and political journal (I have been a reader of your journal for more than 35 years) would discuss a number of practical problems demanding an urgent solution. In particular, issue No 14 for 1981 published the article "Mandatory Component for Success" by Dr of Economic Sciences K. Pankova, which deals with one of the most important problems of the development of agriculture--the means to eliminate kolkhoz and sovkhoz losses and to improve their profitability.

I spent 20 years as kolkhoz chairman and was released from my position because of cardiovascular illness. For the past 3 years I have been chairman of the Bogachevskiy Rural Soviet, Krivoozerskiy Rayon, Nikolayevskaya Oblast. I frankly admit that this position gives me a great deal of free time to think of the past and to assess it critically. As I near the end of my labor career (I am already 60 years old) I would like to express some considerations on the question raised by the author of that article.

It was after the September 1953 and particularly the March 1965 CC CPSU plenums that the kolkhozes were able to reach a level of efficiency (no other description of the situation is possible). In particular, from a backward farm, our Kolkhoz imeni Gor'kiy became an average profitable farm. Some years, animal husbandry was a losing sector but the high profitability of crop growing (150-170 percent) covered the outlays for the production of animal husbandry goods. During the 7th, 8th and 9th five-year plans the farm's profitability reached 70 percent. The kolkhoz was able to fulfill its plans and deliver above-plan goods, while the surplus was left at its disposal. It could sell it on the market or market it on a commission or cooperated basis. The net annual income averaged 350,000 to 450,000 rubles. This was not much, but the kolkhoz was able to engage in expanded reproduction and in extensive construction work paid out of its own and borrowed funds. We built a house of culture, two village clubs, a sector hospital, a school and many other industrial and cultural premises and projects. The material and cultural standards of our kolkhoz members improved.

In the past few years, however, the kolkhoz began to surrender its positions in terms of all basic indicators. Losses were in excess of 100,000 rubles. The other kolkhozes in our rayon found themselves in a similar situation. Yet 5 to 7 years ago they were the most profitable in the oblast and were always given as examples.

I entirely agree with Comrade Pankova that losses "are not a zonal phenomenon in the least." It is not only a question of the level of management of lagging farms, which is frequently mentioned. In our rayon, for example, all kolkhoz chairmen are university graduates and have great practical experience; we have good specialists and the agricultural cadres of the rayon party committee, rayon executive committee and agricultural management are also good, knowledgeable and have practical experience. Naturally, it cannot be denied that one manager or another could work better than he does today. Nevertheless, the main reason for the lagging, in my view, lies elsewhere: it is found in the unscientific, subjectivistic planning.

For example, the Kolkhoz imeni Gor'kiy plans to sell the state 4,500 tons of grain annually during the 11th Five-Year Plan. In order to be able to meet this assignment, yields must average 42-45 quintals. The kolkhoz is not as yet prepared for this. The plan calls for annual sales of 600 tons of sunflowers whereas annual sales have averaged 350 to 400 tons. Unquestionably, yields must grow and the volumes of output must be increased. It is clear, however, that the plan figures as well must be realistic and substantiated.

Planning "from above" is continuing on a persistent and insistent basis: how much to sow, when to sow, how to plow (shallow or deep) and how many cows and hogs to be raised; time charts for breeding the animals are issued, etc. How does this affect the farm? Let me cite one example only. In the Kolkhoz imeni Gor'kiy animal husbandry has specialized in raising calves. The rayon farms must renew their cattle herds by one-quarter every year and the kolkhoz must supply for this purpose 2,500 head of cattle. In this case the question of quality is particularly important. However, the structure of the areas under crops, which has been submitted to the kolkhoz "from above" and which is urgently recommended for the 11th Five-Year Plan, makes the raising of good calves virtually impossible because of the shortage of fresh fodder. Let me not burden you with figures. I shall merely point out that it has been already determined that only 45 to 50 percent of the needs of the cattle for fresh fodder can be met (including second mowing and the use of sugar-beet tops). This is a "lean" structure. Meanwhile, the kolkhoz specialists have submitted a suggestion on how to fulfill a scientifically substantiated plan for the sale of grain to the government and meet 90-95 percent of the livestock's need for fresh fodder. However, will they be able to implement their suggestion?

The fact that the farms themselves must determine the volume of output of the various items, the structure of the areas of their crops, the number and productivity of the herds, crop yields, forms of labor organization, and problems of social development was emphasized at the October 1980 CC CPSU Plenum and the 26th party congress. Despite the categorical ban, the

"launching" of plans, schedules and assignments and the use of regulations and petty supervision of kolkhoz activities go on. Particular attention was paid to the inadmissibility of such practices at the November 1981 CC CPSU Plenum.

In our area the managers of farms which have averaged 500 to 600 quintals of milk per 100 hectares of farmland but have failed to fulfill their sales plan are criticized; conversely, those who have averaged 150 to 200 quintals, but have fulfilled their plans (one can see how well substantiated such plans are) are praised. It is said that habit is very powerful. However, the habit "to command" has caused and continues to cause great damage to agriculture. I cannot recall anyone ever being held strictly liable for such damages.

In my view, the distortion and violation of party directives should be considered as nothing less than disrespect for these directives on the part of some workers.

Unquestionably, one of the most important reasons for the increasing number of low profitability or losing farms is the lack of faith in the ability of managers to direct the affairs of the kolkhozes and sovkhoses entrusted to them without instructions "from above" or petty supervision, and subjectivism in planning.

The second question is that of prices.

The kolkhozes in our rayon sell grain to the state at 5.6-8 rubles, while buying from the reception centers mixed fodder at 18-20 rubles per quintal. We deliver fodder to our own mixed feed plant at 2.5-5 rubles and buy the mixed fodder at 12-14 rubles per quintal. How can the farm compensate for the cost of producing animal husbandry products and reduce production costs? In this case we are affected by the cost of the gross output: the more procurement officials or the workers in the mixed feed industry earn the better they look.

A great deal of farm produce must be sold to pay for the maintenance of a truck or a combine. Given this situation it is difficult to meet production costs, not to mention showing a profit. We must agree with the author of the article in *KOMMUNIST* that we should consider the use of sliding purchase prices "the levels of which must maintain an inverse ratio to the crops." The third question is that of stereotypes used in the use of new technology, arbitrary recommendations concerning the organization of the work, etc.

Let me cite the following example. For the past 7 to 10 years mouldless surface soil cultivation has been practiced in our Nikolayevskaya Oblast. This system has proved its effectiveness in the virgin lands in our own area of risky farming. The new technology requires a full set of labor tools (flat cutters, surface plows, cultivators, stubble drills), the mandatory use of herbicides and a special fertilizer system. We began to "apply" this new technology while lacking the necessary amount of cultivation tools and herbicides. The fields were disked and flat cutters were used only in a few places. What happened? The fields in our Krivoozerskiy Rayon, which

was once famous for its high farming standards, became a nursery for weeds, particularly for the sow thistle (which we fight with deep plowing). The increased amount of weeds considerably reduced yields, particularly of industrial crops and corn. For example, whereas in 1977 our kolkhoz averaged 55 quintals of grain corn per hectare, it averaged 35.4 in 1978, 32.3 in 1979, 25 in 1980 and 15-16 quintals in 1981. The respective figures for sugar beets were 306, 264, 171, 224 and 74 quintals per hectare. A different combination could have been found in combining the new with the old technology and gradually converting to surface cultivation as the farms were supplied with the necessary equipment and herbicides. This was not done (a proper report was submitted). Regrettably, no one was held accountable!

Quite frequently such declines in the yields of grain and other crops are justified by citing poor weather conditions. Naturally, the weather plays an important role and must be taken into consideration. However, the weather has nothing to do with the fact that in some farms the land is not properly cultivated, the crop rotation system has not been mastered and fertilizer is used improperly. The only possible conclusion is that the agronomical service must be comprehensively improved. The agronomist is the chief technologist in farming. The first aspect of his work must be to engage in an active and purposeful search for the most effective practical measures and means to upgrade soil fertility and increase yields. However, the arbitrary use of technology frequently results in the fact that the agronomist remains a passive observer, a person without initiative. There have been cases of agronomists drawing up in advance, in the winter, lists of reasons for production failures in one or another kolkhoz sector, particularly in crop growing. It is high time to put an end to this.

Comrade Pankova is absolutely right in saying that "a thorough study must be made to determine the reasons causing a specific farm to fall behind. A complete (yes, complete!) set of measures must be formulated for catching up. The handling of resources must be planned and above all the inertia in the attitude concerning lagging enterprises must be eliminated." Let me add that we must also eliminate the arbitrary methods of agricultural production management. We must show greater faith in farm managers and specialists. They must be given greater independence and be encouraged to develop their initiative rather than have it suppressed. Only then, in my view, will the kolkhozes and sovkhoses be able to meet the tremendous assignments set for them by the 26th CPSU Congress.

This is my very first letter to your journal. I would not like it to be considered as an "expose." These have been my personal views and conclusions based on my own practical experience. The facts which I have cited are to a certain extent typical of the rayon and, possibly, the oblast. However, I do not generalize them in the least. I would be very happy if my response to this article can help to improve our socialist agriculture.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

SOCIALIST PRODUCTION AS A RESEARCH TOPIC

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 111-112

[Review by Prof M. Volkov of the book "Sotsialisticheskoye Proizvodstvo: Politiko-Ekonomicheskoye Issledovaniye" [Socialist Production: A Political-Economic Study] by V. A. Medvedev. Second revised and expanded edition. Ekonomika, Moscow, 1981, 328 pp]

[Text] A noticeable turn toward positive work on topical practical and theoretical problems of socialist political economy has been noted in the science of economics in recent years. A number of meaningful monographs have been published, one of which is "Sotsialisticheskoye Proizvodstvo," by Prof V. A. Medvedev, doctor of economic sciences.

The author begins with a study of the process of intensification of the social nature of production under contemporary conditions. Methodologically, this is entirely justified, for this process is the material base of the reproduction and development of socialist production relations. The author emphasizes that its intensification takes place under the determining influence of the scientific and technical revolution, which "marks a leap in the development of social production forces and their transition to a qualitatively new state on the basis of radical changes in the system of scientific knowledge" (p 7). The author traces the basic processes in the differentiation and, particularly, the integration of the production process within the single national economic complex. Production socialization covers both its material and manpower factors. In this case, it is expressed in the fact that the scientific and technical revolution intensifies the processes of development of overall manpower and triggers deep changes in its internal structure.

The author justifiably considers the method for combining manpower with production facilities, i.e., the form of ownership of productive capital, the initial, the structuring aspect of any socioeconomic system. The acquisition of the means and results of the production process by the working people, acting as an association on the social scale, is consistent with socialism. "It is precisely this method of combining productive capital with manpower that is consistent with the social nature of the contemporary production process and its future development trends" (p 54); "the socialist nature of the society is precisely predetermined by the combination of productive capital with manpower on the scale of the entire society" (p 55).

These views become particularly topical in connection with the uninterrupted attacks mounted by antisocialist forces on ownership by the whole nation. The author emphasizes that the transfer of modern production facilities to individual collectives or professional groups would eliminate the very foundation of socialist development. This is something with which we can only agree.

The acquisition of productive capital by the people associated on the scale of the entire society excludes, according to the author, the conversion of manpower into an object of ownership, acquisition or alienation. Man--the carrier of manpower--is the subject of economic relations. The arguments cited in the book on this matter and the criticism of the idea of private ownership of manpower, which has been voiced in economic publications, are quite convincing.

The author considers the product, which embodies the joint and planned organized labor of associated producers and which is their common property and is used directly for the satisfaction of their needs, the result of the socialist production process. This labor is a combination of material content with social form.

The social form of production results is inseparably related to the social form of its factors--labor and productive capital. Based on the concept of the direct social nature of labor under socialism, the author calls for improving its assessment and distribution in the national economy. These concepts would benefit by specific forms of development of direct accountability of labor outlays related to the current labor assessment system.

According to the author, the social form of productive capital expresses its role in the creation of the social product. In terms of quantity, it is determined by labor savings in the course of their use. This is an important theoretical and practical stipulation. It provides a methodological approach to the solution of a topical problem such as the creation of a system of effective labor yardsticks and objects, taking into consideration manufacturing outlays and the sum total of technical and operational qualities and, therefore, in terms of improving the price-setting system.

The method used in combining manpower with productive capital and production results and factors, determined by the socioeconomic system, is the most important feature of one type of production relations or another. The author believes that the essence of the socialist (as well as communist) production method, which is the content of the basic economic law, is expressed with the proper depth and level of abstraction in the production of a maximum amount of public products, i.e., of products which are the common property of the associated producers and are aimed at the satisfaction of their needs. In the process of the subsequent ascension from the abstract to the specific and the development of the socialist economic system as an integral unit, the place and functional significance of the various forms and aspects of the social product become apparent.

An extensive part of the book discusses socialist production effectiveness. Its qualitative and quantitative determination as an economic category stems directly from the basic economic law of socialism. On the social scale, production effectiveness is manifested in the ratio between the public product (according to the author, this applies to the end product of the national economy) and the sum total of outlays and investments of social labor. In the final account, production effectiveness is manifested in the development of man but only through a number of intermediary links which, as a rule, exceed the limits of material production. We must not underestimate the social aspects and consequences of production development. However, neither should we ignore the fact that the basic principal material prerequisite for all social progress is the faster growth of the public product (including its quality and structure) compared with labor outlays and investments.

The author proves that the party's stipulation on comprehensively upgrading production effectiveness today "not only does not conflict with V. I. Lenin's familiar statement on the decisive historical role of the growth of labor productivity in social progress but stems from it directly. It represents its specific application under the conditions of a developed socialist society and the scientific and technical revolution" (pp 102-103).

The author considers topical the search for an integral social production effectiveness indicator. He cites arguments in favor of determining social production effectiveness on the basis of the ratio between the end product and "reduced outlays." He offers an original method for computing the values and dynamics of this indicator covering a long period of time, starting in 1960 (see pp 144-147). We find in the work a good analysis of the ways to upgrade production effectiveness under contemporary conditions in terms of basic components--labor and material savings and higher production quality and capital returns.

One of the good features in the book is the special chapter on problems of socialist production management, in which the author analyzes the system of subjective factors governing the functioning of the socialist economy.

The party's economic policy is taken as the basis for management.

V. A. Medvedev describes extensively the main contemporary problems facing it in the light of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, such as the program for raising the living standard of the people in the 1980's, and the need to complete the conversion of the national economy to intensive development and to reorganize the economic mechanism.

On the basis of Lenin's statements, the author defines the economic mechanism as the "combination of organizational structures of the socialist national economy and the forms and methods of their management, consciously developed and applied by society on the basis of economic laws and specific circumstances" (p 264). He considers in detail measures to improve planning, financing and cost effectiveness and analyzes thoroughly topical problems of material incentive and socialist competition.

This is a work expressing V. A. Medvedev's views on important problems of the socialist economy. He has tried to describe each one of them meaningfully, to indicate the specific ways in which they manifest themselves and to identify their position in the socialist economic system. Let us note the author's scientific conscientiousness and scrupulous accuracy and the extensive references to works by Soviet economists. The author has tried to present complex problems in a simple and clear style.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

SOCIETY, THE INDIVIDUAL, ART

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 113-116

[Review by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences A. Dubrovin of the book "Khudozhnik i Obshchestvo. Svoboda Lichnosti i Svoboda Tvorchestva" [The Artist and Society. Freedom of the Individual and Freedom of Creativity]. Compiled by N. A. Anastas'yev and V. M. Litvinov. Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, Moscow, 1980, 300 pp]

[Text] The progression of the thoughts which characterize the articles in the collection "Khudozhnik i Obshchestvo" leads from harmony in reality to harmony in art and from views on the life of the working people to conclusions on works which must reflect this life and make their contribution to it. Although some of the authors turn to events from their own experience, others make a study of the press (such as materials of the nationwide discussion of the draft Constitution of the USSR, while yet others use scientific research data, their single objective is to base their views regarding the development of artistic thinking on the firm grounds of our reality, which gives birth to true art.

The actual circumstances which define the development of culture in today's world are the two polarized ways of life on the planet--the socialist and the bourgeois--and the two different attitudes toward the individual, man and humanistic values. It is entirely natural that precisely such socio-historical problems have been selected as a basis for the study of specifically artistic problems.

As Academician P. Fedoseyev, with whose article the collection begins, emphasizes, "Marx and Engels considered the antagonistic conflict between technical progress and social development, achieved through the deprivations and difficulties experienced by the toiling man, as one of the main features of historical development under the conditions of a bourgeois society.... Real socialism is the first to eliminate this conversion of the products of contemporary human activities into an alien power governing the people. The socialist society refracts the most important achievements of social progress in the achievements of every person and in his way of life" (p 6).

This thesis is comprehensively substantiated in this book which contains an unusual feature for a work in the humanities--an abundance of figures.

In this case, however, they are entirely proper, for they provide an irrefutable confirmation of the tremendous scale of changes of which the mature socialist society is justifiably proud and which become particularly impressive when contrasted with the situation in the capitalist world. For example, in his sharp article on the "raving attacks mounted by our political opponents, mainly in the United States, against the 'condition' of human rights in the Soviet Union," A. Chakovskiy relies not simply on emotions but on facts, on social statistical data in particular. The strictly specific nature of the material used makes it possible to address "honestly" and with dignity those who defame the Soviet way of life and the USSR constitution, "to talk without abuse to which Western 'sovietologists' resort as a rule, to talk from the positions of common sense, so to speak" (p 30).

Two series of strictly factual data are presented in the collection. On the one hand are the millions of fingerprints and files of participants in antiwar demonstrations, unemployment statistics and the tremendous cost of housing, medical treatment and education. On the other are data on the development of our peaceful economy and living conditions and health of the people; the leap from half a million "reading people" in old Russia to total literacy and universal free education; eloquent data which characterize the growth of the culture of the peoples of different republics in the country and the fraternal rapprochement of them, as well as indicators of the broadest possible development of the organization of culture and art in the USSR....

However impressive such figures may be, quantitative characteristics, comparisons or percentages are not the main thing. While acknowledging the full significance of factors such as "the amount of spiritual values created by society" or "the scale of their dissemination," in his article V. Baranov justifiably opposes their absolutizing. What about the quality-value criterion, he asks, for it is precisely this that becomes the main criterion when it is a question of "the problem of the individual as the subject of artistic study under mature socialist conditions" (p 128).

It is this qualitative aspect precisely that is the main topic of discussion in this work. The essentially innovative art of socialist realism in terms of the aesthetic mastery of the problem of the individual is compared with the situation in the antihumane society of contemporary monopoly capital with its literature, propaganda and ideology. The spiritual crisis of bourgeois culture and the aggressive aspiration of the supporters of the old world to distort the nature of artistic accomplishments in the socialist states and to counter progressive trends in their own countries are assessed from the height of the ideals of communism as real humanism, from the heights of the historical experience of an art imbued with such ideals.

For example, the article by G. Oganov "The Epic Literature of the Revolution and the Vanity of Sovietology" as well as some other materials offer an analytical substantive comparison between the principles of optimistic, man-loving Soviet culture and the opposite principles promoted in the West. The following question is asked among others: Why is it that the best works by Soviet artists are frequently not allowed to reach the mass public in the West, whereas in our country many serious works by Western authors are published and are popular among serious readers? This is one of the proofs that our

approach to culture is actually incomparably broader and more democratic than the so-called "non-class" "pluralistic" approach characteristic of the "free world." The mechanics of the ideological influence of this world on the mind is described in V. Molchanov's article "War Against Reason (Bourgeois Propaganda and Art)" and V. Kuvaldin's article "The Place and Role of the Writer in Contemporary Capitalist Society." The problem is not being simplified in the least: the authors proceed from the fact that the law described by V. I. Lenin himself still prevails in Western society--the existence of elements of a democratic culture which opposes the ruling reactionary culture. Today major conflicts are inherent in Western spiritual life. Quite frequently most sensitive sociopolitical problems are discussed in books by Western literary workers from a variety of sometimes conflicting viewpoints. This includes a problem which affects everyone today--peace or war, detente or increased international tension. The idea that the masters of culture must make their contribution to its solution is expressed in I. Zorina's notes on the dialogue between Soviet and American writers.

However, such contacts, dialogues or "moments of rapprochement" do not represent any erosion of positions whatsoever or any pollution of our ideological principles. It is precisely their systematic implementation that offers the fullest, the real freedom to the creative individual which, in turn, represents the true freedom of society and its members. This thought runs throughout the collection, including the addresses by the participants in the discussion on "features of the artistic culture of mature socialism," which are the nucleus of the collection, published by the journal VOPROSY LITERATURY, and other materials on related topics.

It is only in recent years that the problem of the esthetic and artistic culture of society has begun to be considered in detail as a specific area of knowledge with its internal structure and a streamlined and complex system of interrelated laws. The inclusion of views on culture as part of the views on art and the study of problems of artistic creativity on the basis of the broader context of problems of development of civilization is far from accidental: it is caused mainly by practice, by the tasks in the implementation of a Marxist-Leninist cultural policy at the present stage of the building of communism, when the comprehensive approach to spiritual life in all its direct and indirect relations, which are becoming increasingly numerous and widespread, is particularly important. That is what makes development of the question of the further long-range comprehensive study of the artistic culture of developed socialism, as formulated by Yu. Lukin, topical--from the general theory, history and sociology of this aspect of the social "organism" to problems related to its material support and, something quite important, the delicate and complex matter of the scientifically substantiated management of such a specific area of spiritual life. The author quite justifiably discusses the importance of applying efficient methodology to this theoretical work and, particularly, the need "to refine the correlation between the categories of party-mindedness and nationality, which virtually merge under contemporary conditions, for it is impossible today to stand on the positions of communist party-mindedness without a feeling for nationality in the most profound meaning of the term, and also it is impossible to express the interests of the unified community--the Soviet people--without holding the positions of party-mindedness" (pp 122-123).

The problems of party-mindedness and nationality are discussed extensively in other articles as well; the article by G. Dubov deals with the unity between party-mindedness and freedom of creativity. In our view, the remark of Yu. Kuz'menko is also just: "...Nationality in our literature cannot be considered simply as one of its many features. It is a new qualitative interaction between artistic culture and the people renovated by the socialist revolution" (p 89). Relating this new quality to the party-mindedness of Soviet literature, the author emphasizes the need for a "broad historical scale," in order to understand the very appearance of the basic principles governing our artistic thinking and realization of their permanent nature and, secondly, in order to study them not in statistical terms but in terms of their steady creative enrichment related to the development of the people's life.

In their own individual ways the authors approach the problems of the historical progress of art and artistic culture as a whole, while naturally concentrating on the current stage of development. While citing numerous facts of artistic life and a great variety of works, characters and trends in art, they focus on features of the current artistic process such as the new level reached in the expression of historical self-awareness, including the direct involvement of history, interpreted from the positions of the present, in the structure of a story dealing with the present; the expanded scale in the interpretation of the social "macroworld" and individual "microworld;" the increased gravitation toward complete truth, which broadens the means of expression and their differentiation in some cases, and their diffusion in others; the new level in the artistic interpretation of relations between man and nature, considered not only as a habitat but as a factor triggering philosophical considerations on the higher meaning of life.

The dialectics of the ideological-political, moral and conceptual unity of Soviet artists and the simultaneous strengthening of the individual and original principle and trend toward the variety of creative searches holds a central position in such a collective characterization of the contemporary stage of artistic progress.

The close unity within our artistic culture is clearly seen in articles on the closest possible international relations existing among the artistic cultures of the peoples of the USSR. In summing up the numerous specific manifestations of such reciprocal relations and firmly rejecting still existing attempts to idealize elements of the conservative understanding of national traditions, V. Oskotskiy writes: "At the present stage we are justified in speaking no longer of the reciprocal study of each other's accomplishments or one-sided influences of older and more experienced literatures on younger ones, but of their intensive reciprocal arrangement and rapprochement on the broad scale of the multinational wealth of contemporary Soviet literature," and of all other types of contemporary art. Such relations are developing both in width and in depth and "no longer offer serious grounds for engaging in the old naive enthusiasm related to external coincidences and harmonies in terms of characters or topics encountered in the works of writers belonging to different nationalities" (p 101).

Pursuing this line of thought, the critic properly notes that "naturally, creative individuality was and remains the focal point of reciprocal literary influences..." (ibid). Individuality and the individual, the person, are the focus of the attention of the authors. Such is the requirement of the times. In the article "Way of Life, Character, Literature," G. Brovman reminds us that A. V. Lunacharskiy wrote in 1920 that the spirit of communism is expressed in the fact that the individual is "ready to disappear for the sake of the victory of the progressive class of mankind." This has been manifested in many works of art and this was the way of life of the people of that period (p 76). Today, readiness for self-denial is being combined to a greater extent than in the past with the spirit of the self-assertion of the individual, which cannot fail to be reflected in art: time itself "needs people with a variety of individual qualities and rich spiritual individuality" (p 77).

This applies both to the personalities of the characters in works and the personalities of the authors themselves, for the individuality of the artist is manifested in the entire structure of characters, the new discoveries, the style, the depth and originality of esthetic assessments and the significance and originality of the ideological-emotional interpretation of life. It is insufficient to say that the unity of the method of socialist realism "does not exclude the variety of creative individualities," and that it "allows" a variety of topics, styles, genres and artistic manners. Such a formulation of the question makes it appear that the originality of the creative individual is not of prime significance and that it is merely "not prohibited." No, no high-quality art worthy of the new world and the new man can exist without this quality. The authors proceed from Marx' thought that communism is a society "in which the original and free development of the individual is no longer a mere phrase" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 3, p 441). That is why, in the case of an art imbued with communist ideas, the manifestation of individuality is not merely a "desirable" but a mandatory, a prime characteristic. However, this also means that this kind of development of individuality is possible only as a combination of working people, collectivism and communist comradeship. Individualism, including individualism in art, becomes the enemy of originality. "Originality, i.e., the manifestation of individual characteristics, interests and tastes, and the individual creativity of man," P. Fedoseyev writes, "is not eliminated but is manifested to an increasing extent under socialist conditions" (p 18).

One of the noteworthy features of the book is the spirit of activeness, restlessness and aspiration toward the future which runs through it. In his article "In the Light of the Communist Moral Ideal" Yu. Surovtsev justifiably ascribes a great role to the "ethical self-criticism" of a society passionately interested in reaching its humane objectives as quickly as possible, a society interested in the development of the individual and in his "ethical self-criticism," which is related to the "self-criticism of the positive character" in art. A similar spirit characterizes other articles. One of them discusses the further "improvement in the way of life" precisely as being the task for the future; another justifiably rejects the idea that "we have already achieved everything desirable;" yet another recalls that progress toward the "communist way of life" is not "smooth in the least."

The hypotheses and forecasts on the future most promising developments of artistic thinking expressed in the book are directly related to this demanding view of life and art, unafraid of the realistic assessment of arising clashes, and the aspiration to resolve them optimally through collective efforts.

This is also the title of an article by Yu. Andreyev: "Looking Into the Future." Unlike bourgeois futurological projections in the field of art, according to which the character and the plot will disappear in 21st-century literature, there will be no difference between cause and effect or any clear meaning of descriptions, while the individual will somehow become anonymous, without individual characteristics, the researcher confidently speaks of a more complete manifestation of the humanistic and realistic potential of art compared with the past, the increased role of moral and conscious principles, intensified psychological analysis, and a deeper knowledge of the human personality.

Stanislavskiy's statement, cited in the work, sounds topical: "...It is best of all when there is an aspiration, something to defend, something to fight for, to argue, to win or to lose in art. It is the struggle that creates victories and conquests. It is worst of all when everything is calm, organized, defined, legitimized in art, requiring no arguments, struggle or defeat and, consequently, victories" (p 169). The collection has appeared in an atmosphere of creative search, testing and comradely debates, a period when, as is noted in one of the articles, "the clash of opinions, frequently developing into lengthy and sharp discussions, is a normal daily phenomenon in the cultural life of the Soviet Union" (p 177). In this respect the collection itself is no exception. Some of its articles contain controversial features and each of the authors expresses his own, sometimes unconventional, viewpoint on one subject or another. The articles are different from each other not only in terms of genre and style but emphases, assessments and judgments. However, social thinking cannot develop without a comparison among views, without the formulation and discussion of hypotheses and without the search for new approaches to the subject and their subsequent refinement.

What matters is that the initial methodological premises of the authors are accurate and that the problems raised in the book are extremely topical. The further creative discussion of the questions raised in the work remains an important ideological task.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

LENINIST SCIENCE OF VICTORY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 116-118

[Review by Maj Gen Yu. Kirshin, doctor of philosophical sciences, of the book "V. I. Lenin i Sovetskaya Voyennaya Nauka" [V. I. Lenin and Soviet Military Science] by N. N. Azovtsev. Second revised and expanded edition. Nauka, Moscow, 1981, 352 pp]

[Text] Historically, V. I. Lenin is known not only as a great philosopher, creator of the communist party and the Soviet state and head of the October Revolution and the socialist reorganization of society but as an outstanding military strategist and theoretician as well. The birth of the Soviet armed forces is inseparably linked with his name. Lenin's political and strategic leadership played a decisive role in the victories won by the Red Army in the civil war. Under the new historical circumstances, he laid the theoretical and methodological foundations of proletarian military theory.

The monograph by Prof N. N. Azovtsev discusses Lenin's theoretical and methodological foundations of the martial science of the socialist state and the conditions and factors for the victorious waging of war in defense of socialism.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of war and armed forces, which is a unified philosophical, sociopolitical and economic approach, is the conceptual and methodological foundation of military science. Lenin's tremendous merit is that he brought to light the essence of and reasons for war and their sociopolitical nature; he classified them and established the significance of the economic, moral-political, scientific and technical and military potentials in war; he described the place and role of the armed forces in the political system of society and characterized the basic differences between socialist and capitalist armed forces. Lenin's theory of war as a complex social phenomenon, which includes the armed, economic, diplomatic and ideological forms of struggle, made it possible to break down the subject of military science into the study of the laws governing the preparations for and conduct of the armed struggle. Lenin's works describe the law of the dependence of the course and outcome of war on the correlation between the material and spiritual possibilities of the warring sides. "The winner of a war," he emphasized, "is the party with greater reserves, greater sources of strength and greater support among the people" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 39, p 237).

The effectiveness of Soviet military science is ensured by the dialectical-materialistic research method, which makes the fullest and most profound study of the laws of war and armed struggle and the proper resolution of the complex problems of building the armed forces possible.

By laying the foundations of Soviet military science, Lenin made an outstanding contribution to all of its sections and mainly to its nucleus--the theory of the military art. In formulating the principles of military strategy, he paid particular attention to its connection with politics and emphasized the primacy of policy over military strategy. He formulated the ways and means for waging the armed struggle, the principles of party leadership of the armed forces and troop control, problems of centralization and one-man command, and unity between political and strategic leadership.

The author has provided a detailed and profound description of Lenin's contribution to the theory of operative art, tactics and structure of the armed forces. The sociopolitical and organizational principles elaborated by Il'ich, including the creation of a regular cadre army, firm conscious discipline, harmonious development of the individual branches of the armed forces, consistency between the organizational structure of the troops and the nature of the war and the ways and means of waging it have firmly entered the practice of army and navy structure.

The author describes Lenin's contribution to the theory of military training and education. He considers the effective political and military training of the Red Army personnel to be the source of its outstanding victories. It was stressed at the 8th Congress of the RKP(b) that "the army must be trained, armed and organized according to the latest word of military science." In assessing the moral-political and military-professional qualities of the Red troops, Lenin pointed out that no soldier of the old army could show such heroism, feeling of military duty, firmness and dedication. These qualities are based on ideological convictions and loyalty to the communist party and the Soviet people.

Lenin paid great attention to problems of war economy and rear-line organization. "In order to fight a war properly," he wrote, "a strong organizational rear is needed. Even the best of armies and the people most loyal to the cause of the revolution will be destroyed by the enemy unless they are sufficiently armed, equipped and trained" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 35, p 408).

Lenin's military-theoretical stipulations, formulated in the course of intensive efforts, were immediately tested in military practice and, undergoing the crucible of the civil war, became the foundation of Soviet military science. As the author points out, its effectiveness was tested in the Great Patriotic War. Soviet military science has made substantial advances in its development in recent years. The book describes the laws governing the armed struggle and the structure of the armed forces under contemporary conditions and expresses considerations on the further enhancement of the combat readiness of the army and navy and on improving the training and education of the troops.

Military science has become one of the most important factors in strengthening the defense capabilities of the country, upgrading its power and enhancing

the combat readiness of the army and navy. It is one of the theoretical sources of the military policy of the communist party and the shaping of the military doctrine of the state of the whole people, which organically combines the peace-loving Soviet foreign policy and the resolve to rebuff any aggressor.

The monograph proves that in recent years the ties among the scientific organs of the armies of the socialist countries have strengthened and developed further. This has made it possible to sum up the experience in combat cooperation and develop military construction in the fraternal countries in accordance with the international tasks and national characteristics.

Successes achieved in the development of Soviet military science are obvious. However, the dynamic development of military affairs is confronting it with new problems. The work under review describes the topical problems facing all parts of military science. The author emphasizes that its main task is to guarantee maintenance of the combat readiness of the armed forces and the defeat of any aggressor.

Success in military-scientific work directly depends on the effectiveness of party-political work and the creation of a favorable sociopsychological climate in scientific collectives. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out, the development of science largely depends on the development of a creative atmosphere in scientific work. This situation fully and totally applies to military science.

The author justifiably points out that the systematic observance of the principles of party-mindedness and of aggressive and decisive struggle against bourgeois and revisionist concepts on military problems is a necessary prerequisite for the further successful development of Soviet military science.

Unfortunately, not all of the problems raised in the book have been studied with sufficient thoroughness. The author could have described most profoundly and substantively the basic trends governing the development of Soviet military science at its new stage and depicted more completely the connection between military science and the other social sciences; he could have considered its actual tasks in the study of the laws governing the armed struggle and the military and technical aspects of the structure of the armed forces under the conditions of the more complex military-political situation and accelerated scientific and technical progress.

As a whole, despite some shortcomings, this serious study by N. N. Azovtsev is of major importance in the study of Lenin's military-theoretical legacy, which remains topical under contemporary conditions as well.

Lenin's ideas on war and peace and military construction, creatively developed by the communist party, are reliably serving the cause of peace, democracy and socialism. It is the duty of the military cadres to make a profound study of Lenin's military-theoretical legacy and of party activities on military problems, and to develop further the Marxist-Leninist theory of war and armed forces and military science as a whole.

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

EDUCATING THE EDUCATORS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 118-119

[Review by Yu. Vazhenin of the book "Politiko-Vospitatel'naya Rabota v Organakh Vnutrennikh Del" [Political-Educational Work Among Internal Affairs Organs] (Yu. M. Churbanov, responsible editor). Yuridicheskaya Literatura, Moscow, 1980, 287 pp]

[Text] Problems of ideological training and legal propaganda and agitation are of prime importance for the personnel of internal affairs organs, who are part of one of the important sectors in the upbringing of the members of the new society. The book under review will be of practical assistance to them in this respect.

The work covers topical tasks of ideological-education work in internal affairs organs and the comprehensive approach to their solution. The authors point out that the adoption of such an approach means basing ideological work on a consideration of all factors of social life which influence man, his outlook, attitude toward labor, moral principles and actions one way or another (see p 9). The importance of this task is defined above all by life itself, which faces the internal affairs personnel with stricter requirements. In the course of their service they must come across negative aspects of life more frequently than others. They must actively participate in the struggle for the moral foundations of the socialist society. Service in the internal affairs organs presumes true firmness, courage, readiness for self-sacrifice and deep faith in the communist ideals. The entire system of ideological-educational work is aimed precisely at developing such qualities among the personnel.

Daily practical work is one of the most important factors in the education of the people. Naturally, militia work develops in the individual specific features and spiritual values. However, this must be backed by steadily directed work an inseparable feature of which is the moral upbringing of the personnel in a spirit of firm observance of the norms and principles of communist morality.

The party and Komsomol organizations play a leading role in this matter. Specific chapters in the book consider their comprehensive activities. Particular attention is paid to the style and methods of work of party and Komsomol members within internal affairs organs.

The effectiveness of political-educational and ideological work greatly depends on the level of participation of management cadres. The authors describe the important role of the leader in the education of the collective and the great importance of the authority and example of the officer, the commander, in this respect.

The authors draw attention to the need to upgrade the scientific level of the planning of educational work in collectives under contemporary conditions. The methodical recommendations particularly emphasize problems of organization and method of agitation-propaganda work based on the specific nature of the service of internal affairs organs and subunits.

Political training plays an important role in the political-educational work among the rank and file and junior command personnel of the militia and the militarized firefighting units. On the one hand, this is an effective means for establishing contacts between commanders and subordinates. It helps the leaders to become better acquainted with the cadres and to develop in them the necessary moral and willful qualities; on the other, direct involvement in political classes enriches the command personnel. The authors point out the importance of choosing heads of political training groups and members of method councils, for they greatly determine the effectiveness and quality of educational work.

The collective justifiably plays a leading role in education. Education successes greatly depend on the extent to which a member of the collective is aware of the usefulness of and need for his work in the solution of common problems. A separate chapter entitled "Directions and Forms of Political-Educational Work for Strengthening the Collectives of Internal Affairs Organs" describes the conditions which determine the process of development of the collective and the forms and directions of educational work which contribute to its consolidation.

In discussing the role of the collective in educational work, the authors point out the role of the socialist competition. The effectiveness of the competition as a means for upgrading the creative activeness of the personnel in carrying out their assignments is convincingly described with specific examples borrowed from the lives of USSR MVD subunits.

The authors pay particular attention to the sponsorship movement within the internal affairs organs, conducted under the slogan "A Sponsor For Every Young Member!" The most reliable and acceptable principles governing the choice of a sponsor for educational work are described on the basis of practical experience.

One of the most important prerequisites for the successful implementation of the party's assignments is the upbringing of the internal affairs personnel in the spirit of the revolutionary, combat and labor traditions of the Soviet people. These problems are discussed in one of the concluding chapters.

The work under review, which contains specific methodical recommendations, will draw the attention of the heads of organs and subunits and personnel engaged in political-educational work in internal affairs to the most effective and proven ways and means of educational work.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

STATE AND CHURCH IN THE USSR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 119-121

[Review by Doctor of Juridical Sciences V. Klochkov of the book "Religiya i Tserkov' v Sovetskom Gosudarstve" [Religion and Church in the Soviet State] by V. A. Kuroyedov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 263 pp]

[Text] The attention of Soviet experts on religion and jurists is attracted by problems related to the status of religious organizations in the USSR. The works of V. A. Kuroyedov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Council on Religious Affairs, hold an important place among books and articles on such problems. This particularly applies to the book under review, recently published by Politizdat.

The book deals with relations between the Soviet state and the religious organizations at the different stages of development of our society and at the present time; the nature of Soviet legislation on religious cults and its basic principles and norms are discussed; a description is given of the activities of the various religious organizations in meeting the religious needs of believers and their participation in the struggle for peace; argumented refutation is provided on the fabrications of reactionary bourgeois and clerical propaganda on the status of the church, clergymen and believers in the Soviet Union. Particular attention is paid to problems as yet insufficiently discussed in our publications.

One of the many problems which the Soviet state had to resolve immediately following the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution was the breaking of relations between the state and the church, which were incompatible with freedom of conscience, ensuring the effective exercise of this freedom and separating the church from the state and the school from the church. The initial decrees of the system of workers and peasants abolished all religious privileges, discriminatory religious-national restrictions of civil rights and the right of religious organizations to own productive capital. Church property was nationalized and state subsidies of religious institutions and clergymen were terminated; the religious organizations were deprived of the right to marry and divorce people, to register their civil status and to engage in education and upbringing; the numerous schools run by religious organizations were taken over by the state.

As a result of energetic legislative activities, the necessary prerequisites for the formulation of a general legislative act which embodied the Marxist-Leninist principles and programmatic stipulations of the communist party regarding freedom of conscience and the attitude of the Soviet state toward religion and religious organization were created as early as January 1918. The legal document which formulated the basic norms of Soviet legislation of religious cults was the RSFSR Sovnarkom decree dated 23 January 1918 "On the Separation of the Church from the State and the School from the Church," drafted by V. I. Lenin himself. The book discusses the main content of the initial legal acts issued by the Soviet state, particularly the 23 January 1918 decree, and describes the complex circumstances and conditions under which these laws were executed.

The section on the history of relations between the church and the Soviet state in the initial years following the victory of the October Revolution emphasizes that the higher clergy, which was closely related to the overthrown exploiting classes, firmly opposed the revolutionary changes and fiercely attacked the legislative acts granting freedom of conscience and religion. The book also describes the anti-Soviet actions of the heads of the foreign churches and the clerical exiles. It points out in conclusion that in the initial years of the Soviet system the reactionary representatives of various faiths acted as a single internally united counterrevolutionary force.

The section on normalizing relations between the church and the Soviet state describes the complexity and contradictoriness of the process of political reorientation of the various religious organizations in our country and the gradual conversion of the higher clergy to positions loyal to the Soviet system, under the pressure of the masses of believers, and the importance in terms of the solution of this complex problem of the policy pursued by the Soviet state and the communist party toward religion, the legislative codification and consistent implementation of the principles of freedom of conscience and the provision of the necessary conditions for the satisfaction of the religious needs of believers.

The description of the patriotic activities of the church in the Great Patriotic War and the postwar period will be of unquestionable interest.

The exercise of religion, as guaranteed by the USSR Constitution, would be impossible without juridical norms granting the necessary rights to religious organizations, clergymen and believers and assigning to them specific duties. It is the totality of these norms that constitutes the Soviet legislation on religious cults. Like any other legislation, it is based on constitutional norms. Article 52 and articles 34 and 39 of the USSR Constitution describe most completely all basic elements of the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the freedom of conscience. Our country's fundamental law defines it as the right to profess any religion or to profess no religion at all, to exercise a religious faith or to engage in atheistic propaganda. It ensures equal civil rights regardless of attitude toward religion. It also emphasizes the inadmissibility of using religion to the detriment of society, the state or individual citizens. It bans the encouragement of hostility and hatred related to religious beliefs. The USSR Constitution proclaims the equality of all

religions under the law and the noninterference of the state in the internal affairs of the church and the noninterference of the church in governmental affairs.

One of the sections discusses the features of religious centers and spiritual administrations and their activities in the USSR. It also analyzes the process of the weakening of the influence of religion abroad and at home and the efforts of religious organizations to preserve this influence. Along with the desire for renewal, and a certain modernization of religion, individual clergymen use to this end illegal methods which are totally unrelated to religion. The book cites specific facts on the way individual religious extremists inspired by vanity and pursuing self-seeking objectives are grossly violating Soviet legislation on religious cults, are trying to develop in believers dissatisfaction with the policy of the Soviet state and the communist party toward religion and the church, to violate their rights and, sometimes, even their persons, to promote fanaticism among believers, to encourage them to avoid the fulfillment of their civic obligations, and to commit other crimes hiding behind religion and their status as religious leaders. In exposing slanderous reports carried by the bourgeois press about individuals sentenced in USSR courts allegedly for religious convictions and activities, the author proves that they were prosecuted not for their views but for committing criminal acts.

The author exposes the reactionary nature of the propaganda of foreign religious centers, which support the illegal aspirations and actions of religious extremists in our country who disseminate in radio broadcasts and in publications illegally brought into the Soviet Union fabrications on the situation of the church and the believers in our country and who try to drive a wedge into the international relations among the peoples of the USSR and urge the believers to clash with the authorities.

While protecting the proper procedure for the exercise of religious cults, Soviet legislation also determines, on the basis of the social danger of illegal activities, administrative and criminal liability for violations of this procedure. At the same time, it protects from all violations the persons and the rights of believers. This includes criminal liability for attempts to limit their rights. Although there are few such cases in our country and, as rule, proper steps are taken in their connection, the author justifiably emphasizes that violations of socialist legality regarding believers trigger a negative reaction on their part and hinder the effectiveness of educational work.

Article 69 of the USSR Constitution considers assisting the development of friendship and cooperation with the peoples of other countries and the consolidation of universal peace to be the international duty of the Soviet citizens. Believers and their religious associations and centers are actively participating in the exercise of this duty. The book contains interesting data on this matter which has been virtually ignored so far. It provides a detailed description of the activities of religious organizations operating in the Soviet Union in the struggle against the arms race, the prevention of the threat of war and the establishment of just international relations, and the major role which such organizations play in strengthening unity among churches and religious leaders of all countries acting in the defense of peace

and in the international peace movement. The author exposes the slanderous nature of statements by reactionary bourgeois and church propagandists to the effect that the antiwar struggle waged by religious organizations is allegedly imposed upon them by the state. He proves that this movement expresses the sincere aspirations and desires of believers in the USSR who, like the entire peace-loving Soviet people, are doing everything possible for the triumph of the cause of peace.

The views and conclusions expressed in V. A. Kuroyedov's book are supported by the study of numerous factual data, most of which is published for the first time. Therefore, we can state with full justification that the work will be of unquestionable interest not only to party and soviet workers, propagandists and VUZ teachers who are its target but to the readership at large as well.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

STRUGGLE FOR A NEW SCHOOL

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 121-124

[Review by Prof G. Vodolazov, doctor of philosophical sciences, of the book "Voprosy Vospitaniya i Obrazovaniya v Trudakh Zarubezhnykh Pedagogov-Marksistov" [Problems of Upbringing and Education in the Works of Foreign Marxist Educators]. Prof K. I. Salimova, doctor of pedagogical sciences, editor. Pedagogika, Moscow, 1980, 192 pp]

[Text] One could frankly say that never before has the struggle for radical reforms in education and upbringing played such an important role in communist strategy as it does today. This circumstance has been clearly noted by contemporary Marxists. The struggle for laying the scientific-theoretical foundations of a school education, writes noted British Marxist J. Fraiser, is, in the final account, as important as the struggle for the economic and political rights of the working people.

What causes such an increase in the significance of the struggle for a "new school?"

We believe that it is related to three main factors.

First: The qualitative changes related to the scientific and technical revolution in the role of knowledge in contemporary material and spiritual human activities. As we know, science and knowledge are increasingly becoming a direct productive force. That is why the struggle for knowledge is increasingly becoming a struggle for an important share of social production forces in terms of the working class. The struggle for access to science is increasingly becoming to the working people a struggle against the "private ownership" of knowledge, science and information, whose main and decisive aspects have been monopolized by the ruling classes.

Second: The new reasons for revolutionism, which have become widespread among the working class and are related to spiritual, sociolegal and sociopolitical requirements. Whereas quite recently demands related to upgrading and improving material living standards predominated in the requirements of the working class in the developed capitalist countries, today, although naturally such requirements have not been eliminated from the programs, they have somewhat lost their past urgency. This is due to the fact that as a result of

the struggle waged by the working people and the increased opportunities of the contemporary bourgeoisie to "feed" "its own" working class by plundering and exploiting the peoples of the developing countries, the problems of the "piece of bread," the problem of hunger, does not face the bulk of workers in the developed capitalist countries as urgently as in the past.

Furthermore, the broad toiling masses are realizing more and more clearly the limited nature of the "consumer ideal" and that "the ideal of the well-fed work cattle," as G. V. Plekhanov said, "is the ideal of despots and of the most humane bourgeois," and that the working class is rising to revolutionary struggle not for the sake of purchasing refrigerators, televisions and washing machines (as Galbraith and others assume) but in order no longer to be "productive capital" or "one more machine." It is rising against the aspirations of the bourgeoisie to convert it into a rightless and silent "chattel"—regardless of how well nourished it may be; it rises to revolutionary struggle in order to determine its own destiny and the development of its country by ruling social production forces (which were created by it and seized by the bourgeois class). That is why, as is clearly confirmed by the class struggle waged during the recent decade, the working masses and all working people are responding so warmly to the communist programs related to the struggle for the broadening of democratic rights and the struggle in the area of production management, education, culture, morality and simply the defense of the human dignity of the working people.

The final and third factor is the increased role of the state and its ideological apparatus under contemporary conditions. The opportunities for the bourgeoisie to preserve its domination through purely repressive measures, using the state as an instrument for the direct suppression of its class enemy, are becoming smaller. The state is being increasingly used as a means for the ideological enslavement of the working people and as a tool for shaping people with conformist (bourgeois) thoughts and feelings.

This explains the great importance of today's struggle waged by the communists against the bourgeois educational system and explains that it is the reason for the great importance of their programmatic requirements related to the struggle for a "new school." This is a relatively new field of struggle in which a great deal must be discovered and built from scratch and in which a great deal of research is necessary and, like any other research and path leading "into the unknown," it is accompanied by original and valuable discoveries, zigzags, wanderings, findings and occasional losses. The collective Marxist thought tries to sum up valuable experience and make it available to all those who are trying to consider self-critically errors and blunders for the sake of speeding up and "straightening out" the process of the advance of revolutionary proletarian forces along this important sector of the class struggle.

It would be difficult in this connection to overrate the importance of the first work of its kind recently published in our country which studies the experience of the struggle waged by the communist parties and development trends in Marxists pedagogy in the leading contemporary capitalist countries such as France, Italy, Great Britain, the FRG and the United States.

The book harmoniously combines meticulous facts (detailed description of the system of preschool, school and university education in these countries, and a detailed description of all programmatic requirements formulated by the communists on upbringing and education) with a wide and profound methodological and theoretical analysis.

Other attractive features are the "intonation," the style of scientific analysis of the book. In describing the trends in the development of progressive pedagogical thinking in the West and its searches, the authors are not trying to act as infallible judges. They do not assume the role of mentors who know everything. They rather act as fellow workers involved in the theoretical research conducted by progressive foreign pedagogues. They try to note, record and sum up the basic positive features of the gains characteristic of foreign Marxist thinking. They discuss difficult and still unresolved problems which they consider together with their foreign colleagues. This is a book which does not merely describe searches but is itself engaged in the search for a solution to the new problems raised at the contemporary stage of global social developments.

Nevertheless, this is not some kind of meandering without any sense of purpose, without guidelines or a compass. Throughout the work the authors clearly prove that they firmly follow the main direction given by the Marxist-Leninist compass. It is against this historically tried compass that they check the progress of foreign pedagogical thinking. In this respect as well the study of the struggle waged by foreign Marxist educators and communists "on two fronts"--against leftist and bourgeois-opportunistic concepts--running throughout the work is exceptionally indicative. It has enabled the authors to depict the characteristics and depth of the Marxist-Leninist formulation of the problems of education and upbringing.

As the authors justifiably point out, the leftist concepts of "deschooling" (from the English word school) with the slogan "Down With School!" give the appearance of very radical and terribly revolutionary demands. Actually, there is nothing radical or superrevolutionary in the statement that in bourgeois society the school is a jail and the extension of education is an extension of a term in jail; such schools yield "anti-education results." They mold conformists, serve the interests of the exploiting minority, promote bourgeois culture, and so on and so forth. Such premises lead to the extreme radical conclusions which call for the total elimination of schools and of the general education system! However, the leftists are less unanimous with regard to what to replace them with: some suggest forms of "individual" studies; others believe that there is no need for learning in general, for all previous culture has been created by exploiting classes, for which reason it is harmful; one should concentrate on destructive activities and create some kind of loftier "proletarian" culture in the future, and so on.

What is the Marxist reaction to this? What is the most important feature singled out by the authors?

The Marxists point out that the leftist criticism of the schools in capitalist society has some accurate features. However, they emphasize that the leftists

ignore the fact that the school and its curricula are not merely an instrument created by the bourgeoisie to meet its objectives but also a weapon in the proletarian struggle and that the contemporary school is also to a certain extent the result of the class struggle of the working people for access to education, knowledge and culture. For decades the working people have struggled intensively for banning child labor, extending the schooling period of their children and reforms in curricula which would be consistent with the interests of the working people. Naturally, these are hardly the types of schools which the proletariat would like to have. They are not "its" schools but they already contain a great deal of what is important to the proletariat and what the proletariat gained in battle. That is why the leftist slogans calling for the abolishment of schools are objectively a struggle against the historical gains of the proletariat, slogans of retreat from already conquered positions.

Furthermore, as the authors justifiably emphasize, the elimination of the school would not mean in the least the elimination of the influence of bourgeois ideology on the working people. On the contrary, it would increase it. The progressive forces can exert a more effective control over the content and forms of training and ensure the more effective influence of the working people on the upbringing and education process within the school framework. To a certain extent, the school can also act as a form of collective upbringing of the children of the working people, a method for uniting them, which becomes useful during subsequent stages in their activities. Separated from the collective and left to his own devices, the "self-developing" child would be exposed to a far greater extent to the mentality of individualism and anarchism and to the ideological concepts of the bourgeois society. Let us cite in this connection the important observation made by the authors: in their criticism of leftist concepts, the foreign Marxists extensively rely on V. I. Lenin's work "The Task of Youth Associations," which describes the principles of Marxist science on the attitude of the proletariat toward education and past culture and provides an expanded critique of the very foundations of leftist concepts, exposing their class and theoretical origins and their tremendous threat to the cause of the proletarian revolution. The authors cite the French communist L. Seve, the Italian Marxist M. Manacorda and the British educator B. Simon [all of them quoted in this issue] to the effect that today Western progressive pedagogy is entirely based on Lenin's idea regarding the need for the proletariat to master the entire wealth created by mankind. The communists well remember Lenin's famous behest: "...It would be dangerous for us to master communist slogans only....The existence of 500,000 or 1 million people, young men and women, who would consider themselves communists after such a communist training would cause only tremendous harm to communism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 41, p 302). The leader of the proletariat emphasized that it is only on the basis of contemporary education that a communist can create a communist society and that "unless he has acquired such an education, communism will remain no more than a wish" (ibid, p 307).

The authors convincingly describe the struggle of Marxist educators along another front--against official bourgeois policy and reformist-opportunistic concepts in education and upbringing.

The authors single out the main line in this struggle quite accurately and precisely and concentrate their attention on it quite justifiably. It is a question of the struggle waged by the communists against the policy and theory of "social selectivity." Starting with the very first year of school, the students in all of the biggest capitalist countries are beginning to be graded "by capability" in the study of the main subjects. "Level groups" and "homogeneous (combined on the basis of the "identical level of capability") classes" are created (France, United States), along with various types of schools varying in quality in terms of educational level (Great Britain, Italy, FRG), and so on.

The authors justifiably emphasize that the criticism of the policy of "social selectivity" is a complex matter. The contemporary bourgeois theoreticians and politicians quite skillfully conceal the bourgeois-class content of such selection practices. It is not a question, they emphasize, of granting privileges to any specific social stratum or group; on the contrary, the selective system allegedly offers equal rights and opportunities to all children without exception who (based on capability) find themselves classified in the superior, the strong categories. This is a "democratic selection," and a "democratic choice of talent." "All the necessary conditions are created for most favorable progress," official pedagogy proclaims in a pretentious manner. The selective policy, they try to convince us, is not only highly "democratic" but profoundly "scientific," for it is based on the concept allegedly proven by contemporary science of an essential genetic inequality of human capabilities, for which reason it is precisely Mother Nature rather than class-egotistical interests that predetermines the existence of different and unequal ways and methods of education.

As the book accurately points out, the Marxist objections in this area follow two main directions. First, they point out that "for some reason, nature has granted 'greater capabilities' mainly to the children of the capitalists and high officials, who account for the overwhelming majority of students in 'higher level' groups." Furthermore, on the basis of irrefutable specific social studies, they prove that this is not in the least a question of the generosity of Mother Nature, that this is not a competition among "talents" and "capabilities" but a "competition" among children whose parents happen to be rich or in high positions, against the children of working people, who are exploited and rightless, a "competition" with a predetermined outcome.

Secondly, Marxist pedagogy proves that "the conclusions of contemporary science" regarding the natural inequality among people are nothing but a gross and malicious (based on class interests) falsification, and that such conclusions are based not on serious scientific research but on the social order of the contemporary bourgeoisie, which is trying to substantiate the inevitable existence of social inequality on the basis of natural inequality. In the past, the Marxists emphasize, it was precisely on the basis of natural inequality that feudal-clerical ideology substantiated the law of class inequality, at which point the ascending bourgeois class, represented by its own ideologues (Helvetius and other educators), proved that people are essentially equal with equal natural gifts and that there are no natural barriers blocking the mastery of the entire wealth of culture developed by mankind or the expansion of this wealth in the case of any person born with a normal and healthy mind.

Helvetius and like-minded people did not deny the obvious fact that in the feudal society in which they lived there were people who were talented and people who were not. However, the educators claimed that people are not born without a talent but become such as a result of living conditions (upbringing, education and nature of work--subordinate, dependent and exhausting labor for a piece of bread), and that it was not nature but social conditions which "graded" people, for which reason Mother Nature should not be blamed for social inequality. The 1789-1794 French bourgeois revolution eliminated the estate system which granted aristocrats privileges from birth. The concept of Helvetius was submitted to a practical test: could talent be developed among children of different strata, merchants or factory workers, members of the former third estate, now enjoying the same conditions as the children of the nobility and the aristocracy? The experiment succeeded! It was such people who gave the world Balzac, Courbet, Berlioz and Bizet. It was they who developed science and industry in a way which the nobility with its "innate intellectual exclusivity" could not even dream of. As the Marxists justifiably believe, this was a rather substantial argument in favor of Helvetius' viewpoint. The irony of history (and the unquestionable historical pattern) was manifested in the fact that Helvetius' grandchildren and great-grandchildren, the grandchildren and great-grandchildren of those who had made the 1789-1794 revolution, having intensified economic inequality on the basis of official-legal equality, found themselves forced to defend it against the working class using precisely the arguments used by the old feudal ideology, so convincingly rejected in their time by the theoreticians and practical workers of the "third estate," the predecessors of the contemporary bourgeois.

The communist programs, based on the concept of the essential natural equality among people, contain the requirements of the actual, the true democratization of education, as described by the authors: universal and mandatory education for all children, including both primary and secondary training; the creation of a unified laic school modeled on the schools in the socialist countries; the elaboration of programs for education and upbringing which would organically and harmoniously combine the study of technological sciences and the humanities, link theory with practice and aim at training comprehensively and universally developed individuals.

Such programs confirm particularly clearly that it is precisely the working class that has become the true and unquestionable leader in contemporary education. The principal merit of the authors of this book is their convincing presentation of this thesis.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

ETHNODEMOGRAPHIC VIEW OF THE WORLD

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 125-126

[Review by V. Pokshishevskiy, doctor of geographical sciences, of the book "Naseleniye Mira" [The World's Population] by S. I. Bruk. Ethnodemographic reference. Nauka, Moscow, 1981, 880 pp]

[Text] Population problems are assuming an increasing importance in our political consciousness and perception of the global historical process. Naturally, the reason is not that Western futurologists have taken up as the favorite topic of their sinister predictions the consequences of the "demographic explosion," and that the "scenarios" of the future development of mankind, as drafted by the bourgeois ideologues, invariably include its numerical growth as the most important factor of all social difficulties. Soviet scientists have comprehensively proved that the peak of the notorious "explosion" has already been reached by most countries and that the fate of the nations is determined not by the shortage of resources on the planet needed for the satisfaction of vital human requirements but by the socioeconomic structure of their lives and the successes achieved by the forces of democracy, socialism and progress.

The peoples are the main subject of social action in the contemporary age, which is so highly saturated with revolutionary events. That is why the need for a study which would provide us with a comprehensive idea about the peoples of the world as a whole and by individual country (this is important because demographic parameters and ethnic situations are extremely varied and virtually always unique) is extremely great.

This need is largely met by the book by Prof S. I. Bruk, which is the result of long years of population studies, and which was published in a large edition. The size of the work itself is unusual. However, one is hardly able to encompass the content of such a basic work within a smaller framework. Although the text is presented in small print, everything possible has been compressed into comparative tables and the presentation itself is brief. The many theoretical and methodological problems of global demographic statistics and ethnographic studies are interpreted on the basis of specific situations, which makes the study more concrete. The same system is used in criticizing the false concepts prevailing in bourgeois science.

The work begins with two introductory summarizing chapters. The first deals with demographic problems and the second discusses global ethnic processes. They analyze the contemporary numbers (as a whole and by big area) of birth rate dynamics, mortality and natural population growth, the course of urbanization (the urban population is close to 40 percent but the growth of this percentage is slowing down and in the most highly urbanized countries the percentage of urban residents is occasionally even declining), and the territorial distribution of mankind (which is uneven, for more than 70 percent of the population on earth inhabits approximately 7 percent of the inhabitable dry land, and the density of which fluctuates considerably; interestingly, a good half of this population lives within an area not exceeding 200 km from the sea; more than one-quarter lives on the seashore). The author closely considers processes of ethnodivisive and the currently predominating ethnogradative trends, describes the characteristics of ethnic consolidation in a number of developed countries which were recently colonies, and the formation of nations from the old tribal ethnic communities (or ethnic communities trapped by feudal production relations). He describes the complexity of such processes and the political conflicts which they trigger. He indicates the migration mobility, family structure and racial breakdown of the population and the prevalence of different religions. Let us point out, incidentally, that as a rule the figures cited in the book are for a single period--the middle of 1978. This has required scrupulous recomputations of statistical data (taking into consideration dynamic differences by country and nation). However, this has also made worldwide data comparable.

The author uses some concepts largely new to science, such as metaethnic and ethnopolitical community. These concepts are essential, for they make our concept of the Soviet people as a separate historical entity more specific. Thus, as we know, when we use the term "the Indian people" or "the Canadian people," we give them a meaning different from the concept of "the Soviet people." In the first case we emphasize merely the ethnopolitical community; in the second, we describe a much closer integral sociointernational unity. "...The Soviet people are not a simple sum of nations..." Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has emphasized. "Regardless of national affiliation, our people share many common features which unite them within a single monolithic entity. This includes a common ideology and historical destiny. It includes common conditions of socioeconomic life and basic interests and objectives. It includes the developing comity of Soviet socialist culture, which encompasses all the true values of each individual national culture."

Particularly interesting is the section (covering nearly 700 pages) which provides a survey of the individual countries. This is the main merit of the work--the exceptional thoroughness of the coverage. The population of each individual country (whether sovereign state or colonial possession) is extensively described as if in a separate "micromonograph;" there are 210 compact descriptions of this kind! In this connection we must recall that in terms of such studies V. I. Lenin called for "taking not individual facts but the sum total of facts pertaining to the problem under consideration, without a single exception....In order to be able to see the larger amount of data related to national movements, we must consider the entire population on earth. In this case, two characteristics must be defined as accurately and thoroughly as possible: first, the homogeneous or heterogeneous national

structure of the individual country; second, the breakdown of countries...into politically independent and politically dependent" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 30, p 351).

International affairs lecturers and propagandists will find most valuable the ethnic and demographic data provided by the author on the population of recently founded states as well as brief political and geographic information on the stages covered in acquiring their independence, boundaries, area and current status. The historical nature of the entire presentation does not prevent the reader from acquiring a clear idea of the current ethnopolitical atmosphere prevailing in one or another area. On the contrary, it contributes to the clearer understanding and interpretation of it.

The study of demographic indicators and the ethnic structure of the population today is the basis of each "micromonograph." At the same time, the author has tried to depict most comprehensively other features of this "quality," by mentioning the level of urbanization and education, etc. His study includes the linguistic situation of the specific countries (frequently quite complex) and the ratios among various religious currents and sects. He has paid considerable attention to migration processes and to the course of the adaptation and "dissolution" of new arrivals in a foreign environment. Employment in the different economic sectors and the socioprofessional structure of the population have been somewhat ignored, which is regrettable. However, we can understand the reason, for this is an area of extremely fast and frequently circumstantial changes. The interpretation of the socioeconomic circumstances, which are rapidly changing with the intensification of the general crisis of capitalism, and successes or failures in the struggle waged by the developing countries against the domination of multinational monopolies may require the use of other original information methods.

S. I. Bruk has modestly subtitled his book as an ethnodemographic reference. This subtitle is entirely justified by the broad scope of the material, the synchronization of data, their thoroughly checked accuracy and the brevity of presentation. The only major complaint in this case, as in the case of any reference work, is the virtual absence of a scientific apparatus and the listing of reference data.

However, naturally this work is far more than a reference. It represents mainly a multiple-level scientific work which describes important ethnodemographic laws and trends. The reference data is the base which supports the summed-up conclusions.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82 pp 126-127

- [Text] 1. Lenin, V. I. "O Znachenii Voinstvuyushchego Materializma" [On the Significance of Militant Materialism]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 63 pp with illustrations.
2. "Sovremenniki o Markse: P. Lafarg, V. Libknekht, F. Lessner" [Marx' Contemporaries on Marx: P. Lafargue, W. Liebknecht, F. Lessner]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 127 pp.
- 3 "Resheniya Partii i Pravitel'stva po Khozyaystvennym Voprosam" [Party and Government Decisions on Economic Problems]. Collection of documents, K. U. Chernenko and M. S. Smirtyukov, general editors. Vol 13. April 1979 - March 1981. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 735 pp.
4. "Voprosy Organizatsionno-Partiynoy Raboty KPSS" [Problems of CPSU Party-Organizational Work]. Collection of documents, I. V. Kapitonov, general editor. Third expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 782 pp.
5. "Sovetskaya Programma Mira Dlya 80-kh Godov v Deystvii" [The Soviet Peace Programm for the 1980s in Action]. Materials and documents compiled by A. M. Aleksandrov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 367 pp.
6. "O 60-y Godovshchine Obrazovaniya Soyuza Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik" [On the 60th Anniversary of the Founding of the USSR]. CC CPSU 19 February 1982 Decree. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 31 pp.
7. "Vernyy Prodolzhatel' Velikogo Leninskogo Dela" [Loyal Continuer of Lenin's Great Cause]. On the occasion of the 75th birthday of Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman. A. M. Aleksandrov, in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 270 pp.
8. "XXVI S"yezd KPSS i Zadachi Kafedr Obshchestvennykh Nauk" [The 26th CPSU Congress and the Tasks of Social Science Chairs]. Materials of the All-Union Conference of Heads of Social Science Chairs in Higher Educational Institutions. Moscow, 14-16 October 1981. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 63 pp.

9. "XXVI S'yezd KPSS: Yedinstvo Teorii i Praktiki" [The 26th CPSU Congress: Unity Between Theory and Practice]. No 1. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 558 pp.
10. Abalkin, L. I. "Dialektika Sotsialisticheskoy Ekonomiki" [Dialectics of the Socialist Economy]. Mysl', Moscow, 1981, 351 pp.
11. Audisio, V. "Imenem Ital'yanskogo Naroda" [In the Name of the Italian People]. Abridged translation from the Italian by A. A. Veselitskiy. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 224 pp.
12. Bazovskiy, V. N. and Shumilov, N. D. "Samoye Dorogoye" [The Most Precious]. Documentary story of A. A. Kuznetsov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 255 pp with illustrations.
13. "Moral'nyy Kodeks Stroitel'ya Kommunizma" [The Moral Code of the Builder of Communism] Series. Znaniye, Moscow, 1981, 13 pamphlets.
14. "Resheniya XXVI S'yezda KPSS v Zhizn'!" [The Resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress in Action] Series. Znaniye, Moscow, 1981, 11 pamphlets.
15. Bogina, Ye. L. and Shcherban', N. V. "Kritika Antikommunizma v Prepodavanii Obshchestvennykh Nauk: Metodologiya i Metodika" [Critique of Anticommunism in the Teaching of Social Sciences: Methodology and Method]. Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1981, 207 pp.
16. Bonch-Bruyevich, V. D. "V. I. Lenin v Petrograde i v Moskve (1917-1920)" [V. I. Lenin in Petrograd and Moscow, 1917-1920]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 70 pp.
17. Borisov, O. B. "Vnutrennaya i Vneshnyaya Politika Kitaya v 70-ye Gody" [China's Domestic and Foreign Policy During the 1970s]. Political essay. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 384 pp.
18. "Zavoyevaniya Sotsializma Ostoyali v Bor'be" [They Fought to Defend the Gains of Socialism] Documents, articles and materials on the experience of the struggle waged by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia against counterrevolutionary and right-wing opportunistic forces, for the elimination of the political crisis in the party and in society in 1968-1969 and for the further building of socialism in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 375 pp.
19. Kedrov, B. M. "Lenin, Nauka, Sotsial'nyy Progress" [Lenin, Science and Social Progress]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 158 pp.
20. Kirichenko, V. N. "Osnovnyye Idei Pyatiletki" [Basic Ideas of the Five-Year Plan]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 94 pp (The 11th Five-Year Plan).
21. Kolodnyy, A. G. "'Iгры' Vokrug Igr" ['Games' Around Games]. Sovetskaya Rossiya, Moscow, 1981, 160 pp.

22. "Kommunist. 1982" [Communist, 1982]. Callendar-reference compiled by I. A. Shvets. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 315 pp.
23. Korionov, V. G. "Vashington na Pereput'ye" [Washington at the Crossroads]. The new administration and the realities of the contemporary world. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 142 pp.
24. Krasin, Yu. A. "Revolyutsionnyy Protsess Sovremennosti" [The Revolutionary Process of Our Time]. Theoretical essays. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 270 pp.
25. Kuznetsov, B. G. "Sovremennaya Nauka i Filosofiya" [Modern Science and Philosophy]. Basic research methods and the future of philosophy. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 183 pp (What philosophers are working on and discussing).
26. Luk'yanov, A. I., Denisov, G. I., Kuz'min E. L. and Razumovich, N. N. "Sovetskaya Konstitutsiya i Mify Sovetologov" [The Soviet Constitution and the Myths of Sovietologists]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 270 pp.
27. "Marksistsko-Leninskaya Teoriya Istoricheskogo Protsessa" [The Marxist-Leninist Theory of the Historical Process]. The historical process: reality, material base, primary and secondary. By a group of authors headed by F. V. Konstantinov. Nauka, Moscow, 1981, 463 pp.
28. "Mezhdunarodnoye Rabocheye Dvizheniye" [The International Workers Movement]. Problems of history and theory. Vol 5. "Sozidatel' Sotsializma, Borets Protiv Fashizma" [Builder of Socialism and Fighter Against Fascism]. B. N. Ponomarev, chairman of the chief editing commission. S. S. Salychev, responsible editor. Mysl', Moscow, 1981, 750 pp.
29. "Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya i Bor'ba Idey" [International Relations and the Struggle of Ideas]. Editorial collegium: N. I. Lebedev (head of the authors' group), N. P. Dracheva and V. B. Knyazhinskiy. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 287 pp.
30. "Mezhdunarodnyy Yezhegodnik" [International Yearbook]. Politics and economics. 1981 issue. O. N. Bykov, editor in chief. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 319 pp.
31. Molchanov, V. K. "Vozmezdiye Dolzhno Svershit'sya" [Retribution Is Mandatory] (The Nazi war criminals and their protectors). Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 192 pp.
32. Motorin, N. F. "Kursom Sotrudnichestva" [Course of Cooperation]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 95 pp. (Steps of the 11th Five-Year Plan).
33. Novikova, N. N. and Kloss, B. M. "N. G. Chernyshevskiy vo Glave Revolyutsionerov 1861 Goda" [N. G. Chernyshevskiy at the Head of the 1861 Revolutionaries]. Some results and research possibilities. Nauka, Moscow, 1981, 319 pp.

34. "Odinnadtsataya" [The 11th Five-Year Plan]. Compiled by Ye. I. Popov. P. F. Alekseyev, general editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 271 pp.
35. "Partiya i Sovety" [The Party and the Soviets]. By a group of authors headed by B. M. Morozov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 255 pp.
36. Petrenko, F. F. and Popov, V. V. "Leninskiye Printsipy Rukovodstva Sovetskoy Vneshney Politikoy" [The Leninist Principles of Conduct of Soviet Foreign Policy]. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1981, 301 pp.
37. Polonskiy, R. F. "Tol'ko By Khvatilo Zhizni..." [If Only Life Were Long Enough]. The story of Artem. Translated from the Ukrainian by N. Rogova. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 222 pp.
38. "Sem'ya Ul'yanovykh" [The Ulyanov Family]. Compiled by N. S. Gudkova. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 512 pp.
39. Sokolov, V. M. "Nravstvennyy Mir Sovetskogo Cheloveka" [The Moral World of the Soviet Person]. Attempt at sociological study of the moral problems of our contemporaries. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 279 pp. (Individual, morality, education).
40. "Sovremennaya Diplomatiya Burzhuaznykh Gosudarstv" [Present-Day Diplomacy of the Bourgeois States]. By a group of authors. Preface by A. A. Gromyko. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 399 pp.
41. "Spravochnik Propagandista" [The Propagandist's Handbook]. M. A. Morozov, general editor. Compiled by A. M. Rusakovich. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 207 pp.
42. "Spravochnik Propagandista-Mezhdunarodnika" [Handbook of the International Affairs Propagandist]. Compiled by N. K. Golovko. V. V. Zagladin and N. V. Shishlin, general editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 206 pp.
43. "SSSR v 70-ye Gody" [The USSR in the 1970s]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 304 pp.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN REPUBLIC AND INTEROBLAST HIGHER PARTY SCHOOLS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 82, p 128

[Text] Applications will be received for the regular enrollment of students in republic and interoblast higher party schools. The candidates must be recommended by the central committees of communist parties of union republics and party kraykoms and obkoms.

The higher party schools will accept party, soviet, Komsomol and ideological workers who are members of the CPSU as follows:

higher education graduates under 40 years of age may enroll in the 2-year course departments and the 3-year course correspondence departments;

secondary school graduates under 35 years of age may enroll in the 4-year course departments and the 5-year course correspondence departments.

The central committees of communist parties of union republics and the party kraykoms and obkoms must submit to the higher party schools extracts from the bureau decree, reference and proper documents for the personnel recommended for enrollment by no later than 1 May 1982.

Those recommended for the 2-year course and the 3-year correspondence course will be invited to the higher party school for an interview between 20 May and 10 June; candidates for the 4-year course and 5-year correspondence course will be requested to present themselves at the higher party schools for entrance examinations on the foundations of Marxism-Leninism, Russian language (composition) and USSR history (secondary school level). Those recommended for training will be granted a 2-week leave period with pay to prepare themselves and to take the entrance examinations.

Higher party school classes will begin on 1 September 1982.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

END