

R
076082

JPRS 82720

24 January 1983

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT B
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 16, November 1982

19980320 125

DIC QUALITY INSPECTED

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

4
169
A08

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.

JPRS 82720

24 January 1983

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 16, November 1982



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

24 January 1983

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 16, November 1982

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

CONTENTS

Measure of Labor and Measure of Consumption.....	1
L. I. Brezhnev's Speech at Conference of Military Commanders in the Kremlin.....	13
Historic Feat of Arms (D. Ustinov).....	17
Aggravation of the Global Ideological Struggle and the Political Education of the Working People (K. Rusakov).....	35
Along the Great Road of Brotherhood and Creation (T. Usubaliyev).....	52
Strong With Friendship (M. Zhilko, M. Lavrinovich).....	65
Internationalists' Way of Life (G. Zimanas).....	73
Young Growth of Our Art (T. Salakhov).....	79
Lessons Based on a Historical Comparison (Gr. Oganov).....	86
Marxist Philosophical Legacy and Its Distorters (S. Oduyev).....	102
Whom "Reaganomics" Serves (V. Kudrov).....	114

Work Born of the Revolution (N. Tyapkin).....	127
Social Structure of the New Society; Methodological Research Aspects (O. Vasil'yev, M. Dobruskin).....	130
Soviet Bibliographic Encyclopedia (P. Fateyev).....	141
Scientific Analysis of the World's Revolutionary Process (L. Arskaya, I. Pantin).....	146
Short Book Reviews (M. Ovsyannikov).....	156
Bookshelf.....	159

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 16
November 1982

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R.I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : November 1982

Signed to press : 1 Nov 1982

Copies : 795,000

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

MEASURE OF LABOR AND MEASURE OF CONSUMPTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 3-13

[Text] The good of the toiling man is the supreme objective of the activities of the CPSU and the Soviet government. Such activities are not only a function of a relatively small circle of people engaged in party or economic management. The democratic nature of the socialist system ensures the broadest possible masses of workers, employees and kolkhoz members real access to resolving virtually all state and economic problems. The increasing participation of the working people in management and the growth of their initiative, activeness and enterprise for the good of society has been and remains one of the most important tasks in the development of socialist statehood.

Marxism-Leninism provides both theoretical and practical answers to the solution of such problems. They lie in steadily upgrading the quality and scientific substantiation of centralized economic production and the adequately high level of interest on the part of individuals and production collectives in honest and dedicated labor and high end results. Under socialism material incentive plays an important role in achieving this.

The problems of material incentive can be properly understood, posed and resolved only within the framework of the general theory of socialism. After Marx and Engels, Lenin formulated the nature of the new system as follows: Making the land, factories and, in general, all productive capital property of the entire society and replacing capitalist production with production based on a joint plan in the interest of all members of society. The victory of the socialist ownership of productive capital, having eliminated the exploitation of man by man, inaugurated the era of free labor for the sake of a better life for the working people. The implementation of the principle of equal pay for equal work makes any kind of social parasitism impossible. The liberation of labor, which was brought about by the socialist revolution, is a decisive prerequisite for the true freedom of the individual.

The kingdom of freedom of which the founders of scientific communism dreamed begins only where and when man begins to work not merely for the sake of earning and satisfying his needs and not only in the hope of gaining material benefits. However, during the first phase of communism, under socialism, achieved as a result of the long birth pangs of the capitalist society, the same principle as in the exchange of commodity equivalents remains: "...A certain quantity of labor in one form is exchanged against an equal amount of

labor in another" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 19, p 19). On the eve of the October Revolution, depicting in his work "The State and Revolution" the future communist society, showing the brilliant perspicacity earmarked by Marx, Lenin emphasized in this connection that the first phase of communism cannot provide full equality. He pointed out that socialism creates the objective need and opportunity for the development of economic equality in the area of distribution only in the sense of ensuring equal payment for equal labor and that the mastery of this new principle of social justice will require state control and a state developed means for its implementation. "Until the 'superior' form of communism arrives, the socialists will demand the strictest possible control on the part of society and of the state over the measure of labor and the measure of consumption..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 33, p 97).

Socialism radically transformed the socioeconomic conditions of human life, work and recreation of the people and their social position. It directed the development of society on the way to real humanism, ensuring full well-being and the free development of everyone in the field of socially useful activities, capabilities, inclinations and gifts. The practice of socialist construction confirmed the accuracy of Lenin's ideas and proved the total unsuitability of equalization as a method for involving people in work. It proved that equalization, as Lenin pointed out, is an economic absurdity, for it separates consumption from production. It brings about the separation between state management and the economic interests of the toiling masses and does not permit the reaching of the main objective needed to ensure the victory of the new system -- increased labor productivity and production efficiency.

In substantiating the new economic policy, the essence of which was finding a historically accurate approach to the toiling masses and strengthening the actual guiding role of the party and the state in economic construction, in October 1921 Vladimir Il'ich provided a classical definition of the socioeconomic role of material incentive as an objectively necessary method for involving the toiling masses in the active building of socialism and communism. Assessing the period of "war communism" from the viewpoint of the tasks and possibilities of economic management under relatively more favorable conditions, he wrote that "We hoped, riding the wave of enthusiasm, having awakened the enthusiasm of the people, for a general political enthusiasm first, followed by military enthusiasm, and to use this enthusiasm directly for the accomplishment of equally great economic tasks (as the general political and military)... Life proved us to be wrong. A number of transitional stages were required.... Solid bridges leading...to socialism must be built not directly through enthusiasm but with the help of the enthusiasm born of the great revolution, on the basis of personal interest and cost effectiveness. Otherwise we will not reach communism or lead dozens and dozens of millions of people to communism" (op. cit., vol 44, p 151).

Our economy has expanded immeasurably since then. The interests and living standard of the people have changed and their consciousness, skills and mastery have been enhanced. Within a relatively short time a new socialist society was built through the efforts of the Soviet people and entered its mature stage.

Our successes in the development of the socialist economy, shaping a socialist way of life and molding the new man are unquestionable. However, we would be anticipating in reviewing the leading role of material incentive in involving the people in labor, stimulating their responsible attitude toward the implementation of their work obligations, strengthening discipline, developing initiative and upgrading the efficiency of the quality of their labor. In summing up the results of the discussions of the draft of the USSR Constitution in 1977, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said that "...The new constitution is the fundamental law of socialism, although developed, but not of communism. We act according to the socialist principle "From each according to his capabilities and to each according to his work." It is impossible to ignore this principle given the contemporary level of economic development and people's consciousness."

However substantial our achievements may be in building communism, they have not yet raised us to the level of development and equality in the socioeconomic situation of the people and to the level of labor productivity which ensure an abundance of goods and in which the correlation between their quantity and quality and the quantity and quality of the work invested by an individual or a collective becomes unessential in the area of distribution. That is why the strictest possible social and state control is required in determining the measure of labor and consumption, the further intensification of which was stipulated at the 26th CPSU Congress.

The measure of labor and the measure of consumption are extensive and complex concepts. Their socioeconomic purpose is to act as structural components and instruments inherent in the specific socialist mechanism of summing up the assessment of the participation of the individual worker and the labor collective in public reproduction, their economic interrelationship with society, their place in the national economy and their contribution to its effectiveness. Social and state control over the measure of labor and consumption may be effective only if all processes, phenomena, forms and methods related to it operate harmoniously and improve steadily in accordance with current requirements.

In order to intensify this control we must, above all, enhance the role of the state in the management of labor and the distribution and consumption of goods on the level of the possibilities and requirements of mature socialism. The laws and advantages of the new system must be used more completely at the present stage of our social development. This requires a decisive elimination the obsolete ways and means of managing the economy and social processes in favor of modern methods which reflect our increased requirements, resources, knowledge and progressive experience. However, this is complicated by the presence of a number of serious economic difficulties and disproportions.

In improving the socialist economic management mechanism we must take into consideration both the long-term (operational during the entire historical stage of developed socialism) and the relatively short-term factors (which appear under the influence of temporary difficulties and are operational only until they have been surmounted). That is why control over the measure of labor and the measure of consumption must be improved during the 1980s also

through the establishment of new forms and methods inherent in mature socialism and on the basis of objectively existing development difficulties.

The 26th CPSU Congress formulated a great program for economic construction (intensification of the national economy, efficient use of production potential, reaching the peaks of science and technology in all sectors, improving the economic mechanism) the implementation of which will change the face of the country substantially.

It is within the framework of such changes that the profound transformations in the area of labor, improvements in the working and resting conditions of the working people, shaping their income and providing maximally favorable opportunities for their implementation must be systematically prepared and applied. Objectively, this will result in the better satisfaction of the growing material and spiritual requirements of the Soviet people.

Balancing is one of the key problems of economic development in the immediate future. It is from this viewpoint that we must begin to resolve the problem of controlling the labor and consumption methods. Its mandatory and most important aspect is to ensure a strict consistency between end results (i.e., the socially useful and acknowledged) of the work of the individual and the production collective and the benefits they receive.

In this respect the determination of end national economic results becomes a problem of the greatest methodological significance. In resolving it we must take into consideration the real experience acquired in the division of labor in and the real possibilities of accountability and control. Socialism is as yet unable to do without the mechanism of social measurement of outlays and results developed by mankind over the millenia, i.e., without commodity-monetary relations. It raises such relations to an organized planned level which serves the formulation and implementation of the single national economic plan. This approach alone enables us properly to organize the mechanism on the basis of which all work becomes oriented toward high end economic results.

If an enterprise, association or sector is working on the basis of the state plan the plan assignments must become the specific manifestation of end national economic results. In terms of the shop, sector, brigade or individual worker this end economic result means the implementation of the assignment issued by the superior authority. If plan indicators or some of them unsatisfactorily reflect the interrelationship between the labor of the worker or the collective and the problems being resolved by the national economy the reasons for such a situation must be determined and active means for changing such indicators must be found. In all cases, however, one must bear in mind the real conditions of the socialist reproduction process.

Each indicator has its positive and negative features. This conclusion is based on rather long experience gained in the search for a universal yardstick which could apply equally to all participants in the production process. For example, great hopes were placed in its time on the indicator of the normative cost of processing (NSO). Its principal shortcoming, which soon became apparent, was that it did not reflect the extent to which the

manufactured goods were truly needed by the consumer, whether or not they had reached him or had been simply stockpiled in the warehouse. This was the main reason for rejecting the NSO as a universal indicator equally applicable in all sectors. Its positive aspect applied only to some production facilities with guaranteed markets (the NSO does not encourage increased material-intensiveness). Other attempts were made to use indicators aimed at "protecting" suppliers from having their work assessed by consumers (as in the case of commodities shipped out, gross output, etc.). However, they too failed to reflect the real interconnections among the participants in the reproduction process and were value indicators in form only.

Currently the production enterprises are adopting the normative net output indicator (NChP). Its purpose is to eliminate the interest of manufacturers in the inefficient use of materials. However, it too has well known disadvantages. That is why it should not be used, for it would let the measure of the volume of output to remain uncontrolled, having severed its connection with the real reproduction indicators such as the dynamics of production costs, savings or overexpenditures of material outlays, dynamics of marketed actual (rather than normative) net output, balance sheet profit, etc. This is possible to achieve, as confirmed by the initial experience acquired in the use of NChP.

We must also take into consideration the fact that using the non-comparability between this indicator with the real financial-cost categories, in drafting their NChP for some specific commodities some sectorial ministries have set aside tangible reserves and padded their norms. The result is that the plans for the volume of output and the growth of labor productivity of some ministries and enterprises will be easy to fulfill and that ensuring the balancing between natural-physical and financial-value ratios in the national economy would become far more complex. That is why we must continue to improve the most important plan indicators. The high quality of measurements used in determining the work efficiency of enterprises, associations and sectors is a prerequisite for targeting the collective efforts on end national economic results and for the accurate determination of the precise amount of invested labor.

Under contemporary conditions, when we determine the measure of the labor of the collective and its contribution to the common project, we must take into consideration the breakdown of some material balances and economic processes. It is no secret that with increasing frequency productive capital is being underused with increasing frequency because of breakdowns in the delivery of raw and other materials and complementing items; construction deadlines are violated, the work of the transportation system remains poor, and rushing and unrhythmical production prevail. All of this calls for finding the necessary ways and means for normalizing economic turnover and eliminating the harmful influence of the effect of the disorganization of the work in some units on the work of others. We must decisively upgrade procurement discipline, the role of procurement organs and the power of economic contracts. To this effect the 5-year and annual plans of ministries, associations and enterprises are including assignments in terms of output measured in physical units. The implementation of plans for deliveries of industrial and consumer goods in terms of variety will be based on contracts and orders for manufacturing

export goods. However, such measures cannot fully resolve the problem of strengthening procurement discipline and the planned control of the production structure. This makes it important to continue our search for methods which can reflect the specific contribution of collectives in determining their specific contribution to surmounting temporary economic difficulties and achieving a better balancing of public production.

The introduction of the wage norm per ruble of output actually legitimizes the new form of control of the measures of labor and consumption. The normative system for forming the wage fund at enterprises, associations and sectors economically stimulate the increased responsibility of economic units for their work results. This also normalizes relations between the growth of labor productivity and wages in labor collectives. However, not all opportunities for normative establishment of the wage fund are still being fully used. This system is being applied extremely slowly and timidly, without the require stability of plans and norms. Yet success can be ensured only if the size of the wage fund (i.e., the wage and material incentive fund) and its dynamics in the individual cost-effective units are related most firmly to properly planned end results.

The normative method of planning and formation of the wage fund presume stability with adequate substantiation and flexibility of the norms used. With the strict and firm observance of these conditions its merits will become immediately apparent and will be a substantial contribution to strengthening state control over the correlation between the growth of socially useful results and the population's monetary income.

The enterprise should not receive a single additional kopek for wages without respectively increasing the properly planned end national economic results. The dynamics of the wage fund must properly reflect those of production efficiency. Such are today the key problems of intensified control over the measures of labor and wages in the cost effective units of our economy. Such problems face budget-financed establishments and organizations no less urgently. One of them is to surmount the loose functions, obligations and tasks of scientific, engineering-design, controlling, managing, norming and other types of establishments and organizations. A great deal of parallelism and duplication exist here. Logically related to them is the question of substantiating the size of the personnel in budget-supported establishments and organizations. They must apply more extensively the Shchekino method in upgrading the efficiency of their labor organization. Incidentally, this could help to restore the necessary correlation among the earnings of workers, engineering and technical personnel and employees.

A coordination between the measure of collective labor and its wages is a reliable prerequisite for the establishment of accurate ratios between individual labor contributions and individual income from the public economy. "The main criterion governing distribution under socialism," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said, "can be only labor -- its quantity and quality. Unfortunately, this is not always the case in practice. All kinds of equalization, the fact of merely showing up to work rather than achieving real work results and the payment of underserved bonuses have an extremely harmful effect on production indicators and the mentality of the people."

The 26th CPSU Congress called for increasing the dependence of wages and bonuses earned by the individual worker on his individual labor contribution and the end results of the collective's work and upgrading their stimulating role in the growth of labor productivity, improved production quality and conservation of all types of resources. The rate system and labor norming and the wages of the various categories of working people will be improved further in accordance with the difficulty and responsibility of the work, labor conditions and intensiveness and sectorial and regional characteristics. "Our system of material and moral incentives," the congress pointed out, "must always and comprehensively ensure the just and objective assessment of the individual labor contribution. Conscientious workers must be comprehensively encouraged. Loafers and waste-makers must be offered no loopholes for leading a good life without work. He who wants to live better must work better."

In order to implement these congressional stipulations we must engage without delay in intensive work in several directions. The first is the consistent application in economic practice of already adopted resolutions which enable each enterprise and shop to organize even stricter accountability of the true labor contribution of the workers and to improve the incentive system. Today the opportunities for this have been expanded considerably. The enterprises have the right to add to the wage rates and salaries and to withhold them should production indicators worsen. They have the right to stimulate workers through bonuses for the application of technically substantiated production norms and to review them. They can add up to 20 percent to the earnings for work based on progressive norms and bonuses for increasing resource conservation.

Practical experience proves that no full use is being made of these rights. Progressive forms of labor organization and wages and progressive experience are not being disseminated with proper speed. Sluggishness and the power of inertia are the reasons for the fact that no substantial changes for the better have been achieved so far in this area. Organizational measures aimed at substantially upgrading the activeness of labor collectives in using their opportunities must be formulated within the shortest possible time.

Another direction which must be followed in implementing the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress is the creation of an atmosphere of high exigency and principle-mindedness towards oneself and one's fellow-workers in the labor collectives. It is no secret that violations of labor discipline, careless implementation of direct obligations, slackness, neglect of safety precautions, technological violations and similar actions are not only becoming more frequent but are being treated more mildly and liberally instead of being condemned and subjected to moral and material penalties and mandatory organizational and administrative measures. It is above all the good workers who pay for the sloppiness, negligence, disorganization and forgiveness shown toward poor workers. In frequent cases conscientious people and leading production workers who are unwilling to tolerate such actions find themselves in the position of "trouble makers" and gain the reputation of being quarrelsome. Meanwhile, those who work without particular stress, the average workers or simply the loafers feel quite at ease. No outside intervention can eliminate such shortcomings. It is the labor collectives themselves and

their party, trade union and Komsomol organizations who must struggle against and defeat them. Day after day concern must be shown for developing the type of creative atmosphere and healthy moral and psychological climate within each collective and comprehensively contributing to the growth of the social and labor activeness of the Soviet people and the development of the socialist competition.

Finally, the third direction along which the dependence of earnings on the personal labor contribution and the end results of the work of the collective can be increased calls for drafting and applying new state measures aimed at improving the wage-rate system, labor norming and bonuses. The initial steps have already been taken in this direction as stipulated in the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress. In particular, we must gradually raise the minimal wage to 80 rubles monthly and the wages and salaries of workers and employees, above all in the production sectors of the national economy.

The revision of wage-rate conditions is taking place currently under a situation different from the one which prevailed in the national economy in the 1960s and 1970s. The limited nature of funds which can be allocated by the state on a centralized basis in order to increase wage rates and salaries is being felt more sharply. The role of the labor collectives themselves in finding resources for increasing them increases correspondingly.

The most important source for the replenishment of such resources is the substantial increase in labor productivity and the implementation of the planned programs for reducing the number of workers. Another real source is to increase in the wage-rate part of the earnings of wage supplements and increases, which today frequently play the role of tools in establishing an "average-equal" wage and which hinder the implementation of the state policy of wage differentiations based on the quantity and quality of labor as stipulated in the wage rate system.

The wage rate system is the basis for state control over and organization of wages. However, it cannot successfully fulfill its role if the share of earnings based on the wage rates is declining with every passing year. restoring it to its previous level must take place each 10-15 years. As the share of the wage rate share of the earnings drops the amount of additional payments and supplements paid on a decentralized basis increases, as a result of which the annual wage increases become somewhat uncontrolled. Under such circumstances the wage rate system no longer plays its leading role in forming the real earnings. This faulty practice is deservedly known as "righting." It is one of the most widespread forms of equalization.

In a number of cases this becomes an imposed practice. In norming the work and determining wage rates (i.e., establishing on the lower production level a measure of labor and its wage) the economic manager faces the fact that norming is based on one and the wage rate system on an entirely different ground.

In its time, the principle approved by Lenin, known as "behind the wage rate is the norm," had become very popular. It meant that a person should be paid for his work precisely as much as he had produced, with no restrictions

whatever. The current norming and incentive system prevents the use of this principle, for as a rule norms are reviewed relatively regularly, while wage rates or salaries remain unrevised for 10-15 or more years. The normal labor measure changes quite rapidly as technical production possibilities improve and under the influence of progressive experience. The wage rates cannot keep up with such changes. This results in a lowering of rates which, naturally, does not help to establish a healthy atmosphere in the collective, increased production activeness and reciprocal exigency between workers and managers. Practical experience has reacted to this contradiction between lowering norms and extensive use of various above-rate wage supplements. The extent to which norms become weakened and the level of "righting" earnings largely depend today on the foreman and other members of the administration. This situation hardly promotes objectivity. Sometimes the worker must base his material interest on good relations with his superiors. The likelihood of a disparity between material and moral labor incentives increases.

Under no circumstance should the worker's conscience, pride and exigency ever be based on a deal aimed at increased earnings at any cost. This precisely is the line which must be followed by the material incentive system. Wages must be truly earned, and exclude any sort of allowances. A clear and understandable wage system is needed (of the "rate based on norm" variety). The solution of this major socioeconomic problem will have a tremendous positive impact on the entire moral and psychological atmosphere in the labor collectives and will strengthen state control over the measure of labor and wages.

In this connection, the existing mechanism for reviewing wage rates must be made more flexible and responsive so that the percentage of the rate always remain sufficiently high in terms of the share of earnings. In turn, this would enable us, should production conditions change, to update norms more rapidly without lowering rates. The recently adopted procedure which calls for reviewing wage rates once every 5 years should be observed strictly.

However, the radical solution of the problem must be sought elsewhere. Above all, we must abandon the simultaneous review of wage rates, either of the individual enterprise or the sector as a whole. It would be expedient to formulate on a centralized basis new rates and salaries over the next 5-10 years which would stimulate the growth of labor productivity and face enterprises, associations and sectors with the task of applying them within that period of time to the wage fund based on norms. The faster we release unnecessary workers, install new equipment and reduce heavy labor the faster will it be possible to apply the new wage rates and salaries. They must not be mandatorily applied to all enterprise workers simultaneously. This could be done gradually, as funds are saved. With such a procedure the above-wage rate supplements and salary additions will naturally become sources of the implementation of this measure. This system, the application of which could be undertaken immediately and comprehensively, will encourage the activeness of labor collectives in terms of finding reserves and will strengthen state control over the measure of labor and wages.

The role of bonuses in stimulating work efficiency must be substantially upgraded. Currently a bonus is a guaranteed addition to the salary, a variety of equalization. Therefore, along with frontrankers, with the truly

production vanguard, mediocre workers are equally rewarded. The amount of the bonus does not correspond to the real contribution of the worker to the common project, although it should be a means for rewarding the best, a means for encouraging those who have truly distinguished themselves in their work.

Under contemporary conditions all means of incentive must be concentrated above all on upgrading production efficiency. Its growth must outstrip outlays. This, in the final account, is the meaning of the intensification process. It is a dynamic one, which can always be determined precisely. However, its objective determination requires precise and accurate data on outlays and results at all production levels and stages. That is why the party is waging an irreconcilable struggle against the rather widespread practice of padding or direct or indirect exaggeration of quantitative and qualitative indicators of enterprise work or unjustified plan amendments. Such practices also have major adverse social consequences. The lack of coincidence between actually visible and officially announced results, quite clearly seen by the collective, lowers labor discipline, adversely affects the attitude toward socialist property and, finally, hinders control over the measure of labor and consumption.

It would be difficult to assess the material harm which padding causes the country. It would be even more difficult to determine the moral damage this causes. It teaches the people to cheat, for the distorted figures issued by the enterprise go to the superior authorities. Quite frequently, an entirely "favorable" result turns out to be imaginary, triggering complacency instead of sounding the alarm. Furthermore, this leads to inevitable errors in subsequent planning.

Socialist production can and must play a most important role in the communist education of the working person directly in the process of his work. Wherever padding becomes daily practice such a problem becomes impossible to resolve. Instead, it encourages the erosion of moral values.

Groundless plan amendments result in similar socioeconomic consequences. The plan is not a dogma. It can and must be reviewed in cases of substantial changes in the economic situation. Practical experience also proves that the reason for the frequent amendment of plans is their imbalance. However, it is no secret that quite frequently plans are amended downwards, which is requested by the enterprise managers themselves who cite objective difficulties as a reason and the fact that plan nonfulfillment causes moral and material harm to the labor collectives. Such reasons are used in forgiving serious shortcomings, blunders and carelessness of managers and their inability to operate on the basis of contemporary requirements.

Unjustified plan amendments also eliminate the responsibility of the superior planning, procurement and economic organs for their own blunders and errors by guilting statistical data. This is a manifestation of bureaucratism and a weed growing on the soil of centralism. The struggle against it has been and will be waged most decisively. Lenin considered the struggle against bureaucratism one of the main directions in the efforts to improve the Soviet apparatus. As a highly humane person, who always treated the people around him with great concern and sympathy, Vladimir Il'ich was organically intollerant

of the bureaucrats and formalists who were indifferent to the cause of the workers and considered how to organize the material dependence of production managers on production results. "All people's commissariats," he wrote, "... must submit within a week a draft decree on converting the officials (anyone related to economic work) to a system of percentages of trade and profits, with the imposition of strict penalties for losses, slackness and loafing..." (op. cit., vol 44, p 425). The struggle for morality in economic relations is of basic significance. The socialist system is free from unemployment, rivalry and bankruptcy. These are its greatest socioeconomic advantages. The merciless conditions of capitalist economic management are countered by socialism with planning, cost effectiveness and socialist competition. However they can fulfill their progressive role in full only if the results of each economic unit are received in their true unguilted aspect.

The encouragement of highly efficient work and the strengthened state control over the measure of labor and consumption presume the fuller satisfaction of the population's solvent demand for a variety of items and services. This gives priority to the task of improving population supplies with food and durable consumer goods. A Food Program was formulated for the purpose of radically resolving the problem, and approved at the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee plenum. It calls for upgrading efficiency in agricultural production in all sectors of the agroindustrial complex. Today the center of gravity, as a distinguishing characteristic of agrarian policy for the 1980s, is focused on upgrading capital investment returns, agricultural productivity, increased returns on capital investments, greater farm productivity and intensification and improvement of all its relations with all sectors within the agroindustrial complex. This very year there is a real possibility of substantially improving population supplies with potatoes, many types of fruits and vegetables, pasta products, cereals and pastry goods.

Serious attention must also be paid to the program for the development of the production of consumer goods and services. Measures have been earmarked to improve trade services and public catering and to establish firm procedures governing trade and the distribution of products and goods. All of this will help to improve the balance of the population's income and expenditures and the conditions governing earned income.

However, for a certain period of time a shortage of a number of commodities and services will continue to be felt. This calls for a most decisive struggle against black marketeering and various types of abuses in the distribution of goods. The speculator, middleman and wheeler-dealer who makes use of the people's resources on the basis of the principle of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours," earns profits at the expense of society and the working people. He essentially takes for his own use part of the earned income of the honest working people, "rubbing out" the labor ruble from the store, hindering its access to the commodities and services which the state channels into the fund for meeting the population's income. He thus makes his private correction to the correlation between the measure of labor and that of real consumption established by the state and distorts it. Our party and state and the public organizations are engaged in a decisive struggle against the distortion of the socialist principles of distribution of goods (including housing, free services and others). The successful

outcome of such a struggle would be inconceivable without publicity and the extensive participation of the working people themselves. The controlled distribution of scarce food and durable goods, housing and services provided directly within the labor collectives is an effective antidote to abuses.

The 11th Five-Year Plan is advancing. As we know, the conditions under which it is being fulfilled are quite difficult. However, undoubtedly the selfless labor of the Soviet people will enable us to fulfill it successfully. Activeness, initiative and the socialist enterprise of workers, employees, kolkhoz members and all labor collectives and the unity between party and people are the foundation of our successes in resolving the problems set by the 26th CPSU Congress.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

L. I. BREZHNEV'S SPEECH AT CONFERENCE OF MILITARY COMMANDERS IN THE KREMLIN

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 14-16

[Speech delivered on 27 October 1982]

[Text] Dear comrades and comrades in arms:

I accepted with great satisfaction the suggestion of Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov of a meeting with the command personnel of the armed forces. Such meetings are always useful, the more so now, when the world situation is rather complex.

The second year following our 26th party congress is coming to a close. This has been a period rich in major events within the country and in the international arena. Reality proved the correctness of the assessments and conclusions of the congress and the far-sightedness of its resolutions. Naturally, new problems have appeared, which must be resolved without delay.

This also applies to the foreign policy of the Soviet Union -- the largest socialist state which stands in the eyes of the entire world. This gives our policy a special meaning and significance. The 26th CPSU Congress earmarked a broad program in the struggle for peace, consistent with the spirit of Lenin's behests, a program which has earned universal recognition.

The times in which we live, comrades, are complex. The international circumstances force us to double and triple our efforts in the struggle for the preservation of the peace and reducing the threat of nuclear war hanging over mankind. In this struggle we must increase our interaction with anyone who cares for peace on earth. We must also tirelessly strengthen the country's defense and be as vigilant as we can.

Of late the party's Central Committee has frequently pointed out that the international situation is continuing to worsen. The ruling U. S. circles have mounted a political, ideological and economic offensive against socialism and raised the intensiveness of their military preparations to an unparalleled level.

Practical preparations for the deployment of American medium-range nuclear missiles are under way in Europe.

The Israeli aggression in Lebanon must also be considered a consequence of the political course taken by the Americans. It is clear that, in the final account, this is an American doing. The rather difficult situation is developing in many parts of Africa, Asia and Central America. The reason is the same -- an attempt to impose the American diktat.

The people's masses in all continents are angrily opposing Washington's aggressive policy which is threatening to plunge the world into the flames of nuclear war. The adventurism, coarseness and unconcealed egotism of this policy are triggering the growing indignation of many countries, some of them U. S. allies.

Naturally, under such circumstances the development of our relations with other countries is very important. Relations with China are of great importance. We are sincerely in favor of normalizing relations with that country and are doing everything dependent on us in that direction. Beijing is also saying that normalizing would be desirable. So far we see no essential changes in the foreign policy course of the PRC. However, we must not ignore the features which are becoming apparent.

Today two lines clash in world politics.

The line pursued by the United States and all those who follow it is one of increasing tension and maximal aggravation of the situation. The United States is dreaming of the political isolation and economic weakening of the USSR and its friends. It has deployed an unparalleled arms race, nuclear in particular, and is trying to achieve military superiority. By following this path imperialism is irresponsibly gambling with the future of the peoples.

Our line is one of detente and strengthening international security. We shall not abandon it. We shall increase our efforts and retain the initiative in international affairs.

You realize that politics requires more than mere words. Politics is effective when it is based on the real economic and military power of the state, the boundless support of the people and firm friendship and combat alliance with allies and friends. We have all of this and are tirelessly working in that direction.

Now as to internal tasks. Our homeland is welcoming the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR at the peak of its power.

The country's economic and social progress are obvious. Industry is working at a good pace. It can create everything we need, relying almost entirely on its own domestic material and raw material base.

Naturally, not everything is smooth. There are difficulties and shortcomings. Metals, fuels and transportation remain our bottlenecks. Our economic managers will have to do extensive work to eliminate them. The situation in capital construction is improving too slowly, although the measures recently taken are already yielding results.

Extensive work is taking place in agriculture so that in the future we may avoid grain purchases abroad and fully meet rising population demand. We ascribe exceptional importance to the Food Program, which was adopted at the May Central Committee plenum.

Comrades! Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov regularly reports to me on the condition of our armed forces. I myself, as part of my official duties, am always concerned with problems of strengthening the army and navy and am familiar with your situation.

You are doing intensive work. This year's results confirm that unquestionable successes have been achieved in the areas of the combat readiness and preparedness of the armed forces. The large-scale operative, technical and organizational measures which were implemented increased the combat power of the army and navy. I can note with satisfaction the positive results of the large-scale exercises conducted in recent years, the results of which lead to important conclusions regarding the future.

Our people love their armed forces and are confident in their constant readiness to defend their socialist homeland. They value their courage and dedication in the implementation of their military duties.

Every one can see that the Soviet Armed Forces are a powerful factor for peace and security and a reliable means for restraining aggressive forces. The people spare nothing in ensuring that they are always on the level of their tasks. We are equipping the armed forces with the most modern weapons and ordnance. The party's Central Committee is seeing to it that you have everything you need. The armed forces must always be worthy of such concern.

The times now are such that the level of combat readiness of the army and navy must become even greater. We must always be concerned with advancing the combat readiness, with a feeling of exceptional responsibility based on growing requirements. In such a case no event could catch us unawares.

We must be able to operate using the latest achievements of the martial science and art. It is important persistently to achieve positive results in combat training. Particular attention must be paid to troop management.

Weapons mastery and the ability to make full use of their combat possibilities are exceptionally important.

The soviet army must be on the level of all problems related to equipment, structure and training methods. It must be consistent with modern tasks. It is you, comrades, who are responsible for this.

Let us particularly mention the further strengthening of the material base of the armed forces. The struggle on the military-technical field has become sharply aggravated. Frequently it acquires an essentially new nature. Any lagging in this struggle is inadmissible.

We are hoping that our scientists, designers, engineers and technicians will do all they can to ensure the successful solution of all these problems.

Naturally, party-political work related to the education of the personnel must be intensified. A high moral spirit has always been the most powerful weapon of our army. This applies to an even greater extent to the present.

Concern for soldiers and officers and for the equipment of the troops has always been the focal point of attention of our party and Soviet state. You must continue to consider this task as one of the most important ones.

Comrades, the party's Central Committee is confident that the tasks facing our armed forces will be successfully implemented. This is guaranteed by the tempered and highly conscientious command and political cadres in the army and navy, boundlessly loyal to the homeland, the high skill and rich experience of the members of the collegium of the USSR Ministry of Defense and the efficient work of the entire ministry which is reliably guided by the loyal son of the Leninist party and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, our comrade in arms, friend and comrade, Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov.

Comrades! Extensive work and new exercises and campaigns lie ahead of you. We are confident that they will be yet another significant step in the training of the armed forces. On behalf of the party's Central Committee and on my own I am confident that you will fulfill your assignments successfully. You have the steady support and aid of the Central Committee in this respect.

Allow me to wish you further success in your responsible military work!

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

HISTORIC FEAT OF ARMS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 17-31

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Ustinov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of defense]

[Text] Forty years ago, in the battle for Stalingrad the Soviet armed forces inflicted a severe defeat on the German-fascist aggressors. The victory on the banks of the Volga changed the strategic situation on the Soviet-German front and marked the beginning of a radical change in the course of the Great Patriotic War and World War II. Hitlerite Germany was unable to recover following the defeat at Stalingrad and the expulsion of the enemy from Soviet territory began.

Gained at the cost of the incredible stress on all popular forces and major sacrifices, privations, dedication and unparalleled heroism at the front and the rear, the victory in the battle for Stalingrad convincingly proved to the entire world the invincibility of the socialist system and the Soviet state and the boundless loyalty of the Soviet people to the ideals of the communist party as well as the gigantic military might of our armed forces. "The victory at Stalingrad," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, "was not merely a victory but a historical exploit."

The 40th anniversary of the battle of Stalingrad is welcomed by the Soviet people under circumstances of political and labor upsurge created by the preparations for the celebration of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR. Headed by the communist party and its Leninist Central Committee, led by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, the outstanding state and political leader of our time, and implementing the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress, our people are achieving new successes in the building of communism and in strengthening the defense of the socialist homeland and its international positions.

1

A great deal has been said of the battle of Stalingrad over the past 40 years. Thousands of articles and books have been written--scientific studies, memoirs and works of fiction. Today as well, however, again and again we turn back to its events, results, military and political significance and lessons.

The confrontation which developed in the second half of 1942 over the huge area between the Volga and Don rivers, between the Soviet and German-fascist armies, was unparalleled in world military history in terms of scope, stress and amount of involved troops and combat equipment. It involved on both parts the participation of more than 2 million men, more than 25,000 guns and mortars, and thousands of airplanes, tanks and self-propelling artillery systems.

The battle of Stalingrad was not only a gigantic battle between large groups of forces but a severe test of the strength and viability of conflicting sociopolitical systems--the socialist and the capitalist. Like the Great Patriotic War as a whole, it was a battle between the forces of progress, humanism and socialism and the dark forces of reaction, barbarism and imperialism.

An exceptionally difficult situation faced the land of the soviets during the second half of 1942. This was one of the most difficult periods in the Great Patriotic War. The Hitlerite command, profiting from the absence of a second front in Europe, had replenished its combat casualties suffered during the 1941-1942 winter and, throwing additionally more than 40 divisions on the Soviet-German front, mounted a broad offensive along the southern flank. It was hoping to regain the strategic initiative lost at the battle for Moscow, take the USSR out of the war and defeat the antifascist coalition. Because of its great superiority in manpower and materiel, the German-fascist army advanced thousands of kilometers within Soviet territory.

The enemy reached the Volga, broke through the foothills of the Caucasian Ridge, separating the central areas of the European part of the country from the Caucasus, and blocking shipments of Baku petroleum to our economy and armed forces. By then the most important economic areas which had been inhabited before the war by about 80 million people, which accounted for one-third of the country's industrial output, 47 percent of its areas under crops and approximately one-half of its livestock, fell under fascist occupation.

The fascist rulers considered the days of the Soviet state numbered. They hoped that their main objective--the defeat of the Soviet Union--would be reached with one or two more efforts.

The communist party did not conceal the stern truth of the situation. It demanded of the troops "not one step back!" The more difficult the circumstances became at the front, the more closely the Soviet people rallied around the Central Committee of the Leninist party and the Soviet government. The party members cemented the army ranks and were the first in battle. By selflessly carrying out their military duty, through their personal example, they inspired their comrades-in-arms to patriotic exploits.

During those tense days of battle many troops linked their lives with the party, wishing to share with it the responsibility for the fate of the fatherland. "I want to join the battle as a communist," they wrote in their petitions for party membership.

In the summer and autumn of 1942 the word "Stalingrad" became a permanent feature of the press in all countries and continents and was constantly heard on the radio. Holding its breath, the world was waiting for news from Stalingrad. The progressive people on earth admired the fearlessness of the Soviet troops and commanders who stood up on the banks of the Volga fighting to the death.

The inspiring words of the famous Stalingrad sniper Vasilii Zaytsev "There Is No Land for Us Beyond the Volga!" became the battle slogan of the city's defenders. In the mortal battles with the enemy all of them, from the rank-and-file private to the general, displayed their high moral-political firmness, heroism and military skill. The Hitlerites paid in blood, suffering tremendous casualties, for each meter of advance in Stalingrad.

The heroic defense of the city lasted about 4 months. The heaviest burden in the defense battles fell on the shoulders of the forces of the 62nd and 64th armies commanded, respectively, by Generals V. I. Chuykov and M. S. Shumilov. The main enemy strikes fell on them. The battle for the city was unparalleled in fierceness and stubbornness. Despite superior forces, the enemy was unable to conquer the Volga fortress. His offensive opportunities dried out in the bloodshedding battles. The noble fighters of Stalingrad not only withstood but won.

The innumerable military exploits of many formations and units which defended Stalingrad are the pride of our people and armed forces. The combat glory of the 13th Guards Division commanded by A. I. Rodimtsev, the divisions commanded by L. N. Gurt'yev, N. F. Batyuk and I. I. Lyudnikov and the operative group of S. F. Gorokhov will never fade. The working people of the city fought shoulder to shoulder with the troops. People's militia detachments and fighter battalions were organized among the workers and employees of enterprises and establishments, under the guidance of the Stalingrad Oblast party committee, headed by Obkom First Secretary A. S. Chuyanov. The plants which produced the armaments needed by the front and repaired tanks, guns and other military equipment, did not stop working even for a minute.

In paying his deep respects to the defenders of the city-hero, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: "Mankind remembers them as the heroes of Stalingrad. However, they had come here from all parts of the country and our entire country was behind them.

"Answering the call of the homeland and the party, the Soviet people came here to defend the freedom and honor of their peoples, to defend the gains of the Great October. There would have been no Stalingrad victory if the sons of Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, the Baltic area, the Caucasus, Siberia, Kazakhstan and Central Asia had not stood shoulder to shoulder in the trenches of Stalingrad.

"There would have been no Stalingrad victory had the plants in the Urals and Siberia not worked night and day and had the working people in the kolkhoz fields not carried out their seemingly unnoticed exploit.

"The homeland did everything for the heroes of Stalingrad to carry out their duty with honor."

Heavy defensive battles were still raging on the city's streets while the Soviet command was already preparing the strategic operation for surrounding and defeating the German-fascist forces at Stalingrad. Within a short time the VKP(b) Central Committee Politburo, the State Defense Committee, and the Supreme Command Headquarters, headed by J. V. Stalin, did a tremendous amount of work in raising the strategic and operative reserves, moving them to Stalingrad, and accumulating and delivering to the front the necessary material facilities and technical equipment for the troops.

This was helped by the fact that the country's national economy had become reorganized on a military basis. The workers in the rear, answering the call of the communist party "Everything for the Front, Everything for Victory!," supplied the army with increasing quantities of weapons, ammunition, equipment and food. New combat materiel was being delivered to the forces. Tank and mechanized corps and tank and air force armies and artillery divisions were raised.

The strategic plan for the defeat of the German-fascist forces at Stalingrad and the extensive advancing operations conducted in the winter of 1942-1942 on the southern flank of the Soviet-German front were developed as a result of the joint creative activities of supreme headquarters, the general staff, the commanders of the branches of the armed forces and the front commands. Headquarters representatives Generals G. K. Zhukov, A. M. Vasilevskiy and N. N. Voronov played an important role in the formulation and implementation of this plan.

On 19 November 1942, the Soviet fronts at Stalingrad launched a decisive counteroffensive, unexpected by the Hitlerites, in order to surround the main German-fascist forces between the Volga and the Don along converging directions, through powerful strikes. Although as a whole our forces enjoyed insignificant superiority compared with the enemy, thanks to the high art of the Soviet military command, and the experience in launching major operations, acquired during the first stage of the war, the necessary superiority over the enemy in terms of forces and materiel was established in the directions of the main strikes.

On 23 November, the spearheads of the southwestern front, moving toward each other, under the command of Gen N. F. Vatutin, and the Stalingrad front, commanded by Gen A. I. Yeremenko, met. A successful offensive was mounted by the Don front, commanded by Gen K. K. Rokossovskiy. The Sixth Field Army and part of the forces of the Fourth Tank Army of the enemy, totaling more than 330,000 soldiers and officers, were tightly surrounded.

The Soviet army smashed the enemy forces which tried to break through. In this case a particularly important role was played by the heroic actions of the Second Guards Army commanded by Gen R. Ya. Malinovskiy, which not only stopped the enemy but, together with the 51st Army commanded by Gen N. I. Trufanov, inflicted a serious defeat on it.

The German-fascist forces surrendered at the beginning of February 1943. At the beginning of the Soviet counteroffensive we faced 1 million enemy soldiers in the area between the Volga and the Don. By the time of the surrender of the German-fascist forces the enemy had lost more than 800,000 men killed, wounded or captured. The operational plan was implemented brilliantly. For the first time in the history of wars such strong enemy forces had found themselves fully surrounded and subsequently eliminated.

The city of Stalingrad, covered by the glory of revolutionary, combat and labor traditions, remained unconquered.

The defeat of the German-fascist forces at Stalingrad laid the beginning of the powerful offensive launched by the Soviet armed forces in the winter of 1942-1943 in the Northern Caucasus, the upper and lower Don, at Voronezh, in the Rzhev and Demyansk areas and at Leningrad.

Our people welcomed the victory on the Volga enthusiastically. The entire country was seized by a tremendous political and labor upsurge. The working people in the rear, inspired by the victory, assumed increased socialist pledges and met the requests of the front with even greater dedication.

The victory at Stalingrad strengthened the faith of imminent liberation among the Soviet people living in territories temporarily occupied by the enemy. Their resistance to the aggressors increased. The nationwide struggle behind German-fascist lines increased considerably.

The Stalingrad victory became an inspiring example to the soldiers and officers of all our fronts, from beyond the polar circle to the Black Sea.

The homeland highly appreciated the Stalingrad exploit. Dozens of thousands of troops were presented awards by the government and 112 of the most distinguished among them were made Heroes of the Soviet Union. A specially coined medal "For the Defense of Stalingrad" was presented to more than 700,000 participants in the battle; 183 formations, large units and units were given the title of guard; 55 were awarded orders; and 44 were awarded the honor names of Stalingrad, Kantemir, Don, Kotel'nikovo, and others. On the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the victory in the Great Patriotic War, the city-hero of Volgograd was awarded the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal.

The Stalingrad victory was a victory of the great Soviet people, headed by its Leninist-communist party. Its Central Committee was the headquarters which provided the supreme political and strategic guidance of the military operations. The party rallied and directed the efforts of the Soviet people at the front and the rear to a single objective--the defeat of the enemy--and inspired them to military exploits.

The fact that more than 1,368,000 of the best troops and workers in the rear joined the party as candidate members is a clear manifestation of the high prestige enjoyed by the party among the people. More than 573,000 people became party members.

The live and continuing party-political work at the front during the period of the battle for Stalingrad was the basis for the willpower of the people and their faith in victory, triggering their courage and heroism. The members of the party's Central Committee, front and army commanders, military council members, and heads of political administrations and departments actively participated in party-political work. The party word was disseminated among the masses by commanders and political workers, propagandists, agitators, party activities and all party members.

Ensuring the implementation of combat orders, strengthening one-man command, upgrading the role and authority of commanders, and developing among the troops firmness in defense and high activeness in offense and the ability to surmount all difficulties of military life were the most important tasks of political organs, and party and Komsomol organizations. The dissemination of combat experience and the exploits of the Stalingrad heroes played a particular role in these efforts.

The Stalingrad victory, as the victory in the Great Patriotic War as a whole, was a victory of the Soviet social and governmental system. It was a clear manifestation of the inexhaustible economic and organizational opportunities of socialism, the moral and political unity of Soviet society, and the close unity among Soviet people and all classes and social groups, nations and nationalities rallied around the communist party.

The Stalingrad victory was a victory of our entire multinational people, of Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism, of the friendship among the peoples of the USSR and of the unparalleled firmness and courage of the Soviet people and their readiness to sacrifice their lives for the sake of the freedom and independence of the socialist fatherland.

The Stalingrad victory was the victory of Marxist-Leninist ideology over the ideology of Nazism. It was the victory of socialist humanism over imperialist obscurantism and barbarism, and of communist morality over the man-hating morality of fascism.

The Stalingrad victory was a victory of the socialist military organization which proved superior to the effectiveness of the military organization of the fascist state. It was a victory of the Soviet armed forces, of all branches and arms whose personnel displayed unparalleled dedication and mass heroism.

The Stalingrad victory was the true triumph of Soviet martial art, a clear indicator of the maturity of strategic leadership and the high level of combat skill of commanders and troops. Soviet military commanders excelled over the enemy in the art of defense and offense. The surrounding and elimination of large enemy groups despite considerable superiority in terms of forces and materiel were successfully carried out in the battle on the Volga.

More flexibly and consistently than the command of the German-fascist forces, the Soviet command carried out its own plans. It was more careful and far-

sighted in its plans and in its choice of methods for their implementation. The defensive and counteroffensive operations conducted by the Soviet forces at Stalingrad showed originality in operative solutions, the use of new tactical means frequently unexpected by the enemy, efficiency in the interaction of forces and means, the high art of maneuvering, and firm conduct of the troops. The mastery of the experience gained in the Stalingrad victory had a most fruitful impact on the further development of the theory and practice of the art of war in the subsequent periods of the Great Patriotic War.

The Stalingrad victory was a victory of the socialist economy. Under the most difficult war conditions, compared with the prewar level, by November 1942 the country's industry had increased the production of infantry armaments by a factor of 4.3; mortars, 10.2; artillery guns, 6.3; tanks, 8; and aircraft, 3.7.

In speaking of our economy as it functioned at that time, including its most important sector--the war industry--let us emphasize that despite the incredibly difficult conditions, the Soviet Union supplied the active army with all the necessary means of war by itself, through its own resources.

To the workers in the defense industry this was a time of bold and original economic and technical decisions, justified production risks, and rejection of many previously customary labor methods. It was a time of high upsurge of creative thinking on the part of scientists, designers, engineers, technicians and workers. The work on supplying the needs of the front had no secondary sectors. Each unit of the war economy was important, for its successful activities determined the harmony of the entire war economy. The clear military and technical superiority of our army over the Wehrmacht became clear already at Stalingrad.

The significance of the exploit at Stalingrad performed by the Soviet people and our armed forces is exceptionally great. It is justifiably considered historical, for our victory on the Volga was the most important military-political event in the history of World War II. The Soviet armed forces firmly seized the strategic initiative and began to impose their will on the enemy. The fascist bloc converted to defense not only on the Soviet-German front but on the other war theaters as well, including the Pacific. The international prestige of the USSR rose sharply after Stalingrad. The Soviet army was seen by the world as a force capable of carrying out a great mission --the liberation of other nations from the brown fascist plague.

Our Stalingrad exploit is justifiably described as historical also because as a result of the victory of the Soviet troops on the Volga German military power, the prestige of its armed forces and the moral spirit of Nazism were seriously undermined. It was no accident that the funeral sound of the bells was heard for a period of 3 days over the Third Reich. The Hitlerite bloc weakened sharply. The domestic political situation in Italy, Romania and Hungary, whose forces also experienced a catastrophe at Stalingrad, was aggravated.

Finally, the Stalingrad exploit of the Soviet people and their armed forces is described as historical because it proved to the entire people the fact that fascism was doomed and its failure was inevitable. Our victory on the Volga gave a powerful impetus to the intensification of the national liberation movement of the peoples of the Orient and contributed to the strengthening of the anti-Hitlerite coalition.

Today the reactionary bourgeois ideologues in the West are doing everything possible to belittle the universal-historical significance of our Stalingrad victory. Instead of exposing the sociopolitical reasons for the defeat of the German-fascist forces by the Soviet army, they reduce all matters to the errors made by Hitler or by some of his generals, the unreliability of the German satellites, the adverse weather conditions and other secondary factors. A great deal of effort is being made to rank this victory along other less significant events in World War II or in general to ignore it.

However, the freedom-loving peoples remember that the rescue of mankind from the threat of fascist slavery began with the victory of the Soviet army at Stalingrad and that the way to global domination by the aggressor was blocked once and for all.

The lessons of the Stalingrad victory, as a structural part of the victory of the USSR in World War II, will never be forgotten. Its main lesson is the fact that the forces of peace, democracy and socialism proved their unquestionable superiority over the forces of war, reaction and imperialism. Socialism is invincible.

The historical exploit of the Soviet people and their armed forces in the battle for Stalingrad is a stern warning to the reactionary imperialist forces and to all amateurs of military adventures.

2

From the heights reached today we can see with particular clarity that our victory on the Volga was a most important contribution to the defeat of fascism and to the fact that mankind was able to take the path of a just postwar organization of the world, the path of democracy and socialism. The Stalingrad heroes fought for the sake of great and humane objectives and their struggle yielded worthy results.

Developed socialism was built in the USSR thanks to the tremendous efforts of the people and the firm and consistent implementation of the Leninist general line by the communist party. The resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress opened even wider the prospects for building communism.

The national economic successes in the 11th Five-Year Plan make it possible to implement step by step the social program adopted by the party congress. The implementation of the USSR Food Program will reliably ensure the people with food and industry with agricultural raw materials.

The Soviet people are justifiably proud of the profound changes which have taken place in our country over the past 65 years and with the revolutionary historical mission which our homeland, marching in the living ranks of the fighters for peace and the independence, freedom and happiness of the peoples, is fulfilling honorably.

Fraternity and friendship, comradely mutual aid and multilateral cooperation between the USSR and the other members of the socialist comity are a guarantee of our common successes in building the new society and the struggle for peace.

Socialism and peace are inseparable concepts. The foreign policy of the Soviet state, starting with the Great October Revolution, has an inherent consistent peace-loving nature. It is based on the most profound interest shown by our people in peace as the most important prerequisite for successful progress toward communism.

As early as 1918, in his "Letter to the American Workers," V. I. Lenin noted that "... As a socialist republic ... we have raised in the eyes of the entire world the banner of peace, the banner of socialism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 37, pp 53-54). The new generations of Soviet people as well see their duty lying in the adamant struggle for peace. Expressing the will of the entire party and people, in his speech at the closing of the 26th CPSU Congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: "We intend to concentrate all our forces on two interrelated directions. The first is the building of communism and the second is strengthening peace."

As in the past, imperialism is the main threat to peace. In the decades following the Great Patriotic War it has frequently led the world to the brink of a new world war. The lessons of the crushing fascist defeat in World War II and at the Stalingrad battle have obviously not been ignored by the aggressive imperialist circles. The fact that they are failing in their criminal intentions is the result of the tireless struggle waged for peace and against the threat of nuclear catastrophe on the part of the USSR, the other socialist countries and all peace-loving forces of our time. More than ever before today the Soviet Union and its allies are the main bulwark of peace on earth.

As before World War II, today imperialist policy is displaying with particular clarity its adventurism and readiness to gamble with the vital interests of mankind for the sake of its narrowly selfish objectives.

The most aggressive imperialist circles, American above all, are trying to regain the role of rulers of the fate of peoples and countries. Essentially, the programmatic speeches of the leader of the White House and his closest assistants discuss plans for the establishment of global U.S. rule.

At the turn of the 1980s the U.S. administration charted a course of undermining detente. The ruling U.S. circles consider that the main obstacles on the way to this adventuristic course are above all the Soviet Union and the socialist comity. That is precisely why the Soviet Union has been proclaimed

"Enemy No 1" of the United States and that is precisely why President Reagan has proclaimed a "crusade" against the USSR and the other socialist states.

The malicious anti-Soviet and anticommunist objectives of imperialist reaction were manifested most openly in the strategy of "direct confrontation" adopted by Washington for the 1980s. This aggressive strategy calls for a firm confrontation with the Soviet Union and the use of U.S. military power for the sake of imposing its will on any country in any part of the world, to counter the struggle waged by the people's masses for social and national liberation and to hinder the establishment of countries free from colonial oppression and following a progressive path of development.

The prime objective of the "direct confrontation" strategy is the elimination of the approximate parity in military-strategic power existing between the United States and the USSR and between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, and the desire to surpass the military union militarily and to dictate conditions to it.

Unquestionably, the hopes of the Washington politicians and strategists of gaining military superiority over us will be unsuccessful. The approximate parity in military-strategic power between the USSR and the United States is no accidental result in the least but a legitimate outcome of the increased possibilities of developed socialism.

Having taken the path of avengers, starting with the end of the 1970s the ruling circles of American imperialism mounted an unprecedented arms race. During the 1982 fiscal year the overall military expenditures of the United States totaled \$214 billion and outstripped similar expenditures in 1981 by \$40 billion. Allocations for military purposes for the 1983 fiscal year are in excess of \$260 billion. All in all, over the next 5 years (1983-1987) the truly astronomical amount of more than \$1.6 trillion, a record in U.S. history, will be spent on military objectives.

The main emphasis in military preparations is on the development of strategic offensive forces and nuclear armaments of all kinds. New weapons systems are being created and conventional systems are being improved.

The new American strategy calls for the extensive use of weapons for the mass destruction of people, including neutron, chemical, ray, and other weapons. The U.S. politicians and strategists deem it entirely acceptable and even expedient to wage a nuclear war and are making practical preparations for it, based on the hope of gaining the upper hand.

They are particularly concerned with creating a potential for a first nuclear strike, reducing the distance across which such a strike would be most profitable and protecting their own territory from nuclear war. The deployment of new American missiles in the Western European members of NATO and in other countries neighboring the USSR would precisely help to resolve these problems as conceived by the Pentagon.

The United States is trying to energize existing aggressive military-political alliances and to create new ones. New military bases are being opened in addition to those existing thousands of kilometers away from the United States, aimed against the USSR and its allies. The American presence abroad is increasing. Generous military assistance is given to reactionary and anti-people's regimes in exchange for their involvement in the implementation of the global and regional plans of American imperialism. Acts of naked aggression and international banditry, committed by countries such as Israel and South Africa, are being encouraged. By proclaiming entire parts of the globe part of its "vital interests," the United States is unceremoniously interfering in the affairs of other countries, including Poland and Afghanistan. It is trying to dictate to sovereign countries the policy they should pursue --both domestic and foreign--and the way they should handle their own natural resources; should such countries refuse to obey to their diktat they are threatened with all kinds of sanctions, even including war.

Deliberately supporting existing and creating new hotbeds of tension, the United States is trying to involve us not only in increasing armaments but in local military conflicts as well. It is hoped that this would wear out the Soviet economy and would sharply slow down the solution of economic and social problems.

To this purpose efforts are being made to curtail and even terminate economic and scientific and technical relations with our country and to apply sanctions and boycott.

An actual ideological war is being waged against the USSR and our friends and allies. Forgeries and disinformation are used in an effort to discredit socialism and the ideas of scientific communism in the eyes of the toiling masses, to promote hostility for the Soviet Union throughout the world, to divide the workers and national-liberation movements and to split the socialist comity.

However, regardless of how much the imperialists and their accomplices are stressing their forces, their new crusade against the USSR will end in total failure, as have all such crusades in the past. Past experience proves that economic blockade, cold war or military aggression are unable to stop the development of socialism and to put an end to the struggle of the peoples for national freedom and social justice.

The aggressive foreign policy course pursued by the United States has no future nor could have one. The only sensible way for global progress is that of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems. The period of international detente confirms the real possibility of following this path by mankind.

The course pursued by the United States and its allies of undermining detente, urging on the arms race, engaging in threats and interference in foreign affairs and suppressing the liberation struggle is countered by the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist comity with a course of restraining the arms race, strengthening peace and detente and protecting the sovereign rights and freedoms of the peoples.

The peace program for the 1980s adopted by the 26th CPSU Congress and all subsequent peaceful initiatives of our country are distinguished by political farsightedness and true humanism. They express the joint position held by the members of the socialist comity and have a beneficial impact on the international situation. We consider that any grave foreign political problem can be resolved not through confrontation but through just and equitable agreements.

The Soviet side has taken a number of practical steps which contribute to the strengthening of peaceful cooperation, taken one-sidedly, as setting a good example. Such steps include a reduction in the size of Soviet forces and armaments in Central Europe, terminating the deployment and reducing the number of medium-range nuclear weapons, and others.

Again unilaterally the USSR took the historical step of assuming the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The adoption of such a clear obligation by the other nuclear powers would mean in practice a ban on the use of nuclear weapons in general. "We are still waiting for the NATO countries to answer to this step in a spirit of good will," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the dinner in honor of I. Gandhi, prime minister of the republic of India.

Also important is the recent initiative taken by the Soviet Union, which suggested that the leading organs of NATO and the Warsaw Pact issue declarations on the nonproliferation of the realm of action of the two military-political groups in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The threat of nuclear war is not abating. The solution of vital international problems cannot be postponed. Time waits for no one. Such problems, however complex they may be, must be resolved. The only way to achieve this is through talks--honest, open and direct--talks which are awaited by all progressive people on earth, for peace belongs to all mankind.

The successful completion of Soviet-American talks in Geneva and in Vienna could play a major role in abating international tension. So far they have failed to yield the desired results, for our partners insist on the one-sided disarmament of the USSR with a simultaneous "further rearming" of the United States and its NATO allies.

The United State is trying to extract from us unjustified concessions and achieve a reduction in strategic weapons which would disturb the approximate balance of forces to the benefit of the United States. Understandably, such a position has nothing in common with the sincere desire to reach agreements respecting the legitimate interests of the security of either side.

The Soviet Union will not undertake to disarm unilaterally. If the U.S. administration and the governments of the other NATO countries merely begin to drag the talks on over an indefinite period of time, while continuing the policy of arms race and nuclear confrontation under the cover of talks on their desire for peace and disarmament, they would assume a severe responsibility in the eyes of mankind.

The Soviet Union will continue to structure its policy in accordance with the behavior of the United States and its NATO allies: whether or not they would show common sense or, as before, try to abandon the positive features of the policy of detente.

3

The dedication of the Soviet people to the cause of peace is consistent and inflexible. However, it also presumes constant concern for ensuring the country's security. "The defense of the socialist fatherland," the USSR Constitution states, "is one of the most important functions of the state and is the cause of the whole people."

Through their own historical experience the Soviet people have realized the adventurism and aggressiveness of imperialist policy. They well know that power, substantial power is needed in order to protect the revolutionary and socialist gains from aggression and to safeguard the peace. The Soviet army and navy--the beloved offspring of our people--represent precisely such power.

The image of the armed forces of the USSR has changed incomparably compared with the period when the Soviet soldiers stood up to defend Stalingrad with their bodies. Today the army and navy have everything necessary to repel any aggression, whatever its origin. The 26th CPSU Congress stressed that "not for a single day have the party and the state ignored problems of strengthening the defense power of the country and its armed forces."

Communist party leadership is the very foundation of Soviet military construction. Under contemporary conditions the importance of this leadership becomes even greater because of the considerably increased complexity of tasks related to organizing the armed defense of the USSR, the drastic qualitative changes in the condition of the army and navy and military affairs as a whole, the increased role of the moral-political factor in terms of the course and outcome of a war and the broadened international tasks of the Soviet state and its armed forces.

Along with the solution of a variety of political, economic, social, ideological and other problems related to building communism, the CPSU is formulating a military policy and military doctrine. It guides the entire life and activities of the armed forces. It is concerned with upgrading their combat power and combat readiness and strengthening their cooperation with the armies of the fraternal socialist countries.

Soviet military policy is a structural component of the entire policy of the party and the state. It is imbued with the ideas of Lenin's theory of the defense of the socialist fatherland and the spirit of proletarian and socialist internationalism. It is inseparably linked with the consistent implementation of the peaceful foreign policy course pursued by the CPSU and the Soviet state.

The just objectives of our foreign policy course are reflected in Soviet military doctrine as well, which is of a strictly defensive nature. The USSR Constitution legislatively codifies the fact that the Soviet armed forces have been created with a view to protecting the socialist gains, the peaceful toil of the Soviet people and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the state. No other type of Soviet military doctrine could exist. This legitimately stems from the class nature of the Soviet state and the essence of its foreign policy to which militarism, aggressiveness and adventurism are absolutely alien.

However, the defensive nature of the martial doctrine does not doom our army and navy to a passive attitude in the least. According to this doctrine active and decisive as well as offensive actions are considered among the most efficient means for repelling an enemy attack.

Such actions were applied by the Soviet armed forces in the past as well for defense purposes, in order to remove from the imperialists any desire to mount an aggression against us, through crushing counterstrikes. Hitler's strategists saw for themselves the power and irrepressible nature of these strikes.

The communist party daily guides the practice of defense construction and training of the armed forces. There is no single area in military affairs in which the constant beneficial impact of the party, its Central Committee, the Central Committee Politburo and personally Comrade L. I. Brezhnev are not felt. A new vivid proof of this is found in the participation of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and other party and state leaders in the recently held conference of the leadership of the Soviet army and navy. In his speech at the conference L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that "the Soviet army must be on the level of all problems: equipment, structure, and methods of training. It must be consistent with contemporary tasks." L. I. Brezhnev expressed the confidence of the party's Central Committee that the tasks facing the armed forces will be carried out successfully.

In guiding military construction, the communist party is always concerned with ensuring the development of the army and navy in accordance with contemporary scientific and technical progress.

The achievements of Soviet science and technology and the dedicated work of the entire people enable us to have any type of armament which a potential foe may have or would like to have, in the necessary quantity. However, the measures implemented to improve the technical equipment of the army and navy are something we are forced to do. Our state has never supported the arms race. It has never tried to compete in the military area. Such competition is extremely dangerous to the cause of peace. Both in the past and the present the Soviet Union has persistently and adamantly suggested to the United States and the other NATO members to restrain on a reciprocal basis and on the principles of equality and identical security of the sides from the creation and production of any types of weapons, both nuclear and conventional, and to reduce existing arms stockpiles. Unfortunately, so far such clear and constructive suggestions have met with no support.

In resolving the basic problems of the technical equipment of the army and navy the party believes that man remains the main force in war. The appearance of new types of weapons and the extensive automation of troop and weapons control do not reduce the role of the soldier or the importance of his professional, moral-psychological and physical qualities. "... However high the technical equipment of the army may be," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said, "man, who has mastered this equipment to perfection, remains the main, the decisive force in war. This is particularly important now, in the age of nuclear missile weapons, when the outcome of a war will be decided by people who have mastered weapons and combat equipment, who are morally and physically tempered and who are infinitely loyal to their homeland, party and people."

The decisive role of man in battle is based mainly on the characteristics of modern warfare. It must be assumed that, compared with the Great Patriotic War, the stress of combat operations and the load which must be carried will be increased manyfold. A modern battle means not only a tactical and armament confrontation and not only a tremendous physical, moral and psychological trial of the troops. Political consciousness, class convictions, willpower, character and courage assume even greater importance in modern combat.

The successful implementation of the combat assignments facing subunits, units and ships can be met only by troops with excellent training and professional skill, with high combat spirit, and with most profound and inflexible "conviction in the justice of the war and awareness of the need to sacrifice their lives for the good of their brothers," to use Lenin's words (op. cit., vol 41, p 121).

The greatest concern of the communist party is the shaping of such qualities in the Soviet forces. The successful solution of this problem is ensured by the entire way of life of Soviet society, its armed forces, and the active and purposeful party-political work of commanders, political organs and party and Komsomol organizations.

The training and education of the armed forces personnel is a comprehensive process. It imbues all areas of army and navy life and covers all categories of military servicemen, from the soldier and seaman to the general and the admiral.

The final objective of training and education in the army and navy is to train armed defenders of the homeland infinitely loyal to the communist party and the Soviet people, masters of their combat skill, graded specialists, excelling in combat and political training.

The development of a Marxist-Leninist outlook, which is the foundation of communist idea-mindedness and conscientiousness, plays a decisive role in the training and education of the Soviet troops.

The Leninist doctrine of the defense of the socialist fatherland and the profound mastery and implementation of the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums is the pivot of the ideological upbringing and of all party-political work in the armed forces.

Great significance is ascribed to the tactical, fire, technical and specialized training of the personnel. Extensive, persistent and painstaking work is under way. High-level ground, air and sea training is ensured through adamant military efforts, based on major and minor accomplishments, hammered daily in the course of intensive efforts in protecting the state borders and the air and sea territories of our homeland, on the training grounds, in sailing maneuvers and in air exercises.

We have the good tradition of training the troops under most complex and stressed circumstances, under conditions maximally close to real combat, always acting with full stress and using all fire and maneuvering possibilities of weapons and progressive combat and operational means. Such is the inflexible law of training and education, sacredly observed by the Soviet forces.

The comprehensive approach, socialist competition, the conclusions and recommendations of military science and art and military education and psychology are extensively used in improving the quality and efficiency of the training-education process.

Soviet military science and art are becoming an increasingly active motive force in upgrading combat and operative training, the efficiency of the training and educational systems of the troops and the strengthening of their combat capability and combat readiness.

The combat readiness of subunits, units, ships and large units in fulfilling their combat assignments is becoming the main criterion of the efficiency of the entire training and educational process of the entire army and navy personnel.

The combat readiness of the armed forces is the peak of the military mastery of the troops in peacetime and a key to victory in war. The party deems it a primary task to see to it that the combat readiness of the army and navy are not only maintained on a high level but are always enhanced so that no surprises could catch us unawares.

The party organizations are the political nucleus, the cementing force of the military collectives. The troops have become accustomed to see the party members in the very first ranks, where things are most difficult and where success is hammered out. Their ideological and organizational activities and live words and personal example in combat training and service are efficient factors in increasing the party's influence on the mass of service personnel, their training and upbringing and the enhancement of their combat readiness.

The coordination of the efforts of commanders, staffs, political organs and party and Komsomol organizations ensures the successful solution of all problems related to combat and political training and our high combat readiness.

An exceptionally important role is assigned to raising the troops in the revolutionary, combat and labor traditions of the communist party, the Soviet people and their armed forces. It is no accident that contemporary army and

navy life cannot be imagined without close contacts between troops and party and armed forces veterans, participants in the civil and Great Patriotic Wars, Heroes of the Soviet Union and Heroes of Socialist Labor, and leading production workers. The daily life links with the history of the homeland and the combat biography of the armed forces help to upgrade the training of the troops and the development in them of the best qualities of armed defenders of the socialist fatherland. The veterans of the Stalingrad battle are making a major contribution to this effort.

Exposure to the legendary glory of the past inspires the army and navy youth in their zealous continuation and multiplication of the military valor of the senior generations of the Soviet people. In describing the Soviet troops of today, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out at the 26th CPSU Congress that "today the sons and grandsons of the heroes of the Great Patriotic War are already in the ranks of the defenders of the homeland. They did not experience the severe trials of their fathers and grandfathers. However, they are loyal to the heroic traditions of our army and people. Whenever the interests of the security of the country and the defense of peace require it and whenever the victims of aggression must be helped, the Soviet troops stand up in the eyes of the world as selfless and courageous patriots and internationalists, ready to surmount all hardships."

The closest possible ties with the collectives of industrial enterprises, establishments, schools, cultural and educational and creative organizations and sovkhozes and kolkhozes are a tradition of Soviet army and navy forces. The Soviet troops live and work within the single labor rhythm of the entire country, constantly feeling the love of the people for the army and navy. The troops will realize that serving the fatherland is part of the nationwide cause of building communism as a necessary and important component of it. If necessary, the military servicemen directly participate in the various national economic measures and help the population in the struggle against natural disasters.

Army and navy service contributes to the solution of one of the most important tasks of the party and the people--the shaping of an active and conscientious builder and defender of the new society. The Soviet people consider the armed forces a school of political, combat and moral upbringing of our youth, a school of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism.

All defense measures taken by the communist party and the Soviet state are based on the unanimous support and inexhaustible creative enthusiasm of the people. The working people of town and country actively participate in civil defense activities. Families, schools, labor collectives, trade unions, the Komsomol and the other public organizations are making their contribution to training pre-draftees and promoting the military-patriotic education of the young generation. The USSR DOSAAF is engaged in extensive mass defense work. Our people consider strengthening the defense capability of the country their own deeply personal project.

Thanks to the fatherly concern of the communist party, the Soviet government and the entire people, the army and navy are in a state of constant readiness

for the defense of the country. "The firm alloy of high technical equipment, military skill and unbreakable moral spirit," stipulates the CPSU Central Committee accountability report to the 26th party congress, "is the combat potential of the Soviet armed forces."

The great historical mission of defending the gains of socialism is being carried out by the Soviet armed forces shoulder to shoulder with the armies of the fraternal socialist countries. The Warsaw pact--a defensive military-political alliance among socialist countries in Europe--plays a major role in restraining the imperialist aggressors and defeating their plans fatal to mankind. The Warsaw Pact joint armed forces are a firm shield protecting the peaceful life of the members of the socialist comity. The joint exercises, which include the "Shield 82" exercise, recently held in Bulgaria, convincingly prove the further strengthening of the combat alliance among fraternal armies.

The party's appeal for extensive preparations to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR and to mobilize the creative energy of the working people for the successful implementation of the 11th Five-Year Plan was adopted by the Soviet forces as a combat program. Closely rallied around the communist party, its Central Committee and Central Committee Politburo, headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, and infinitely loyal to the lofty ideas of communism, the army and navy forces are struggling with twice the energy to upgrade the efficiency and quality of combat and political training. They are tirelessly strengthening military discipline, organization and order in subunits, units and ships and reaching increasingly higher indicators in combat readiness.

The dreams of the heroes of Stalingrad and of all Great Patriotic War veterans, who wanted to see their beloved homeland even more powerful and beautiful after the defeat of the fascist aggressors, have come true. Our people are confidently advancing toward communism. They deem it their sacred duty to protect and increase the results of the heroic efforts of many generations and the fruits of the victory at Stalingrad and in the Great Patriotic War as a whole, which were won at a high cost.

The statue of the mother-homeland, carrying a sharp sword in her hands, standing on Mamayev Kurgan, reminds us of the immortal glory of Stalingrad. This sword is not an arm of attack but of defense. However, as in those distant war years, it is terrifying to the foes of our country. Let this be remembered by the lovers of military adventures and by anyone who encroaches on the peace and security of the nations.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

AGGRAVATION OF THE GLOBAL IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE AND THE POLITICAL EDUCATION OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 32-46

[Article by K. Rusakov, CPSU Central Committee secretary]

[Text] Our party and Soviet people are advancing toward the outstanding celebration of the 65th anniversary of the October Revolution and the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR. They are marching in a single rank and it is this unity and close cohesion of the Soviet people rallied around the CPSU and its Central Committee, headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, the loyal follower of Lenin's cause, that convincingly prove the accuracy of the path chosen by the party and the inspiring force of Marxist-Leninist ideology which can lead and organize the toiling masses in the accomplishment of great objectives.

In combining a tremendous and highly meaningful socioeconomic practice with the inspired propaganda of progressive ideas, the party is pursuing a firm course toward the further growth of the economic power of our homeland, the improved well-being of the working people, the strengthening of the defense capability of the USSR and the positions of global socialism and safeguarding peace the world over.

It is shaping the Soviet person as a conscientious working person with high political standards, a patriot and internationalist distinguished by his high conscientiousness and his readiness, will and ability to build communism.

The 26th CPSU Congress reemphasized that the education of the new person retains its full relevance and that it has today features which must be taken into consideration. The conditions under which ideological and educational work is being conducted today have changed considerably. The education and cultural standards of the Soviet person have improved. The scale and tasks in building communism have expanded considerably.

The congress particularly emphasized the noticeable aggravation of the ideological struggle in the world arena. We are in a period during which the class enemy is mounting massed and, in some respects unprecedented, attacks on socialism and Marxist-Leninist ideology.

All of this raises largely anew the task of the political education of the working people, making it particularly important.

Clear and specific guidelines in this area may be found in the greetings presented by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to the participants in the practical science conference held in Tallin on 12-14 October 1982.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized the need of ensuring the more thorough ideological training of the Soviet people, upgrading the scientific substantiveness and aggressiveness of our propaganda, its efficiency and intelligibility and exposing more profoundly and substantively the anti-humane nature of the ideology and policy of contemporary imperialism.

1

Global development in our revolutionary epoch are determined by the historical competition between the two conflicting socioeconomic and political systems -- socialism and capitalism. One of its strategic battlefields is the clash of ideas, which has a tremendous and steadily growing impact on economics, politics and international relations and on the pace and nature of social progress.

From the viewpoint of historical perspective the outcome of the confrontation between the ideologies which reflect the outlook of the basic classes in contemporary society -- the bourgeoisie and the proletariat -- has already been predetermined. According to Marx and Engels bourgeois ideology is a distorted awareness which blocks the accurate understanding of objective reality (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 3, pp 167-168). By defending all the inequities caused by private ownership and the exploitation of labor on which it is based they try to restrain social progress and to hinder the solution of the vital problems facing the individual nations and mankind at large.

Conversely, socialist ideology means a scientific awareness which accurately describes the laws governing social development. Consistently expressing the hopes and aspirations of the broad popular masses, it is a powerful weapon for the revolutionary transformation of the world and the assertion of the ideals of justice, freedom, equality and fraternity among individuals and nations.

History proves with the utmost clarity that the future belongs to socialist ideology. Ever since Marx, Engels and Lenin developed an integral system of ideas combined with the concept of scientific socialism and ever since Marxism-Leninism merged with the revolutionary labor movement its influence and prestige have grown steadily. The Great October gigantically accelerated this process. Today, when a developed socialist society has been constructed in our country, a world socialist system has been created and the communist movement has reached the level of an influential political force and ever new countries, freed from imperialist yoke, are selecting the path of socialist development, we have the right to claim that our ideology is having an increasing impact on global social developments.

Naturally, however, this conclusion should in no case make us feel complacent. It would be quite pertinent to recall Lenin's words to the effect that "More than any other our revolution proved the law that the power of a revolution and its pressure, energy, resolve and triumphant outcome increase the power of bourgeois resistance" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 40, p 244). Such precisely is the case today. Facing the weakening of its positions throughout the world, forced to retreat in the face of the pressure of the liberation movements and losing the battle for the minds and hearts of the people, imperialism is mobilizing all means at its disposal to stop this historical trend.

The massed ideological attack on socialism assumed a particularly violent nature with the advent of the Reagan administration in the United States. The essence of its domestic policy course is an attack on the rights of the American working people, the abolishment of social programs and comprehensive encouragement of big capital. In the area of international policy the activities of the White House are aimed at achieving U. S. military superiority through huge armament increase programs, the suppression of the struggle of the peoples for their liberation and social progress by all possible means and increased confrontation with the USSR and the other socialist countries.

Even the American press rates the Reagan administration as the most conservative since the war. However, this is not merely a matter of the feelings and views of the political leadership. The explanation for the present turn in the policy of American imperialism lies in the deep-seated reasons which have inspired the ruling class to put the government precisely in the hands of the type of crew currently ruling Washington.

Our 26th party congress, which emphasized that "the realm of imperialist domination in the world has narrowed," provided a proper key to understanding these reasons.

Above all, there has been a drastic aggravation of the capitalist economic crisis. The upheavals in the financial system, galloping inflation, production stagnation and increased unemployment (in the United States alone, 10 percent of the active population, or 11.3 million people, according to official data, and 15 million according to the American trade unions, are totally unemployed) have all intensified the social stress and political instability in the capitalist world.

The series of U. S. foreign policy defeats has been another reason for the American reactionary turn. American imperialist strategy, aimed at preserving its diktat in the liberated countries through economic pressure and political maneuverings, actually failed during the past decade. Washington reacted with open irritation to the fact that a number of Asian, African and Latin American countries took the path of progressive development. The reactionary circles decided to stop this historical process at any cost.

Let us add to all this the growing interimperialist contradictions, the aggravated economic rivalry and the emergence of new power centers.

Given these circumstances, U. S. monopoly capital called for strengthening the weakened American leadership in the capitalist world in pursuit of the twin purpose of protecting its self-seeking interests and uniting the imperialist front in the struggle against socialism and the national liberation movement.

History offers numerous examples of the bourgeoisie seeking a way out of the crisis by "tightening the screws" within the country and increased aggressiveness abroad. On each such occasion, in an effort to "substantiate" the propaganda of such turns it has tried to blame others for its own sins. Here again imperialism has resorted to its old favorite method of blaming the Soviet Union and the socialist countries for its own difficulties and accusing them for virtually anything taking place in the world not to the liking of the rulers in Washington.

The victories of the national liberation movements in Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique and Nicaragua and the progressive changes which have taken place in several other countries are all depicted by bourgeois propaganda as results of "Moscow's intrigues." This was also the explanation for the anti-imperialist revolution in Iran, which was largely a reaction to the many years of support of the shah's regime by Washington. The American propaganda centers are fabricating one malicious falsification after another: that the Soviet Union is the principal organizer of international terrorism, that we are making use of the forced labor of foreign workers, and so on.

Naturally, in the past as well, imperialist propaganda could not be said to have been noted for its propriety. Throughout the historical struggle between the two social systems, in its efforts to weaken the impact of our policy and ideology on the minds of the people, it has resorted to the slander of real socialism and the Marxist-Leninist outlook. Nevertheless it is important not to ignore the substantial differences between ideological and psychological warfare. The principled position taken by our party on this matter is well known. The CPSU has always believed that socialist and bourgeois ideologies are irreconcilable and that the struggle between them will go on regardless of global policy turns. However, this applies precisely to the struggle between ideas rather than the openly subversive activities which threaten peace, security and the development of mutually profitable economic and cultural cooperation among nations.

President Reagan's call for mounting a new anticommunist crusade is imbued with nothing but the spirit of psychological warfare. Let us recall that the first antibolshevik was proclaimed by global reaction immediately after the victory of the October Revolution. At that time it was being openly said that Soviet Russia -- the first socialist republic -- had simply to be strangled in its cradle. Today, many decades later, the delirious idea of an anticommunist campaign is being circulated again, this time after a semi-centennial history of diplomatic relations existing between the USSR and the United States, and after they are bound by a number of accords which constitute something in the nature of a code of peaceful coexistence and when both countries bear particular responsibility for the prevention of nuclear war.

The virtually entire governmental machineries of the United States and many other capitalist countries have become involved in the psychological warfare being waged against the USSR, the fraternal socialist countries and the communist and workers parties. It is headed by the President of the United States and his closest assistants, and conducted by special subversive services and numerous institutes specializing in the struggle against communism -- more than 150 in the United States alone.

This entire subversive activity is being generously financed. The budget of the U. S. Information Agency alone -- the main official foreign policy propaganda administration -- exceeds today \$640 million. Huge funds are being spent on the Voice of America and the Liberty and Free Europe radio stations, whose piratical activities, in the full meaning of the term, are programmed by the CIA. The American radio stations are broadcasting more than 93 hours daily in the languages of the peoples of the Soviet Union alone.

Quite recently, the U. S. administration decided to appropriate a huge sum to build a new radio station in Florida beamed at socialist Cuba.

The task of directly influencing the population of the socialist countries is being given increasing priority in anticommunist propaganda with a view to trying to undermine its belief in the justice of the ideas and cause of communism and even, if possible at all, to develop some sort of antisocialist opposition in them.

Noticeable changes have been made in the content and methods of bourgeois propaganda. Here a conversion from a "flexible," more or less artfully concealed anticommunism has been made to a frontal attack on Marxism-Leninism and real socialism. Washington has even gone so far as to claim that socialism is an "accidental product of history" doomed to disappearance. The impression is created that the ghosts of Truman, Dulles and McCarthy have crawled out of the cold war caves.

However, none of this signifies that the traditional pharisaic means have been abandoned. Whenever suitable, the contemporary anticommunists do not hesitate to "sympathize" with the population of the socialist countries and to think of means to improve our system and to correct its shortcomings. They employ social democratic phraseology and disseminate anarcho-syndicalist views. That is precisely the way they have acted and are acting toward Poland.

We learn on a virtually daily basis of cases proving that the bourgeoisie is suppressing the rights of the working people in the capitalist countries mercilessly, with all means at its disposal. Meanwhile, the subversive radio stations are hypocritically bemoaning the fact that "trade union liberties" are being violated in Poland. Such double standards are extensively applied also by the leaders of a number of capitalist countries, the United States in particular.

The defense of capitalism is one of the main lines followed in contemporary anticommunist and anti-Soviet propaganda. In this case it is indicative that while extensively boasting of the "advantages" of so-called free enterprise

and political pluralism, it ignores capitalist vices such as poverty, unemployment and the particularly horrifying situation of the working people in dozens of economically underdeveloped countries within the capitalist orbit, mercilessly exploited by the monopolies.

Imperialist reaction is also focusing its efforts on defaming the achievements of real socialism and distorting its nature. Hostile propaganda is trying to implant the idea that the party's leading role is allegedly "incompatible" with popular rule or socialism with democracy. It is doing everything possible to discredit Marxist-Leninist theory and the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union, to excite nationalistic feelings and religious prejudices and to contaminate above all the young generation with a spirit of consumerism and total permissiveness.

Naturally, in discussing the directions, nature and tone of Western propaganda we must distinguish among currents such as anti-Sovietism, anticommunism, conservatism, liberalism and social reformism.

Our party will continue firmly to oppose anticommunism and anti-Sovietism, to expose the class enemy mercilessly and to defeat its ideological subversions. At the same time, it will continue to engage in substantiated arguments with those in the West who, while preaching views alien to ours, make no use of psychological warfare methods. We favor a constructive dialogue with supporters of ideological currents with whom we can cooperate in the struggle for resolving the main problem of our time -- the preservation of the peace and safeguarding of international security.

2

Our country and the Soviet people have repeatedly faced massed malicious imperialist attacks. As we know, neither economic pressure nor political blackmail or efforts to crush our system militarily have been able to weaken socialism. Equally sterile are today's attacks mounted by imperialist propaganda. However, the intensified efforts of the class enemy have a corrupting influence on the minds of the people and force us to make use of the ideological potential in efficiently counteracting hostile propaganda and developing in the working people a deep conviction in the historical justice of the great cause of socialism and communism.

The collectivistic nature of our system itself and the humanism of the Leninist party policy are the firm foundations on which socialist consciousness is shaped. Naturally, however, it would be erroneous to rely on some sort of automatic influence of socioeconomic circumstances. "The development of the consciousness of the masses," Lenin emphasized, "always remains the base and main content of our entire work" (op. cit., vol 13, p 376).

The gravity and complexity of the processes of global development and the scale of the problems related to the building of communism dictate the need of steadily improving the entire system of ideological and educational work. The party considers as its most important task to shape the Marxist-Leninist outlook and to see to it that theoretical knowledge turn into firm convictions and become the reasons for the labor and political activeness of

the Soviet people. That is the way the problem was formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress and that is how it has been formulated in the party's Central Committee decree issued after the congress.

The information-propagandist activities of the television, the radio and the press have improved of late, and mass political work among the labor collectives has become noticeably energized. The party education system has become better differentiated. United politics days in which leading personnel of party, soviet and economic organs and social organizations actively participate have confirmed their usefulness.

However, extensive efforts lie ahead in the implementation of the tasks facing the ideological front and the elimination of shortcomings and weaknesses which are still being felt in this important sector of party activities.

Two closely interrelated tasks stand out above all: the even more energetic and extensive propaganda of the achievements of our society and the convincing criticism of capitalist reality. The key direction which our propaganda must follow is to present in their completeness the unquestionable advantages of socialism over capitalism and the scientific foundation of the Marxist-Leninist ideas on the historical inevitability and progressiveness of the socialist reorganization of the world. The history of the building of socialism and communism and the entire live practice of real socialism offer endless and exceptionally gratifying data in this respect. All that is required is to use them skillfully.

As has been proved most obviously, socialism ensures the fastest possible elimination of economic backwardness and the confident and dynamic growth of the national economy. The national income of the members of the socialist comity more than tripled and their industrial output more than quadrupled over the past 20 years alone. Although during the 1970s the economic development of the CEMA countries took place under more difficult circumstances, during that period as well their average annual growth of output was twice that of the developed capitalist countries. Over a 10-year period the USSR nearly doubled the volume of its industrial output. For comparison's sake let us point out that this would have taken 18 years in the United States, 19 in France, 20 in the FRG and 30 in Great Britain.

Social and spiritual achievements have been equally significant. The steady upsurge of the living standard of the people's masses, their exposure to the values of progressive culture, total population literacy and an all-embracing social insurance system and many other features of socialist reality characterize the profoundly humane nature of our system.

Equally unquestionable are the advantages of the socialist political system which ensures the active participation of the working people in the country's administration. The unified system of democratic people's organs reliably ensures the expression of the interests and desires of the toiling people in all aspects of our governmental policy. Thanks to the active efforts of party, trade union, Komsomol and other social organizations, the communist party, as the guiding force in Soviet society, keeps its fingers on the

pulse beat of the people's life and can fully take into consideration and coordinate the interests and various requirements of the individual population strata and social groups in formulating domestic and foreign policy.

Describing the dynamism of our social and governmental system and the steady advancement of socialist democracy is a particularly important aspect of ideological work. The new USSR Constitution reflects the major changes which have taken place in the country as a result of building developed socialism. Extensive work is being done to improve legislation, to strengthen law and order and to create conditions leading to the comprehensive development of the political and labor initiatives of the Soviet people.

Today the level of progress is largely gauged by outstanding scientific and technical accomplishments. The emergence of the Soviet Union in the front ranks of mastering nuclear power for peaceful purposes and the study of outer space is a concentrated manifestation of the opportunities of socialism in this respect. Unquestionably, the outstanding accomplishments of our science and technology deserve propaganda's steady and generous attention.

While encouraging the active propaganda of successes, the party has never deemed it necessary to embellish our socialist reality. The simplistic approach of proclaiming everything Soviet as being the best has long been tagged as jingoism quite appropriately. The true patriot always looks at life with his eyes wide open. We have many difficulties, shortcomings and unresolved problems caused by objective circumstances and organizational weaknesses. The party deems it necessary not to gloss over but to expose such shortcomings firmly and self-critically and to seek effective means for their elimination. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's speeches, the proceedings of party congresses and CPSU Central Committee plenums and Central Committee decrees on topical problems related to the development of Soviet society are models of exigency, sharp and principle-minded criticism and formulation of constructive initiatives.

The party is implementing a set of measures aimed at improving the planning, economic management and administration systems. Key significance is ascribed to the fuller satisfaction of the needs of the working people. The fulfillment of the Food Program is considered a most important project of the whole people. The mass information media and all domestic ideological institutions must make their contribution to it.

The successful solution of national economic problems requires the comprehensive development of initiative and the strengthening of production, state and labor discipline. Everything possible must be done to enhance the prestige of honest work for the good of society and to develop in the people a conscientious attitude toward the work and the desire to upgrade their professional skills and to work with increasing productivity.

Success in the field of labor education depends to a tremendous extent on the moral atmosphere in the society and the individual collective and the energetic struggle against various types of negative phenomena in our life. It is necessary, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has pointed out, to create an atmosphere of intolerance toward those who take the path of swindling the state

through eye-washing, bribery, and theft of socialist property. "The observance of the norms of social morality and law must become a natural need for every Soviet person, an inviolable inner law. This is one of the main tasks in educational work. This," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has emphasized, "is an important field of work of party and Soviet organizations, trade unions, the Komsomol and the press, television and radio."

Bourgeois propaganda speculates on our problems, builds on them and simply fabricates on their basis. Such fabrications must be refuted promptly and with proper arguments. The entire 66-year old experience in the development of the Soviet state proves that whatever difficulties they have been faced with, the party and the people have always found ways leading to resolve them successfully. This applies to the future as well. Our system has tremendous resources the utilization of which will reveal even more clearly the advantages of the socialist organization of labor and management.

On the eve of the 60 anniversary of the founding of the USSR it is particularly timely to speak of a historical gain by socialism such as the solution of the national problem. Thanks to the Leninist national policy the former inequality among nations and national discord have been eliminated. The friendship among peoples has been established and a new historical and international community -- the Soviet people -- has been formed. Fair-minded people the world over consider the experience in resolving the national problem by the USSR a great accomplishment, worthy of extensive propaganda.

Socialism not only provided an example in resolving the national problem on the scale of our multinational country, but established a new type of international relations among truly sovereign states. The comprehensive economic and political cooperation among the fraternal countries and their interaction in defense of revolutionary gains have been established and are successfully developing on the basis of socialist internationalism, equality and mutual aid. Collective organizations such as CEMA and the Warsaw Pact have been established.

The CPSU, its Central Committee and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev personally are paying tireless attention to the development and strengthening of relations with the fraternal socialist countries. In this respect the workers on the ideological front as well face important tasks. They must rebuff the increased efforts of bourgeois propaganda to distort the nature of relations within the socialist comity.

One of the most favorite means of the enemy is his wish to depict relations between the USSR and the other socialist countries as unequal. The thesis is intensively promoted to the effect that a "Soviet model" is being imposed upon them, thus restricting their independence. The entire reality of existing socialism refutes such fabrications.

Unquestionably, the basic foundations of economic, social and political life are shared by the socialist countries. It is equally obvious that each individual fraternal country, communist party and people are looking for their optimal forms of organization of their national economies, management methods, forms of political life and means for the development of their

spiritual culture consistent with their national conditions. The socialist world is a varied and complex organism in which a lively search is under way and in which the best becomes common property.

In this connection, as was emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress, propaganda and the utilization of friendly progressive experience are of great value. In turn, the fraternal countries become extensively familiar with our own accomplishments. Such practical exchanges yield more than simple practical benefits. They strengthen the feelings of reciprocal respect and trust which have developed among the working people in the socialist countries and offer good training in international upbringing.

The Soviet people are lively interested in the development of the building of socialism in the fraternal countries, their successes and their problems. Such questions must be answered clearly, above all on the basis of the assessments provided by the fraternal parties themselves. Coverage of life in the socialist world must be extensive and account for a significant share of the activities of the mass information media and the political instruction of the working people.

The members of the comity have achieved impressive successes. However, they must also face complex problems related, in particular, to the difficulties of converting their economic development to an intensive track and the need to meet growing fuel and raw material requirements. The fraternal countries will have to resolve these problems while experiencing the steady economic and political pressure of imperialism.

Raised in a spirit of internationalism and accustomed to taking close to their hearts the concerns of their friends and allies, the Soviet people reacted with concern to the profound economic and political crisis in Poland where the counterrevolutionary forces, profiting from the errors of the previous Polish leadership, mounted a frontal attack on the people's system. This offensive was blocked by the proclamation of martial law. However, the enemies of socialism are continuing to do everything possible to prevent a stabilization of the situation.

A struggle is still under way on a number of important problems affecting the country's life. It is focused mainly on the future of the trade union movement, which has assumed particular gravity in Poland today. Hiding behind the screen of "Solidarity," the enemies of socialism created, as we know, a political organization aimed at seizing the power. That is why they violently opposed the recently passed Sejm law on trade unions which will be organized on a sectorial basis, with the mandatory recognition of the leading role of the PZPR and the socialist system in the People's Republic of Poland.

The situation in the country remains grave, and although the bulk of the Polish working people favor the strengthening of public order, without which the elimination of the severe consequences of the crisis is impossible, the enemies of socialism have been able to misdirect and to involve in their plans some young workers, intellectuals and university students and petit bourgeois town and country strata. The consciousness of these people has become profoundly deformed, which predetermines the length of the process of

healing of social life and the choice of the means to achieve this by the Polish leadership.

The normalizing of the situation in Poland is hindered by the hostile activities of the imperialist countries. The United States has organized a factual economic blockade of Poland. It is waging a massed ideological campaign against it, in which President Reagan has joined. Bourgeois propaganda is making use of the Polish events for anti-Soviet purposes as well.

In their struggle to surmount the crisis, the working people, the Polish communists and the PZPR leadership, headed by Comrade Jaruzelski, are enjoying the total support of the USSR and the other fraternal countries. The internal counterrevolution and international reaction are trying to present this support of the people and the legitimate government of an allied socialist country as intervention in Polish affairs. On the other hand, the actions of the United States and NATO, which are actually trying to strangle Poland through economic "sanctions," are presented as just about beneficial to the Poles and as "highly moral." In a word, one of the gravest ideological conflicts in the world has developed around Poland. It is important to explain accurately the meaning of the Polish events and to expose imperialist intrigues accurately.

The communists are drawing suitable lessons from the Polish events. This means, first of all, that the party must not allow itself to become alienated from the working class. It must display vigilance and resolve in the struggle against the enemies of socialism and pay the necessary attention to ideological-educational work.

China plays an important role in contemporary international life. It is our neighbor and the Soviet people are not indifferent to the course of events in that country. The recently held 12th CPC Congress confirmed as a whole the course pursued in recent years and codified the changes which took place in the party and the country after Mao Zedong. The congress condemned the distortions which had been allowed to occur during the period of the so-called "great cultural revolution" and the "great leap." Nevertheless, it stated that the CPC will continue to be politically guided as in the past by the ideas of Mao Zedong. The congress' materials reiterate the old assessments of the reasons for the worsening of Sino-Soviet relations. Along with signs which could be considered as a desire to change the existing situation for the better the Chinese leadership and information media are pursuing their anti-Soviet statements. Time will show the extent to which the leadership of the PRC is willing to truly improve relations with our country.

As to the CPSU, it has always favored the normalizing of relations with the PRC. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized in his Baku speech, this would be a good contribution to strengthening the foundations of peace and stability in Asia and the rest of the world.

3

As we know, the ideological struggle is waged not in general, not abstractly, but on the subject of very specific and relevant problems which reveal

the advantages or weaknesses of a given social system. The problems which most affect the broad popular masses and their solution, which determine the present and future of mankind, become heated ideological battlefields.

The safeguard of peace is the most important among them, for its solution is related to the survival of mankind.

The take over of the Reagan administration in the United States was marked by a serious aggravation of the threat of war. Having charted a course of hindering detente and promoting the arms race, the current American administration is reanimating the doctrines of "limited" and "protracted" nuclear warfare and legitimizing the "first strike strategy."

U. S. military appropriations have reached the astronomical sum of about \$260 billion for the 1982/83 fiscal year. Washington is calling for the deployment of a large additional number of medium-range missiles in Europe and is openly raising the possibility of turning the European continent into a theater of nuclear confrontation. The American "hawks" are trying to justify the wild outburst of their militaristic activities by claiming that the balance of military power existing between the USSR and the United States and the Warsaw Pact and NATO has been disturbed in favor of our country. Recently the USSR Ministry of Defense published a number of documents which prove the falsity of this version. They contain rich factual data convincingly presenting the nature of the real situation.

Together with its allies, our country is countering the aggressive U. S. course with a policy of active defense of peace and strengthening of international security. The USSR is defending the principles of peaceful coexistence and detente and is making consistent efforts to stop the intensification of the nuclear insanity. We know that the peace program for the 1980s, formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress, has been expanded lately with a number of important initiatives covering a broad range of problems related to restraining the arms race and to disarmament. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's message delivered at the second special UN General Assembly on disarmament, voluntarily pledging that the Soviet Union will not be the first to use nuclear weapons, met with a particularly strong response throughout the world. Our country is pursuing the same line of preventing nuclear war. We are pleased to note that the peaceful efforts of the Soviet state are meeting with the broad response and support of global public opinion.

Ever since Lenin's Decree on Peace the international policy of the Soviet state and the other fraternal countries has been to assert one of the great truths of the 20th century: Socialism means peace. Our propaganda must make all mankind aware of this truth and to explain the significance of Soviet disarmament initiatives energetically and convincingly. The importance of this action is enhanced by the fact that, having felt the full power of the antiwar movement, of late imperialist reaction has been doing everything possible to disorganize it, to force it to abandon its positions and to turn it against the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union above all.

Equally important to us is actively to engage in the military-patriotic education of the youth and to improve their readiness to fulfill their sacred

civic duty -- the defense of the borders of the fatherland and the gains of socialism.

Human rights is a major area on which the ideological struggle is currently focusing.

The slanderous charge that the socialist countries of violating the provisions of the so-called "third basket," of the Helsinki Final Act is being currently used by bourgeois propaganda as a pretext for undermining detente and violating agreements reached on the development of international cooperation.

However, the area of rights and freedoms is one in which the superiority of socialism is particularly obvious. It is precisely our society that legislatively codified and provided real guarantees for the most important economic, social and political rights and freedoms, the content of which is increasingly expanding as new successes are achieved in the building of communism. This must be properly reflected in our propaganda.

Equal importance should be paid to exposing the worse possible violations of individual rights in the capitalist world. All bourgeois constitutions contain many high-sounding statements on freedom but no single article guaranteeing the people vital rights such as the right to work. Even more striking is the actual rightlessness of the working people in the capitalist countries. In the United States alone, the richest capitalist country, according to reports in the American press itself, "23 million people, or one out of five adults, are illiterate to such an extent as to be unable to read and write sufficiently well to deal with the basic requirements of daily life." Yet, as Lenin said, an illiterate person remains outside the realm of politics (see op. cit., vol 44, p 174). He is not only unable to protect his rights but frequently is even unaware of their existence.

In a bourgeois democracy the ruling class has thousands of opportunities to protect its rule with the help of a refined political mechanism and manipulation of public opinion. Whenever capitalist power is really threatened capitalism does not hesitate to violate democratic rights and institutions or to establish terrorist and fascist dictatorships.

The hypocritical nature of bourgeois democracy becomes particularly apparent in the brutal and barbaric manner in which imperialism violates the basic rights of other nations. Charges that American imperialism has supported and encouraged the existence of most brutal regimes in Latin America would fill dozens of volumes. The blood of thousands of Salvadoran patriots and, most recently, the tragedy of the Palestinian people, are on its hands.

Human rights are an element of the broader and more universal concept of way of life which, of late, has become a battlefield in the ideological confrontation. It has urgently raised the question of the need for vivid, skillful and convincing propaganda of the socialist way of life and communist morality. We must organize the type of youth upbringing which would assist most appropriately its harmonious labor, ideological, moral and aesthetic development. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasizes, the shaping of a

communist outlook in the generations entering conscious life is one of the most vital tasks facing our ideological activities.

Finally, historical perspective is an important key topic which is in the epicenter of the ideological struggle. Faced with the attractiveness of Marxism-Leninism, which offers the prospect of steady progress, the bourgeois ideologues keep trying to find an alternative to communism. The results of such efforts have been the concepts of the "postindustrial" society, the "technotronic era", the "age of informatics," etc. In the final account, they are all based on the faulty premise that by itself, without radical social changes, scientific and technical progress will extend the age of capitalism into infinity.

The growth of the crisis, the aggravation of relations between developed capitalist and developing countries and the rise in crime, drug addiction and violence in the capitalist society as well as the danger of war, increased as a result of the militaristic course charted by the United States, have predetermined the sharp turn from the optimistic prospects predicted by the bourgeois scientists to pessimistic forecasts of an allegedly inevitable breakdown of all civilization. Nevertheless, as in the past, the official Western ideological centers are formulating dozens of forecasts the purpose of which is to award the future to capitalism.

All of this demands of the Soviet social scientists to pay great attention to bringing to light the social prospects on the basis of the profound study of the trends and processes of contemporary social development, taking its entire complexity and contradictoriness into consideration. The elaboration and propaganda of the Marxist-Leninist approach to the solution of global problems of our time, such as meeting energy and raw material needs, the need to ensure the necessary amount of food for the growing population on earth, environmental protection, and the elimination of the profound gap separating economically developed and developing countries, assume great importance. The radical solution of these problems can be achieved only on a socialist basis. However, immediate measures must already be taken to prevent their further aggravation. This, in turn, requires international cooperation.

4

As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has emphasized, under contemporary conditions having a powerful ideological apparatus is no less important than a strong defense. We do have such an apparatus. The task is to ensure its maximally productive utilization, improved organization, style, forms and methods of ideological and educational activities and its enhanced scientific level and efficient use in disseminating the results of research.

The Soviet scientists have done a great deal to provide propaganda with a good theoretical foundation in the struggle against anticommunism and anti-Sovietism. Nevertheless, science remains in great debt to propaganda. In many respects the criticism of bourgeois ideology is fragmentary and some of its important directions remain outside its scope. Above all, our scientists do not always provide prompt assessments of the changes taking

place in bourgeois politics and ideology and which are reflected in the content of Western propaganda. As a result, quite frequently our fire is aimed at "yesterday's targets," so to say. The elimination of this essential shortcoming is a vital task.

Another responsible task facing science is the comprehensive development of the sociological, psychological and pedagogical aspects of information-propaganda activities. What is the nature of the mechanism of shaping political awareness? What are the factors which influence this process? What mental stereotypes must be surmounted? The development of such and other similar problems would be of substantial help in propaganda practice.

We know that propaganda is truly efficient only with properly organized feedback, with an objective assessment and consideration of the way one of its theses or another is received, and the degree of its efficiency. The word of the propagandist or the lecturer may reach its target and yield the necessary results only if we have a clear idea of what motivates the people and the nature of their feelings, expectations and requirements. Hence the increased importance of the systematic study of public opinion and of the value orientations of the various population categories. Sociology and the other sectors of our scientific studies must resolve this problem together with the party organizations.

It is self-evident that under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution the possibilities of propaganda tremendously depend on the availability of contemporary information spreading facilities, to which the party pays prime attention. New printing facilities are being developed steadily, the population's television coverage is being expanded and equipment and apparatus are being updated. Such efforts will be continued as was clearly and specifically stated in the documents of the 26th CPSU Congress.

As it is, however, we already have a firm technical foundation at our disposal. It is important to handle available technical facilities sensibly and more efficiently. This, in turn, depends mainly on the level of organization of propaganda and its quality.

Propaganda is made by people. In the final account, its results depend on their knowledge, skills, creative enthusiasm and degree of understanding of their responsibility. We have today a large and skilled journalistic detachment. Hundreds of thousands of propagandists are employed within the party education system. Each labor collective has political reporters and agitators. An entire army of lecturers participates in the activities of the "Knowledge" Society. The prime task of the party committees is skillfully to direct the work of propaganda cadres and to concern itself with their training and proper use. Capable people must be valued. They must be helped to upgrade their ideological standards and professional skills and the ability to argue and substantively to refute our ideological opponents.

Improving the style and methods of propaganda work involves a set of important tasks. This problem was sharply defined at the 26th party congress: "Have our forms of mass-political work not become too ossified? It was one thing when the people were still insufficiently trained and

undereducated; addressing ourselves to the contemporary Soviet people is a different matter." As was pointed out at the congress, today they simply turn off the television set or the radio and set the newspaper aside if addressed to in a mindless formal language, in general terms.

In cautioning against what Lenin described as "political blathering," the party calls for the discussion with the people on the gravest and most complex matters to be as "among equals," i.e., to be serious, live, and without cliches and standardized preset formulas. In other words, propaganda must be truthful, topical, profound and vivid.

Unfortunately, not all propagandists have discarded the obsolete concepts. Some of them also think that if they say nothing new they can say nothing wrong. However, the avoidance of topical subjects, attempts to smoothen sharp corners and make irresponsible judgements depreciate propaganda statements and cause substantial harm.

Efficiency in information-propaganda activities is equally important. Complete and prompt information related to all topical problems of domestic and international life is today a vital need affecting millions of Soviet people and one of the best means of political education. Although by and large we speak with full justification of substantial improvements made in this area, so far the need for it has not been fully met. The increased political knowledge of the working people and their ideological and cultural requirements demand far more. We must also bear in mind that wherever Soviet television, radio and press fall behind and lecturers and propagandists fail to be in step with events our ideological opponents try to fill the vacuum with their tendentious information.

It is important to bear in mind the need for differentiated propaganda work, based on the interests and mentality of the various social strata. The other aspect of this is the suitable and efficient division of ideological functions based on the specific nature of the press, radio and television, the party and Komsomol education systems and lecture propaganda.

Literature and art play a very special role in ideological activities. Their ideological-moral and political influence in our country would be difficult to overestimate. The party has positively noted the increased attention which our writers and cinematographers pay to the "industrial topic," to the area through which the front end of the battle for communism runs. Unfortunately, along with talented novels, plays and films, many second-rate and dull works are created on this subject. Nor could we be satisfied with the standard of many literary works and movies on life in the armed forces.

The need for artistic journalism is particularly great today. Noteworthy publicistic works include not only essays, articles and pamphlets but novels, plays and poems. However, the range of authors using publicistic genres remains small. This direction in creative work must be thoroughly encouraged by the creative unions, the Union of USSR Writers above all.

The study and dissemination of progressive experience presents a major opportunity for improving our ideological work. A great deal of instructive

features may be found here. For example, the Moscow and Leningrad party organizations have established well organized comprehensive systems for informing the working people on topical problems of foreign and domestic policy, socioeconomic developments and the ideological struggle. Propaganda commissions are successfully working in many party organizations in the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, Georgia, the Maritime and Khabarovsk Krays and the oblast, city and rayon party committees of many other republics and oblasts; party commissions regularly study the questions asked lecturers and speakers, and prepare analytical surveys on the state of public opinion and the problems arising in this connection. The practical experience of the Estonian party members and the Latvian and Lithuanian party organizations is noteworthy, as they are hold the front lines in the ideological confrontation.

The party draws the attention of the ideological cadres and of anyone related to propaganda and educational activities to the pivotal task -- intensifying the aggressiveness of propaganda and upgrading the efficiency of ideological work. It is no secret that some comrades still tend to judge its results above all by the number of implemented measures. Meanwhile, naturally, the true results of ideological work must be assessed by the way it affects the people and the growth of their political consciousness and labor activeness and the desire to prove themselves in production management and in all realms of social life.

The results of ideological and political education become apparent in the areas of high political standards, civic maturity and consciousness of the masses. The ability of the Soviet person to explain and, whenever necessary, to defend our party line and to refute erroneous views, not to mention hostile attacks, and convincingly to present our Soviet viewpoint is another important indicator of the efficiency of ideological work, which must be in the focus of attention of each political organization.

Socialism is in a stage of historical advance. This objective reality of our time must be made quite visible in our entire propaganda and ideological work.

Under the Soviet system our people have frequently faced the fierce attacks of imperialism. However, we advanced confidently, surmounting all obstacles. This makes even more futile the efforts to hinder progress toward communism today, when our country has built a developed socialist society, when a powerful comity of socialist counties exists and when millions of working people the world over are rallying under the banners of Marxism-Leninism.

Social progress proves that the future belongs to socialism. This is the source of our optimism and the inspiring incentive for our active and aggressive struggle for the communist cause.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

ALONG THE GREAT ROAD OF BROTHERHOOD AND CREATION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 47-57

[Article by T. Usubaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee]

[Text] Every day, illuminated by the light of friendship and cooperation among Soviet peoples, every day lived by the USSR becomes an organic part of its 60-year-old biography. Wherever one may look or as far back as one may think, one feels the inseparable interconnection among all accomplishments and aspirations of the Soviet peoples of different nations and nationalities who live and work under the wise guidance of the communist party.

The economy and culture of Soviet Kirghizstan blossomed in the united family of Soviet republics living according to the laws of fraternity, equality and mutual aid. This once backward mountainous area with essentially no industry and most primitive agriculture is now justifiably one of the highly developed industrial-agrarian parts of the country. Today the republic's industry is represented by more than 100 sectors producing about 4,000 different types of goods. Many industrial commodities produced by Kirghizstan are well known not only at home but abroad. With every passing year crop growing and animal husbandry output are increasing and the plans for their delivery to the all-union fund are being regularly fulfilled. Nurtured by the native land and enriched by the achievements of the fraternal, Russian above all, cultures, the culture of the Kirghiz people, national in form and internationalist in content, has reached unattainable heights.

The Kirghiz Communist Party, which numbers more than 130,000 members, is the organizing and guiding force in strengthening the fraternal relations between the Kirghiz SSR and the other union republics, and bringing up the working people in the area, in which members of more than 80 different nations and nationalities live, in a spirit of internationalism and boundless loyalty to the communist ideals. It is one of the combat detachments of the CPSU and has a decisive impact on the entire course of economic and cultural development.

The republic's working people well know that the economic and cultural upsurge of Kirghizstan is the result of the achievements of the October Revolution, the unbreakable and fruitful friendship among Soviet peoples and their close unity with the great Russian people. "Through personal experience the peoples of the land of the soviets have realized that their unification

within a single union multiplies their strength and accelerates their socio-economic development," notes the CPSU Central Committee Decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Founding of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." "We have the right to be proud of the fact that together with the working people of all nations in the country the peoples of the former national outlying areas, previously doomed to age-old backwardness, confidently marched toward their socialist future, bypassing capitalism and reaching the heights of social progress."

I

The achievements of the Kirghiz SSR, shoulder to shoulder with the other union republics building communism, are largely based on the natural potential of Kirghizstan, utilized in the interest of the republic itself and the union as a whole.

The advantages of the socialist comity of nations and nationalities, an inseparable part of which the Kirghiz SSR has been, is and will remain, are an example of the way the resources of our area, studied and developed with the help of the fraternal republics, serve the entire Soviet people.

In mentioning the major successes achieved in the country's economic policy, at the 26th CPSU Congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out as a decisive factor the tremendous constructive activities of the Soviet people who "placed the richest possible natural resources on the service of the national economy."

The utilization of the natural resources of any of the economic areas of the land of the soviets is not limited to its territorial borders. The communist party and the Soviet government attentively see to it that all natural resources--Azerbaijani or Tyumen petroleum, Karaganda or Kuzbass coal, or the timber of Siberia and the Far East--are used by all Soviet people as equal citizens of our state. All Soviet republics, regardless of their natural potential, are developing evenly, experiencing no shortages of one resource or another. Kirghizstan, for example, obtains timber, metal, petroleum products, natural gas, coal, lacquers and dyes, vegetal oil and chemical fertilizers and many other types of raw materials. In turn, everything which the republic has is available to the single national economic complex of the USSR.

The Kirghiz SSR is of a rich and varied nature. Deep ravines with stormy rivers--the main sources of inexpensive electric power--yield to high mountain pastures or valleys with their blue lakes. Rich Alpine meadows, forests of Tyan-Shan pines or walnuts and wild fruit trees grow along its mountain slopes. Favorable conditions for the growing of grain, industrial and melon crops exist in the fertile valleys, irrigated and warm. The Kirghiz soil contains coal and rich antimony and mercury deposits, other nonferrous metals and valuable construction materials.

Before the Great October Revolution the natural resources of our area were left almost undeveloped and unused. The founding of the USSR became the powerful base for the study and development of such resources and for

enhancing the economy of Soviet Kirghizstan. The help given by the communist party and the Soviet government and all fraternal peoples, the Russian above all, was particularly tangible at the initial period of socialist transformation, when Kirghizia had neither sufficient funds nor highly skilled specialists.

Detailed geological studies of mineral deposits in Kirghizia were initiated in the middle of the 1920s by instruction of the presidium of the USSR All-Union Sovnarkhoz. Expeditions headed by the greatest scientists worked here, people such as A. Ye. Fersman, D. I. Shcherbakov, S. S. Shul'ts, L. S. Berg, B. A. Fedorovich, N. M. Prokopenko, D. I. Yakovlev, V. E. Poyarkov, V. I. Smirnov and others. They made a major contribution to the study of the natural resources of our area. In 1928, on the request of the republic's party organization and government, the USSR Academy of Sciences sent to Kirghizia an expedition in charge of comprehensively summing up data on natural resources. The results of the study were analyzed at conferences sponsored by the USSR Academy of Sciences and the republic's government.

Deposits of nonferrous metals and other minerals of important industrial significance were found on Kirghiz territory. Kirghiz fuel-energy and hydro-energy potential was defined. Today major enterprises have been built and are in operation on the basis of such deposits. The Kirghiz Communist Party is paying prime attention to the development of nonferrous metallurgy, which holds one of the leading positions in its industry. During the past 10 years alone the production of nonferrous metals in the republic doubled.

Since ancient times the tracks of shepherds and hunters were the only connections linking the northern and southern parts of the republic, split by powerful mountain ridges. The laying of the Frunze-Osh highway began many years ago. The entire country helped to build this road which rose higher than the clouds. The people know it as the Great Kirghiz Track. Running through a tunnel dug by the Moscow subway builders in mountains more than 3,000 meters above sea level, the highway firmly linked the northern with the southern rayons of the republic and provided access to the very rich pastures of the mountainous Susamyrskaya Valley, the hydraulic power resources of the Naryn and large mineral deposits.

The party organs continue to pay particular attention to enhancing the power industry in the republic, considering this a guarantee for successfully resolving the problem of socialist industrialization. The Kirghiz mountain rivers have truly inexhaustible power. The Second Congress of Soviets of the Kirghiz ASSR, which was held in August 1929, instructed the republic's government to draft a plan for the electrification of Kirghizia in connection with the general plan for the electrification of Central Asia. One year later, with the help of the union government, the expansion of the Alamedinskaya and Frunze electric power plants which, at that time, were quite powerful, was undertaken and so did the construction of electric power plants in Kyzyl-Kiya and Sulyukta.

The initiation of large-scale construction required extensive skilled cadres to be brought from the outside. In 1929-1930 about 2,500 people came to

Kirghizia. Subsequently, specialists from other parts of the country were steadily recruited for the construction of the electric power plants.

In recent decades the republic's party organization has been ascribing particular importance to the use of the hydraulic power resources of the Naryn River--the biggest river in Kirghizia. Here, as estimated by the scientists, 23 hydraulic power plants can be built capable of generating annually 30 billion kilowatt hours of electric power.

The Uch-Kurgan hydroelectric power plant, which was built by decision of the Eighth Congress of the Kirghiz Communist Party, added another outstanding page to the chronicle of fraternal cooperation between the Kirghiz and the other peoples of the Soviet Union. A multinational collective was created here with members of about 30 different nationalities working jointly. The entire country helped in the building of this GES: equipment and materials came from Moscow, the Urals, Siberia, Georgia, the Ukraine and the Baltic area. Workers, engineers, specialists and scientists with experience in designing and building such equipment, did everything necessary for the Uch-Kurgan GES to be on the level of domestic hydraulic power construction. The station reached full capacity 20 years ago.

Members of more than 40 nationalities took part in the construction of the Toktogul power-irrigation hydraulic junction on the tempestuous Naryn River, the biggest of its kind in Central Asia. This GES, which generates 1.2 million kilowatts, is of major importance not only to Kirghizia but to the other Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan. The current generated at the Toktogul GES made it possible considerably to reduce the scarcity of electric power consumption in the Central Asian republics.

The development of Naryn hydroelectric power is continuing. Not far from the Toktogul GES the construction of the Kurpsay GES, generating 800,000 kilowatts, is nearing completion. It will be commissioned within an extremely short time--a single five-year plan. No such pace has as yet been reached in domestic hydraulic power construction. The labor exploit on the Naryn is a result of the dedicated and organized efforts of all those who participated in the construction of the GES and an example of the great help provided by the fraternal republics. Thus, far ahead of schedule enterprises in Leningrad, Kharkov and Novosibirsk delivered assemblies and mechanisms for the turbines, hydrogenerators, and power transformers. In congratulating the hydraulic power construction workers of Kurpsay for starting the first turbine ahead of schedule, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out that "this is yet another convincing example of the unbreakable friendship among the peoples of the Soviet Union."

The Uch-Kurgan, At-Bashinskaya, Toktogul and Kurpsay hydroelectric power plants built on the Naryn, have already given the country more than 31 billion kilowatt hours of inexpensive electric power. This is only a minor share of what this river must give our homeland.

Hydraulic construction collectives were established in one construction project after another under the guidance of the party organizations.

Outstanding examples of a creative attitude toward the work have been given by hydraulic construction veterans in Kirghizia such as party members M. Sabirov, head of a brigade of fitters-assembly workers and deputy to the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet, heads of concrete-laying brigades M. A. Vasyanin and S. Fettayev, head of a bulldozer operators' brigade A. I. Kurashov, engineers K. B. Khuriyev, V. S. Shangin, V. V. Khe and V. A. Kolesnikov and many others who have contributed to the construction of power plants along the Naryn power system from the Uch-Kurgan to the Kurpsay GES.

The Communist Party of Kirghizia is steadily helping the hydraulic power construction workers in increasing the pace of construction of the Nizhnenaryn power system of hydraulic power plants. During the past 5 years alone such problems have been considered about 15 times by the Central Committee bureau. Currently the construction of the Tash-Kumyr GES, generating a power of 450,000 kilowatts, is under construction. Preparations are under way for the construction of the Shamaldy-Sayskaya and Kambaratinskaya GES, with an overall generating capacity of 2.2 million kilowatts.

In the future, another 16 hydroelectric power plants will be built on the Naryn River. It is thus that "electric flow" of the Kirghiz rivers, ever more extensively supplying its power to the plants and factories of Fergana, Andizhan, Alma-Ata and Dzhambul, and lighting up the mountain settlements of the Tian-Shan and the Pamir, will play an important role in further strengthening the economic relations among fraternal republics.

II

The waters of the mountain rivers of Soviet Kirghizstan are not only turning the turbines of the power plants but are irrigating millions of hectares of droughty land. It is no empty saying that water means life. A shortage of irrigation water has always been felt in this area with its long warm period and very fertile land. A combination of these gifts of nature is something our people dreamed of for centuries. V. I. Lenin ascribed tremendous importance to this vitally important problem starting with the very first years of the Soviet system. It was precisely he who signed the historical RSFSR Sovnarkom decree "On Allocating 50 Million Rubles for Irrigation Projects in Turkestan and the Organization of Such Projects," on 17 May 1918. This called for completing the construction of irrigation systems along the Chu River Valley, covering an area of 94,000 desyatins. Russian engineers V. A. Semenov, V. A. Vasil'yev and D. I. Mayevskiy were the first to draw up a blueprint for the development of irrigation of the Chu and Talass valleys and to design hydroengineering systems.

As it continues the work on the radical reorganization of agriculture, the republic's party organization considers land irrigation one of the main levers in agricultural production upsurge. Irrigated agriculture began to develop at a particularly fast rate after the May 1966 CPSU Central Committee Plenum which, on Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's initiative, drew up a great plan for extensive land reclamation.

Aware of the importance of this project, the state gave tremendous material assistance to the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Starting with 1965 alone, between 1966 and 1981 912 million rubles in state capital investments were allocated for land reclamation, or more than during the entire previous 40 years by a factor of 4.6. The extensive funds allocated for land reclamation, the development of the production base, the construction organizations and their strengthening with skilled cadres made it possible to build large-scale irrigation systems on a contemporary technical level and to reconstruct obsolete reclamation projects. The allocations stipulated for the 11th Five-Year Plan will be even higher.

There are more than 1,000 water sources on the republic's territory, 850 of which are used in irrigation. The building of large water resource projects within Kirghizstan is of tremendous importance to the development of irrigated farming throughout Central Asia and Kazakhstan. Thus, the construction of the Orto-Tokoy water reservoir on the Chu River and the Kirov reservoir on the Talas River, which total jointly about 1 billion cubic meters of water, made it possible to irrigate additionally hundreds of thousands of hectares of land both within the republic and in fraternal Kazakhstan.

The Toktogul water reservoir on the Naryn, with its capacity of about 20 billion cubic meters, plays a particular role in this connection. This reservoir made it possible to expand the size of the irrigated land in the Fergana Valley and the Kzyl-Orda Steppes of Kazakhstan by 400,000 hectares and ensured the guaranteed irrigation of huge areas under cotton and rice, which previously suffered from water shortages. The creation of water reservoirs virtually resolved the problem of eliminating water shortages in the basin of the Syrdar'ya River in Central Asia.

Let us remember the "biography" of the Toktogul water reservoir. When the Naryn was finally tamed and the GES turbines were ready to begin operations and the long-awaited start was nearing, it became known that the cotton fields of fraternal Uzbekistan were threatened by a terrible drought. The only hope to rescue the Uzbek cotton growers was the use of the Naryn waters. They were given this water although the commissioning of the Toktogul GES had to be postponed by several years.

Along with building irrigation projects, the republics' communists are engaged in land reclamation. A widespread system of canals exceeding 30,000 kilometers has been built for irrigation purposes. The overall volume of all water reservoirs, ponds and dams is in excess of 20 billion cubic meters.

A great deal has been accomplished. However, the systematic drop in water supplies and the drought, which have systematically reoccurred, particularly in recent years, have made us take a second look at some trends in the development of irrigated farming in the republic. "We shall be steadily increasing the share of agricultural output from the reclaimed land," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said. "Without this droughts can continue to affect us for a long time, throw off production and disturb national economic plans."

Today irrigated land accounts for about 90 percent of the entire gross output of the republic's crop growing. Kirghizstan raises high grain, vegetable, feed, industrial and other crops on its irrigated land. We deliver to the state fund many types of crop and animal husbandry products.

In implementing the CPSU Central Committee and Soviet government decision on increasing deliveries of seeds of beets, grasses and tobacco, the working people in the seed growing farms are increasing their output with every passing year. Whereas in 1981 the RSFSR received 100,000 quintals of sugar beet seeds (nearly 40 percent of its requirements), this year it will receive 110,000. By the end of the 11th Five-Year Plan deliveries totaling 220,000 quintals of sugar beet seeds will make it possible to meet RSFSR requirements almost completely.

During the 11th Five-Year Plan the Kirghiz SSR will be carrying out important irrigation-reclamation projects. In particular, the construction of yet another major water reservoir will be completed in the southern part of the republic--the Papanskoye. The Nizhne-Ala-Archin irrigation projects will be commissioned, thus increasing the availability of water in the Chu River valley.

It has been estimated that the republic has still more than 1 million hectares of land suitable for irrigation. We have undertaken their development essentially with the building of small water reservoirs, well drilling and extensive use of machine irrigation. No less than 150,000 hectares of land will be irrigated over the next decade.

Thanks to the aid of the fraternal republics, numerous local hydroengineering specialist cadres have been trained. Today they are successfully coping with scientific research and practical work and are contributing to the development of this sector in other parts of the country. The rich experience which has been acquired and the technical solutions developed at the hydraulic projects in Kirghizia are being extensively applied in the irrigation systems along the Volga, in Krasnodar Kray, Moldavia, Kazakhstan and all of Central Asia. This enables us to harvest more and more products, to be true masters of the land and successfully to implement the Food Program adopted at the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

Natural pastureland totaling almost 9 million hectares is one of the main Kirghiz resources. Such pastures, which are far from the big settlements, in inaccessible areas reaching altitudes of 3 or more kilometers above sea level, are to this day the basic source of development of animal husbandry. Their skillful utilization has been and remains the prime concern of the republic's party organs. In this respect we are being greatly helped by the USSR Academy of Sciences and by many noted pasture development scientists. Particularly substantial contributions have been made to the development of this important project by academician I. V. Vykhodtsev and Professor Ye. V. Nikitina. Under the guidance of I. V. Vykhodtsev the Kirghiz scientists undertook the geobotanical study of Kirghiz pastureland and assessed most of it from the farming viewpoint. A great deal has been done for the efficient utilization of pastureland by Hero of Socialist Labor N. I. Zakhar'yev, USSR

Kirghiz Academy of Sciences member. Today the development of pastureland farming is the work of the Kirghiz Scientific Research Technological Institute of Pastures and Feeds.

Many Kirghiz pasture grounds are used efficiently and are the base for the development, present and future, of the republic's sheep breeding. Currently its farms number more than 10 million head of sheep. In the past 6 years alone Kirghizia has delivered to the state 557,000 tons of mutton and 242,000 tons of wool; the average volume of wool shearing in Kirghizia is among the highest in the country--3.4 kilograms. This is sufficient to provide woollen fabrics for the entire adult population of our country.

The decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the Food Program direct the Kirghiz toiling people, as those in other republics, to a sharp upsurge in animal husbandry and increased production of animal husbandry goods. The further development of animal husbandry in our country is inseparably linked with improving pasturing, on which it directly depends.

Firmly in third place in the gross production of output, following the RSFSR and Kazakhstan, the republic's sheep breeders have reached the highest indicator in the country--a production in excess of 300 kilograms of wool and 1,162 kilograms of mutton per 100 hectares of farmland. The specialists in this sector are trying to achieve the highest possible yields from our mountain pastures. This decade the number of sheep will be increased by another 2 million. Compared with the previous decade mutton production will be increased by 500,000 tons and wool by 80,000 tons.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree on further development of sheep breeding in the Kirghiz SSR was of tremendous help to the republic's party organization. It clearly defined the future development of the sector, formulated the problems facing it and indicated the ways to resolve them. The republic has been allocated the necessary funds and material resources to this effect.

In order to cope with its assignments, Kirghizia is trying to develop a firm feed base and to direct the efforts of the rural workers to the all-round improvement of natural facilities--pasturegrounds and hay-growing areas which account for the bulk of the feeds. Their role in ensuring animal feed is scheduled to grow with every passing year.

The extensive use of the republic's pastureland (160 sheep per 100 hectares) in many areas has led to the fact that they become covered with inedible, harmful and toxic plants and shrubs, while some of them become subject to erosion.

The decisions of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee and Kirghiz SSR Council of Ministers earmark specific measures to ensure the comprehensive improvement of natural farmland, which must be carried out in the various oblasts, rayons and farms. The republic is doing a great deal to see to it that the pastureland remains useful over a long period of time and help us to increase animal productivity. During the 10th Five-Year Plan more than

40 million rubles were allocated in capital investments for such purposes. Thousands of hectares of mountain pastures are being improved on a planned basis. This is yielding considerable economic results. Thus, as a result of timely measures, grass yields in some pasturegrounds in the Susamyr and the valley of Son-Kul Lake doubled. The task now is for agricultural and water resource organs, kolkhozes and sovkhoses, making extensive use of the elaborated technology for improving pastures and hay-growing land, and relying on acquired experience, to expand the size of such operations.

During the 11th Five-Year Plan work will be done to ensure the radical improvement of pastureland over 100,000 hectares; cultivated pastures will be developed on 75,000 hectares; organic and chemical fertilizers will be applied on 1.6 million hectares of farmland and 135,000 hectares will be cleared of shrubs and harmful and toxic vegetation and rocks.

Mountain forests play an important role in the generous variety of natural resources of the republic. They cover a huge territory in excess of 650,000 hectares. The Kirghiz forests include more than 60 varieties of trees and shrubs, many of which are valuable. Suffice it to say that they account for more than one-half of all natural orchards of walnut and apple trees and nearly one-third of pistachio trees.

These forests, which cover the steep mountain slopes, play a tremendous soil protection and water control role. What enhances their importance further is the fact that the rivers which start here irrigate vast territories in the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan and are a powerful reserve for hydraulic power resources.

The republic party organization directs its efforts on expanding the areas in forests in Kirghizia and increasing their productivity with every passing year. To this effect we have created 25 forest farms, 3 state preserves, and the Ala-Archa natural park, whose personnel, together with scientists from the forest department of the Kirghiz SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Biology, are engaged in the preservation and multiplication of these resources. Over the past 30 years about 90,000 hectares in the republic have been planted in new forests, one-quarter of them over the past 5 years. Here the foresters grow Greek walnuts, cherry-plums, apples, pistachios, Tyan-Shan pines, firs, larch trees, birches, oak trees, poplars, and many other valuable species.

Walnuts play a particular role in the forest stock of the republic, covering an area of more than 230,000 hectares. By order of the USSR Sovnarkom, dated 1945, they were proclaimed timber-fruit preserves. Their national economic significance is great. Above all, they are the main reservoirs and sources of water for irrigating the Fergana valley which can have no agriculture without water. Apiculture and truck gardening have become widespread in these forests. Thousands of tons of honey, fruits and walnuts come from here during good years.

The party and soviet organs are providing steady control over the proper utilization of the timber resources and those who display a purely

consumerist attitude toward them are punished strictly. "In order to protect the sources of our raw materials," Lenin wrote, "we must implement and observe scientific and technical regulations. For example, if it is a question of timber deliveries, we must see to it that forest resources are properly used. If it is a question of petroleum deliveries, we must plan for the struggle against flooding. Therefore, what we need here is to observe scientific and technical regulations and ensure efficient exploitation of resources" (op. cit., vol 43, p 174). Every year the forestry personnel plant more than 1,200 hectares in antierosion species in ravines, gullies, sandy areas and other kolkhoz and sovkhoz land unsuitable for agriculture, thus blocking the further development of soil erosion. Furthermore, more than 200 hectares of tree belts are planted every year to block the wind and to protect farm crops.

The attention paid to the preservation of animals and vegetation has been increased over the past decade. The newly created forest farms, preserves and reservations are doing extensive work in ensuring the preservation and reproduction of hunting game and rare and vanishing species. The republic pays particular attention to informing the population on environmental protection matters. The Red Book of the Kirghiz SSR is ready for publication. It will include rare and vanishing species of animals and plants.

In analyzing the state of affairs in forestry, the republic's party and soviet organs are taking all the necessary measures aimed at preserving and expanding the Kirghiz mountain forests. Thus, this five-year plan 15,000 hectares will be planted in trees. It has been estimated that the volume of industrial output from the forests will total about 5 million rubles. Plans call for the creation of two new state preserves--the Naryn and the Kyzyl-Unger--and a natural park.

III

Not all Kirghiz natural resources are as yet put on the service of man. Their accelerated development will contribute to the solution of major socio-economic and national economic problems and will increase the republic's contribution to the growth of the country's production potential.

The ever-more extensive involvement of the republic's rich natural resources into economic circulation is the focal point of attention of party and state organs. Today their development is taking place on a large scale. Thus, over the last 10 to 12 years, by instruction of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, in the eastern part of our area a large group of scientists and specialists from corresponding ministries and departments carried out extensive expeditionary, hydrological, power industry and other studies. As a result, deposits of tin, tungsten, and nonferrous and rare metals were discovered in the Issyk-Kul and Naryn oblasts; deposits of granite, marble and cyanite, unique in terms of coloring, were discovered. Furthermore, extensive stocks of water and hydraulic power resources in the area were mapped.

The potential energy possibilities of the Sary-Dzhaz River alone are assessed at 10 billion kilowatt hours. Its waters could play an important role in irrigating the lands of the Chu valley and the Issyk-Kul depression, where irrigated crops exceed nonirrigated farming by a factor of 5-6. Every year the farms in this area are experiencing extensive difficulties in procuring irrigation water for already developed land. The completion of the first part of the work will make it possible to irrigate about 200,000 hectares of land.

The protection of the Issyk-Kul Lake is one of our very important problems. The large amount of clear sunny days, the amazing mountainous-maritime climate, the existence of mineral waters and medicinal mud and the picturesque landscapes make its shores most favorable for the development of sanatorium-resort areas of union significance. However, in recent decades, as a result of intensive farming use, its water level has been declining. Attempts to block this increasing process through protective measures are failing to yield the desired results.

The interests of the further socioeconomic development of the republic and of increasing its actual contribution to the country's economic potential urgently call for the fastest possible utilization of the rich mineral-raw material, land-water and hydraulic power resources of the Issyk-Kul area, which is inseparably related to the development of the industrial base of the Chu valley. The tasks related to the shaping and development of the Issyk-Kul-Chu territorial-production complex have been reflected in the "Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990." This is a manifestation of the tremendous aid and support provided by the CPSU Central Committee and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev personally.

In accordance with scientific research projects which involved the participation of dozens of scientific research institutes and design-engineering establishments, the program for the development of the area's natural resources includes the development of tin, tungsten, and rare metal ores and construction material deposits. Four hydraulic power stations will be built on the Sary-Dzhaz River, which will generate 5.3 billion kilowatt hours of electric power. Some of the waters of this river will be transferred to the Chu valley.

The water transfer from the Sary-Dzhaz will also enable us to resolve the problem of the danger of the further water losses of the Issyk-Kul Lake and will ensure the normal development of this resort area. Currently 400,000 people annually come to recover their health and to rest on the Issyk-Kul. According to the approved development plan for the Issyk-Kul area, their number will exceed 1.5 million per year.

We must admit that the increasing popularity of Issyk-Kul has not always been understood by some comrades. This is manifested in the fact that some ministries and departments engage in all possible tricks for the sake of ensuring their personnel the possibility to rest on the banks of the lake without

any particular difficulty or outlays. Some even try to build primitive housing and installations without proper permit, forgetting that the very fact of their existence threatens the lake with pollution.

Bearing in mind the great importance of the further development of the Issyk-Kul area as an all-union health resort, the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's government have passed a number of decrees aimed at bringing order in construction along the lake and have earmarked a set of measures to improve the sanitary condition of the recreation area and to ensure the preservation and sensible utilization of the natural resources of the Issyk-Kul valley.

Work is currently under way to ensure the development of beaches, roads and settlements and to landscape the shores. Stricter requirements have been formulated regarding the architectural and sanitary condition of new and previously built projects. The small rest bases are being eliminated and temporary buildings are being removed. By decision of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's government, the transportation of petroleum products in tankers was banned on the lake. The tremendous number of motorboats has led to a ban on their use. Unquestionably, all of this has considerably cleaned up the waters of Issyk-Kul.

The party and soviet organs take into consideration the fact that during the period of the development of the Issyk-Kul-Chu territorial-production complex the amount of freight haulage will increase sharply and the number of people coming to the area for work or recreation will increase. So far all transportation has taken place by automotive vehicle only. The need has come to build an electrified railroad from Rybach'ye to Przhhevsk, which could handle the ever-growing transportation volume.

In the CPSU Central Committee accountability report to the 26th party congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev named among the characteristics of economic development in the 1980s the inevitable increase of outlays on environmental protection. The use of natural resources is the prime base for human activities on earth. However, the more intensively the economy develops the more carefully we must ensure its utilization.

The pace of rebuilding the land is steadily rising as greater attention is being paid to the preservation of the republic's farmland. A program is being drafted for the comprehensive development of mineral deposits, and preventing air, river and lake pollution. The Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, the party-economic aktiv and the republic press are constantly dealing with problems of environmental protection, exposing shortcomings in this major and complex matter and drastically criticizing careless managers of enterprises and organizations which would like to extract as much as possible out of nature without trying to replenish the losses and who violate environmental protection laws. Whenever necessary malicious violators are criminally and administratively prosecuted.

The Kirghiz nature, which is an organic part of the natural complex of the land of the soviets, requires the tireless concern of man. This five-year

plan about 45 million rubles, i.e., one-third more than during the previous five-year period, have been allocated for environmental protection measures implemented in the republic.

In implementing a broad program for the efficient use and multiplication of natural resources, the republic's party members tried to provide systematic control over the proper exploitation of natural resources. They attentively see to it that propaganda in this area is effective and are doing everything possible for the wealth of our land to be used to the fullest extent by the present and future generations of Soviet people.

The study and development of Kirghiz natural resources through the common efforts of the fraternal peoples and the use of such resources to meet the needs of the entire land of the soviets are merely some of the most convincing examples of how the conversion of interests of union republics ensures their successful and steady development. Whether we are considering the level of industrial or agricultural growth, science or culture, we can clearly see everywhere that the source of our accomplishments, as those of the other Soviet republics, lie in the cooperation and unification of all nations and nationalities within our socialist fatherland.

The inviolable unity of the USSR is based on the firm foundations of friendship, fraternity, cooperation and mutual aid, which imbue all areas of our country's sociopolitical, economic and cultural life. This unity, the binding force of which is the communist party, is strengthening with every passing year. It is the base for the progress of each republic and of our entire great state advancing on the path of peace and creativity.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

STRONG WITH FRIENDSHIP

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 58-64

[Article by M. Zhilko, party committee secretary, Minsk Automotive Plant, and M. Lavrinovich, general director of the BelavtoMAZ Production Association, USSR State Prize laureate]

[Text] The constructive strength and lofty power of our multinational fatherland are truly inexhaustible. They are nurtured by the unbreakable unity of the Soviet peoples rallied around the communist party.

It would be accurate to claim that the strength of the great comity of socialist republics and their survival under most difficult circumstances -- in the tense daily work efforts and in war -- has been tested repeatedly. However, such tests make the unbreakable ties of fraternity even stronger and increase our joint economic power as well as the ideological and moral potential of the working people, proud of their involvement in historical accomplishments.

Today no one -- even an unconcealed spiteful critic or open enemy -- has any doubt that the peoples of the USSR were able so rapidly to reach the contemporary levels of economic, scientific and technical and cultural development exclusively thanks to joint efforts. Through their interaction the fraternal peoples are resolving with unabated energy both strictly local problems as well as problems of all-union significance aimed at further laying the material and technical foundations for communism and upgrading the well-being of the working people. This is confirmed by many proofs, and convincing examples. Quite instructive in this respect is the history of the birth of the Minsk Automotive Plant. Closely interwoven with its biography are the destinies of members of virtually all nations in our multinational state.

....The unfortunate capital of Belorussia lay in ruins and ashes after its liberation from fascist slavery. The war was still being fought at the western borders of the USSR and the country was stressing its forces for the total defeat of the Hitlerite military machine. Meanwhile, an event which was to become historical, took place on 16 July 1944: On kilometer No 7 of the Mogilev highway a labor detachment arrived at the Krasnoye Urochishche settlement, armed with shovels, saws and axes. It was here, on the site of the fascist concentration camp that the construction of the Minsk Automotive Plant was undertaken. The front demanded a tremendous quantity of equipment

on a daily and even hourly basis, the delivery of which from distant areas involved certain difficulties and interruptions. The decision had therefore been made to develop new production facilities in the liberated area on an urgent basis.

The first builders in Krasnoye Urochishche were those who only yesterday were members of the combat detachments of people's avengers. The former leaders of the partisan subunits became the heads of the labor brigades. Some of them turned out to be automotive specialists. Later on the construction workers became the backbone of the labor collective of the automotive assembly plant which took just a few months to complete, for by decree of the State Defense Committee, as early as November 1944 automotive vehicles were to be shipped to the front, the assembling and repair of which had been assigned to the plant. The December plan was raised by one half... Such were the extreme circumstances dictated by the difficult war-time situation.

Despite the enthusiasm of the entire collective it was obvious that it lacked sufficient strength and needed urgent outside help. Such help came without hindrance. Hundreds of volunteer automotive workers expressed the desire to work in Minsk, aware of both working and living hardships. The first to respond were workers at the Gorkiy Automotive Plant. One after another trains carrying equipment, instruments and all the necessary parts for vehicle assembly arrived in Krasnoye Urochishche from the banks of the Volga. The largest enterprises in Moscow, Yaroslavl and the Urals assigned their best specialists and highly skilled workers to Minsk. Actually, problems of training local cadres could not be postponed, for which reason a large group of Belorussian youngsters were sent to the industrial centers of Russia to attend special courses taught by experienced foremen.

Throughout her entire life Hero of socialist Labor N. P. Yakubovich, a veteran at the iron casting shop, has felt a profound gratitude toward the people of the Urals for the science and lessons in life which she and her comrades received in distant Miass.

"A real meeting took place on the railroad station square in honor of our arrival," Nadezhda Pavlovna recalls. "Everybody wanted to go to the hostel. However, the workers immediately dispersed us, taking us into their families. We lived surrounded by fatherly concern and motherly care. Later on, for many years we remained friends, corresponded and visited one another."

It was thanks to the birth of the MAZ [Minsk Automotive Plant] that many people adopted the hospitable land of Belorussia as their own, finding here their vocation and happiness. Yaroslavl engineer G. M. Kokin, who was appointed chief enterprise designer, was among the first settlers in Krasnoye Urochishche. Leningrade defender I. K. Krasnov had participated in the liberation of Minsk, where he was severely wounded. Once healed, he decided to become a builder of automobiles. Some of the initial builders of the MAZ included chief engineer B. V. Obukhov, chief technologist M. Yu. Kane, and chief energy official and subsequently general director of the BelavtoMAZ I. M. Demin. Rank and file workers D. I. Barashkin, A. Ye. Galkin, M. I. Chekulayev, A. I. Nekhay, M. P. Skoromnik, L. I. Kozhushko and many others became the backbone of the production brigades. Incidentally, the example of

the pioneers is having an educational impact on the young Belorussian automotive builders to this day.

Many memorable events have occurred during the overall short history of the plant, events which constitute its historical chronicle. One of the most exciting was the assembling of the first automobile... The automotive workers fulfilled their pledge to the homeland ahead of schedule. On the day of the 27th anniversary of the Great October Revolution a group of assembled trucks left for the front. Representatives of the military units which accepted them warmly thanked the plant workers. It was only then that many of the workers fully realized the importance of their efforts, for without them the military exploits in the struggle against the hated enemy would have been impossible.

The party's plan for the participation of the MAZ in the final stage of the defeat of the fascist forces was fulfilled in its entirety. Following the installation of the main assembly line output quadrupled. In less than 2 years 18,174 vehicles were assembled and repaired for the needs of the front and the country's national economy.

Meanwhile, the design bureau was already developing the idea of a basically new model to meet peace-time requirements. Tremendous work lied ahead in restoring the dislocated national economy. This faced the country's automotive fleet with a huge task for, as we know, it had been weakened as a result of the discriminatory measures taken by the United States and its allies.

The point was that the Western politicians were already concocting their cold war plans. Their actions were dictated by the desire to undermine the economic potential of the victorious country which had suffered tremendous losses and experienced the immeasurable calamities in its duel with fascism.

The decision of the U. S. government to recover urgently all technical facilities (including automotive vehicles) which had been shipped to the USSR during the difficult war years on the basis of the lend-lease agreement, could be classified only as hostile. The authors of this malicious action were not guided in the least by commercial considerations: the Fords, Dodges and Studebakers assembled at the Soviet ports were demonstratively and immediately crushed into scrap metal.... How similar this is to actions of the Reagan administration and its clumsy efforts to break up trade cooperation between Western countries and the Soviet Union! Actually, Washington's "hawks" are vainly consoling themselves with the illusion that banning the delivery of equipment for the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod gas pipeline would hinder the implementation of our plans for economic construction. The Soviet people are fully resolved to manufacture the necessary machines themselves and thus to turn to naught the intrigues of the enemies of peace.

Therefore, today we have a repetition of the situation of the end of the 1940s when, defying common sense, the masters of the White House had decided to use strict economic "sanctions" against the peace-loving policy of the USSR. One does not have to be a prophet to predict their sorry outcome. This is one of the many lessons of history...one of which has to do with the building of the MAZ.

On the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Great October Revolution the Minsk automobile makers presented the country with a precious gift: solemnly rolling in the parade were flower-decorated five MAZ-205 6-ton dump trucks marking the birth of the automotive industry in Belorussia. This was a report to the Soviet people to the effect that the assignment issued by the party and the government had been fulfilled ahead of schedule. A vehicle bearing the emblem of the bison, tireless, easily climbing sharp slopes, travelling without roads and able to withstand the searing heat of the desert and the bitter frost of the north, had been born. Soon afterwards, the first shipment of trucks left for the construction projects in Moscow. This was symbolic, for it was thus that the people of Minsk were expressing their love and gratitude to the Russian people for their fraternal aid to the restoration of wrecked Belorussia and its capital.

Trucks, dump trucks and trailers kept coming off the assembly line although the plant was still in its construction stage. However, these were the exceptional circumstances of the difficult period of restoration. The great construction projects of the homeland required hardy trucks. The automotive workers made them. Initially, in connection with the digging of the Volga-Don Canal, our collective was assigned the manufacturing of a big batch of 25-ton capacity trucks. The government's order was fulfilled on time. The powerful Belorussian dump trucks worked at the Angara as well. Captivated by their work, the poet A. T. Tvardovskiy wrote:

The order was given;
A brief motion of a flag
And, like RGK tanks
The Minsk 20-tonners
Rocking their sides as though shoulders
Came straight out of the gate and with their
load, at the enemy.

Eleven plant workers were awarded the title of USSR State Prize Laureate for designing the vehicles of the the MAZ-500 series. They were developed by the graduates of the Belorussian Polytechnical Institute together with engineers from Moscow, Yaroslavl and Gorkiy. Interaction with like-thinking people enriches design work, making it more fruitful and efficient, while joint labor promotes a feeling of collectivism and friendship which, in the final account, influences production efficiency. During all these years contacts between the MAZ and various production collectives in the country have become even wider and stronger. More than 1,000 enterprises in all the fraternal republics are participating both directly and indirectly in the making of the vehicle. The Urals and the Ukraine ship to us high-strength metal, the engines come from Yaroslavl, Voronezh ships tires, Lithuania compressors, Kirghizia preheaters, Armenia electrical equipment, Bashkiriya reclining seats, Georgia industrial rubber goods and forgings, and the Komi ASSR lumber. It is precisely thanks to the friendship among the peoples that the building of the largest possible automotive enterprises became possible, without which one could not imagine the development of socialist production and which have been assigned an exceptionally important role in laying the material and technical base of communism.

The organization of business relations among republics, regions and individual enterprises is no simple matter of trade but an already customary socialist form of economic management which enables us successfully to resolve most complex economic problems on the basis of the principles of fraternity and mutual aid. Loyal to Lenin's behests, the CPSU is systematically pursuing a truly humanistic policy consistent with the basic interests and historical expectations of the big and small nations which constitute the single socialist society. The productive forces of our society are developing harmoniously. The Soviet system abolished the economic inequality among the peoples of the USSR, which in the past produced the grounds for national discord. The great fraternity of working people and the sacred feeling of a united family, which binds the Soviet republics in an inviolable Leninist friendship, appeared in the course of the right struggle for a new and just world.

Looking back at its 60 years of development, the entire history of the Soviet Union is seen as planned work related to the efficient location of production forces for the sake of the common good. That is why members of the Belorussian nation may be found in any republic and in all the largest construction projects of the country. They are laying steel tracks, developing the infinite national resources of the north, and building cities and electric power plants in the east. The source of our strength and power lies in the selfless interaction among the peoples.

As we know, the initial project for the plant called for the construction of several thousand trucks per year in two models only -- the MAZ-200 and the MAZ-205. Reality called for expanding the capacity of the enterprise and the parallel increase in production variety. The plant's reconstruction aimed at organizing the production of the MAZ-500 model, which are medium capacity trucks, was undertaken in the 1960s.

The production of super heavy-duty dump trucks was assigned to the Belorussian Automotive Plant in Zhodino. Other related production facilities were developed on a parallel basis. Therefore, today the enterprises of the BelavtoMAZ Association are located in four different oblasts in Belorussia and the Russian Federation. Cooperation has sharply increased the labor productivity of workers, engineers and technicians. Firms steps were taken to improve technological processes, and production mechanization and automation. The joining of forces made possible the implementation of a broad task -- the production of trucks with a capacity ranging from 8 to 180 tons! This was also helped by the close cooperation ties maintained with a number of scientific collectives throughout the country. Today the scientific sector of the head enterprise has 10 base laboratories employing 526 specialists. Many among them are production workers who have earned candidate of science titles or are even doctors of technical sciences.

Recently, MAZ engineer I. A. Goretskiy defended his candidate dissertation on a topic of great practical significance at the Ukrainian SSR Academy of sciences Electric Welding Institute imeni Ye. O. Paton. It dealt with extending the service life, reducing metal outlays and lowering labor intensiveness in manufacturing heavy-duty trailers and semi-trailers for use in the north. This is merely one example of successful scientific research which involves the participation of thousands of inventors and rationalizers.

Loyal to the laws of socialist comity, they make no secret of their experience and discoveries and generously share them with anyone who truly aspires to adopt anything new and progressive. Today, when the MAZ is at the peak of its strength, we do not forget that our successes and achievements are also victories won by our innumerable friends and assistants in all parts of our boundless homeland. With every passing year the thousands-strong MAZ collective is strengthening relations with a great number of enterprises. Such relations extend to all ends of our fatherland and go both ways.

The automotive manufacturing giant at Naberezhnyye Chlny was still under construction while cadres for it were already being trained. Several hundred young workers were trained by the MAZ in 46 major skills for its colleague on the Kama. Tuner Shamil' Mamayev, stamping operator Lyudmila Artemova, design engineer Sergey Silin and others remember gratefully their MAZ training. Many of the 1,790 trainees are still maintaining business and creative contacts with our plant workers. Alongside the people of the ZIL and the Yaroslavl engine manufacturers, Minsk designers, technologists and programmers participated in the creation of several KamAZ models. Creative brigades of MAZ specialists repeatedly travelled from Belorussia to the banks of the Kama, and some specialists moved to Naberezhnyye Chelny permanently. Thus, the service of the chief designer at the KamAZ is headed by former MAZ employee V. N. Barun; V. A. Azarov, formerly with the MAZ is technical director, while G. I. Gurova, former MAZ specialist, is deputy chief of the design-technological standardization department. The list could be extended. The MAZ also participated in training cadres for the Volga Automotive Plant in Togliatti. One of the active organizers of this project, technical training department engineer A. F. Baranovskiy, was awarded a high government distinction -- the Order of Friendship Among the Peoples.

The sponsorship relations maintained by the Minst automotive builders are expanding. Courses for tuners of automated and semi-automated machine tools are being offered by the USSR Ministry of Automotive Industry, using the facilities of the head enterprise and the branch of the skill upgrading institute. So far this is the only training combine of its kind in the country. Young workers from all union republics come to Minsk to master the complex skill of tuning digitally programmed equipment.

The MAZ maintains extensive international relations with similar plants in the socialist countries. It has a contract for scientific and technical cooperation with the IFA enterprise (in Ludwigsfelde) in the GDR. Close friendship ties exist between the Minsk people and the personnel of the Tatra Plant (Czechoslovakia). Business contacts with automotive manufacturers encourage creative thinking, help to accelerate scientific and technical progress, enrich the practice of socialist competition, and offer favorable opportunities for the further development of independent artistic and technical creativity and the upbringing of the members of labor collectives in a spirit of internationalism.

The MAZ vehicles have gained a firm foothold in foreign markets. In terms of most important technical and economic indicators the MAZ are as good as the vehicles produced by similar foreign firms. Today vehicles bearing the bison emblem are at work in more than 50 foreign countries. Along with requests

from foreign commercial companies the plant receives frequent compliments and letters of thanks from people directly involved in the use of our trucks. Here is one among many. Driver Ivan Titov from Bulgaria writes: "I drive a MAZ (Plant No VR-2678) for a construction organization. My truck has not had a capital repair in 4 years, although it has already hauled loads for 10,617 hours. On the basis of 20 kmh this means 212,340 km. I am still using the original tires and parts. Consequently, savings in spare parts, fuel and repairs have totalled 5,160 leva. With this one could purchase a new truck. I am hastening to share my pleasure with those who assemble such reliable and durable vehicles."

Hero of Socialist Labor K. G. Pavlenkovich, test driver, was member of a delegation which visited Vietnam. Here are his impressions from the trip: "One feels," he told his comrades, "an incomparable sensation of pride in our homeland when one sees, so far from it, USSR-made machine tools, trucks, tractors and household goods. In Haiphong, holding my breath, I watched the unloading of MAZ from a freighter. Today, when I look at a map in which dozens of arrows mark the road travelled by the MAZ throughout the world, I can clearly imagine the hot African sands which our MAZ can cross. I see dams in the construction of which our "bisons" work indefatigably. I see people of different nations -- white, yellow, black -- the friendship with whom is helped by the outstanding Soviet equipment. Minsk trucks may be found throughout the earth and on any road."

We consider September 1978 a memorable year, when Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee secretary warmly congratulated the drivers, repairmen and engineering and technical workers of the Main Automotive Transportation Administration of the Moscow City Executive Committee, the collectives of the automotive plants and the Central Scientific Research Automotive and Automotive Motors Institute for the high efficiency achieved by many of the Main Automotive Transportation Administration in the use of transport facilities -- reaching truck runs of up to 350,000 km without capital repairs. Drivers of MAZ accounted for a substantial percentage of the comrades cited. The new plans of our association stipulate that during the 11th Five-Year Plan the record setting indicator of 350,000 km run without capital repairs must become the norm for all MAZ-5335-model trucks. New horizons lie ahead, which we intend to reach in the course of creative interaction with our production partners. In this case the so-called contract of the six plays a special role. This refers to the cooperation between the MAZ, the Avtodizel' and Dizel'apparatura Associations in Yaroslavl, the Central Scientific Research Automotive and Automotive Motors Institute (NAMI), the Moscow Automotive-Highway Institute (MADI) and the Automotive Transportation Combine No 1 of the Main Moscow Automotive Transportation administration. This efficient cooperation among scientists, and production and exploitation personnel has been tested over a long period of time and has yielded excellent results. Over the last 6 years the service life of MAZ trucks (powered by a YaMZ motor) has increased by a factor of 1.7 before capital repairs, reaching 300,000 km. All serially produced vehicles by the Minsk plant bear the state Emblem of Quality.

Despite its obviously industrial line of work, BelavtoMAZ pays great attention to the orders received from rural workers. It developed the

MVU-30, which is a self-propelling machine for the application of chemical fertilizer. Its structural qualities are such that the grain growers can fertilize winter crops early in the season on a highly productive basis. No less important is the production of spare parts for agricultural machinery and the delivery of complementing items and assemblies to enterprises directly involved in the agroindustrial complex.

The Minsk automotive workers accepted the decisions of the May 1982 Central Committee plenum, which formulated the historical Food Program, with a feeling of tremendous responsibility. Its implementation is now the direct obligation and civic duty of every Soviet person. The implementation of the measures earmarked by the party will require the stressed efforts of the working people in all Soviet republics. One could confidently say that as always the friendship among the fraternal peoples of the USSR will have an inspiring effect on the work of all labor collectives on which the implementation of the party's task depends directly or indirectly.

The MAZ personnel are a multinational united collective. The party members, who number almost 4,000, and who numbered only 30 at the start, are its foundation and political nucleus. Our collective is welcoming the great date -- the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR -- full of strength and daring plans. Major accomplishments lie ahead for the sake of the well-being of all the fraternal peoples. The unity between workers and peasants is strengthening within their strong international comity.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

INTERNATIONALISTS' WAY OF LIFE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 65-69

[Article by G. Zimasas, editor in chief of KOMMUNIST, theoretical and political journal of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee]

[Text] The advantages of our system--the absence of private property of productive capital above all--offer extensive opportunities for the internationalization of all social life. The steady and constant development of production forces--the base of internationalization--inevitably widens the national framework. However, any objective researcher could not fail to see that internationalization in the capitalist society, as its entire life, flows down the channel of the political, economic and social interests of the monopolies, leading to the struggle for markets, inexpensive manpower, fierce competition and, frequently, armed conflicts. Internationalism in the socialist world, as our own practice clearly shows, is a qualitatively different process.

In the economic area it means the successful development of the single national economic complex of the country--the material foundation of the fraternal friendship among the peoples of the USSR. It means the growth of labor productivity, which is increasingly becoming the prime, the vital need of man; it means the increased size of the working class, including native cadres. The socialist society is a society of working people and internationalization is radically influencing the conditions, results and characteristics of labor.

In the political area the process of internationalization is inseparably related to the creation of a nationwide state and the establishment and development of socialist democracy. Under the Soviet system a cultural revolution was carried out by all the peoples of our country. Soviet culture, which is unified in terms of socialist content and main direction in its development and varied in terms of national forms, serves the most important factor of shaping the new comprehensively developed person.

The process of socialist internationalization leads to the blossoming and rapprochement among all nations and nationalities in the country, harmoniously manifesting the unity between the national and the international. "Life proves," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the CPSU Central Committee accountability report to the 26th party congress, "that the intensive economic and social development of each one of our republics accelerates the

process of the all-round rapprochement among them. The blossoming and reciprocal enrichment of national cultures take place...." These two aspects are interdependent. Reciprocal enrichment is one of the features for the rapprochement among socialist nations, although understandably contacts among nations cannot always be based on reciprocal enrichment. Countries and peoples who have long remained oppressed naturally can make only their possible contribution to the creation of the new society at the beginning. The true reciprocal enrichment takes place with the development of socialism, when backward outlying areas disappear in the course of the implementation of the party's national policy. However, to this day some countries and nations may need unilateral aid, which is provided by our country to peoples fighting for their liberation. Internationalism morality--a norm of our lives--is also the most important guarantee for the further strengthening of the friendship among peoples in a developed socialist society.

Under the conditions of the new social and international community--the Soviet people--new opportunities arise for rapprochement among nations. The true values of one nation become the values of all. This is one of our great accomplishments. Naturally, under the new circumstances new problems arise as well. One of them, as the CPSU Central Committee Decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Founding of the USSR" emphasizes, is to educate the working people in a feeling of pride in the socialist fatherland and of high standards in international contacts.

The shaping of high standards in international relations naturally presumes a more attentive attitude toward languages, above all Russian, as a language of international communication. Its very study is determined by the interests of each nation and nationality and it is important to see to it that every citizen of the Soviet Union become well familiar with it. The feeling of belonging to the single Soviet nation unquestionably contributes to the fact that in our country the Russian language is becoming widespread, on a voluntary basis, as Lenin predicted. It is equally important for people of different nationalities who live in one republic or another to study the language of the native nationality. The importance of the knowledge of languages is understandable but not everything is reduced merely to this. Those who have lived a long time in a given union or autonomous republic without having mastered the language of the local population cannot be familiar with its literature and art and trace their development. They are unable to become profoundly familiar with the heart of their people. Upgrading the culture of international contacts requires the sincere aspiration to understand the mentality of the other nation and the laws governing the development of its culture as well as true respect for its national dignity. On this level the importance of bilingualism is invaluable.

In itself, unquestionably, the process of internationalization is conflicting. Its contradictory nature involves, in particular, the fact to this day, when patriotism and internationalism have become a norm of life of the Soviet people and the most important features of the socialist way of life, recurrences of bourgeois nationalism still make themselves be felt. In our country there neither is nor could there be any social, any class base for nationalistic manifestations. However, their vestiges are most stubborn and

persistent. They live long for a variety of reasons but mainly because they could be concealed behind what is truly national, such as national policy, traditions and patriotism. They can and do revive under the influence of the erroneous, the distorted perception of healthy national feelings.

The practice of building a new society in the socialist countries convincingly proves that revisionist elements have always tried to "play on" national feelings. In the case of failure to be properly rebuffed by revolutionary forces, the nationalists acquire a certain influence and involve within the realm of their influence rather broad population strata.

"Bearing in mind that nationalism is one of the main means for subversive imperialist activities against real socialism, we must wage a systematic and aggressive struggle against attempts to promote nationalistic prejudices among individual people and firmly oppose any deviation from the Leninist principles of national policy," emphasizes the CPSU Central Committee Decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Founding of the USSR."

Surmounting the vestiges of nationalism is not only the internal affairs of a socialist country but is of great international importance as well, for it is related to the further strengthening of the global socialist system and the unification of the entire global communist and labor movements. Lenin himself wrote that the struggle "against the most deeply rooted petit bourgeois-national prejudices become more important the more topical becomes the task of converting the dictatorship of the proletariat from national ... into international...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 165).

The range of vestiges of nationalism is still quite broad. Obviously, it can be said that open nationalists who openly reject the ideas of friendship among nations have greatly compromised themselves in the eyes of the broad public. However, such vestiges still remain in a refined aspect, assuming a chronic, a "sneaky" nature. Their manifestation is not always obvious. They may be expressed in the inflation of national specifics and ignoring such specifics in other nations. They must be concealed under the guise of idealizing the past of one's people and of its individual cultural leaders, and denying the laws of the class struggle in this past. The feudal stage in the lives of some nations is occasionally presented to them as their "golden century." An aspiration becomes apparent to promote religious ceremonies under the guise of national traditions. There still exist among us people who consider nationality rather than moral qualities as the most important features in the characteristics of a person, rather than his political viewpoint.

Underestimating the experience in building socialism or the culture of other nations is unquestionably as nationalistic as the selection of cadres based above all on national features, national exclusivity, mistrust and egotism. It is very important to be able properly to assess such phenomena and decisively oppose such practices.

We must not fail to take into consideration that essentially nationalistic yet frequently modified or skillfully concealed vestiges are not always realized as being such by everyone. They may affect even people who essentially reject alien views. We occasionally hear that, although allowing the very fact that such a "subconscious nationalism" exists, by this token we favor the true nationalists and offer them the opportunity to conceal behind the mask of naivete. Naturally, some people can indeed pretend. However, quite frequently, we believe, such naivete is nothing but an error, a result of nondialectical thinking, of an inability to think things to the end and to consider an action or a word an aspect of alien class ideology and mentality. To reject the fact that nationalistic vestiges could be inherent even in people who are subjectively internationalists means to surrender anyone who allows such errors to the nationalists and thus to help them actually. People who are wrong must be corrected but not labeled or identified with elements who are truly hostile to internationalism but by exposing the class content and true aim of one of their views and actions or another.

It is important to bear in mind that nationalism frequently assumes a religious form. Naturally, this does not mean that all believers are necessarily nationalists. It is understandable, however, that even clergy who are loyal to the socialist system are representatives of an outlook which opposes socialism and that people without firm internationalist convictions naturally gravitate toward their organizations. That is why we must emphasize again and again the great need for combining the systematic struggle for internationalism with atheistic activities in pursuit of the main objective which is to liberate as many people as possible from the influence of the clergy.

Involving the working people, the honest and patriotic people in particular, in the struggle for the ideals of the entire toiling people regardless of their religious views, in the struggle for peace and for improved well-being, is very important. Lenin pointed out as early as 1905 that unity in the revolutionary struggle for improving society is more important to us than "unity of proletarian views regarding heaven" (op. cit., vol 12, p 146). Naturally, the communists must not tolerate religion. It is a question of the importance of uniting within the struggle for the solution of the main problems working people of different views. Unquestionably, this will contribute to their ideological emancipation as well.

It is obvious that the vestiges of nationalism, as well as other manifestations of bourgeois and petit bourgeois mentality must be uprooted in the course of improving the socialist way of life. As the practice in building the new society has emphasized, it is particularly intensive in the realm of development of a communist awareness and shaping a scientific Marxist-Leninist outlook in all working people. Naturally, when we speak of asserting an internationalist way of life and internationalist patriotic upbringing, we consider it as an inseparable part of communist education at large. One cannot develop internationalism alone while forgetting the need to develop in the people political consciousness, and the norms of labor and communist morality.

It is always important to bear in mind the dialectics of the socialist way of life and awareness as a whole: a socialist way of life alone lays the foundations for the development of internationalism which (closely related to all realms of socialist awareness), is not only a result but a prerequisite for the development of the socialist way of life.

The 26th CPSU Congress emphasized the need for actual "unity among party ideological-theoretical, political-educational, organizational and economic work." This means education in terms of words and actions and total elimination of any gap between them. Sometimes the term "verbal upbringing" is mentioned in a drastically negative sense. It is understandable, however, that one cannot educate without words, the way words cannot be separated from actions. That is precisely what is meant when we discuss today work aimed at the further strengthening of the material and spiritual foundations of the socialist way of life.

Naturally, one of the most important tasks is upgrading the well-being of the working people. Unquestionably, improved educational work will contribute to its growth. However, it would be a dangerous illusion to reduce improvements in the way of life to upgrading the well-being. These are interrelated but quite different tasks. Practical experience indicates that many people have everything they need but their way of life cannot be described as socialist. In particular, it may be poisoned by nationalistic views. It is precisely the identification of the way of life and the living standard that our ideological opponents would like to impose upon us by praising bourgeois sufficiency in the capitalist countries and trying to present it as the living standard of the entire people.

Unity among all types of educational work can be achieved most efficiently above all within the labor collective in which labor which, under socialism, is of an international nature, with the process of the upbringing of the individual.

Naturally, here all aspects of our reality are important. The scarcity of one or another product which was previously in abundant supply may have an adverse effect upon the people. On the basis of such a fact an unstable person may even draw erroneous political conclusions. Naturally, here again the role of the labor collective and its concern for the way of life, housing, labor conditions and satisfaction of the spiritual needs of man and his involvement in active social life is very important. If work within the collective is properly organized it can indeed create miracles in the education of the people, as confirmed by the experience of the best collectives. This means that we must be seriously concerned with the further unification of the collectives and the truly prestigious nature of their leaders, the party organizations above all.

All collectives include members of different social and professional groups--workers, employees, engineering and technical cadres, and service personnel. As early as 1920 Lenin emphasized the great need for "the ability to understand the characteristics, the specific features of the mentality of each stratum, profession, and so on" (op. cit., vol 41, p 192). With good and

harmoniously organized work all of them act as one. However, we must not ignore the characteristics of the group awareness with a view to the further unification of the collectives and enhancing the level of group awareness to that of the whole nation.

Unquestionably, in this connection the various forms of contacts among people, both at work and outside work are important. As we know, there are many collectives which practice only one type of communication--a meeting with a monologue by the speaker who frequently repeats elementary truths, for which reason the others are only looking at their watches, waiting for the end. Yet many excellent forms of contacts exist within each collective whose members can engage in interesting, practical and friendly conversation, united as they are by a common cause, and spend their leisure time in a variety of useful ways. All of this is important in improving the way of life. Conversely, how greatly educational work, above all in the labor collective, is weakened and how active become vestiges, obsolete traditions and sources of poisoning the mind with the toxin of nationalism. Let us not forget that some prejudices seem to generate others. Egotism, willfulness, bureaucratism, support of toadiness, suppression of criticism, bribery and speculation can help to revive and restore nationalistic prejudices and vice versa. Errors in party cadre policy, which requires an identical approach to cadres of all nationalities, may lead to corresponding mistrust and frequently become generalized.

Unquestionably, the capitalist world is one of the main factors for the negative influence exerted on the mentality and awareness of the person. Its ideologues deliberately rely on the promotion of nationalism and national mistrust in our country. They act quite treacherously and, with the help of history, distort Soviet reality. They are accustomed to do this, for nationalism is an old weapon of theirs.

But the communists have always considered as one of their most important tasks the struggle against nationalism, both realized and clearly expressed as well as refined. A great deal has been done and is being done in this direction in our country. Today we are speaking above all of the qualitative level of this struggle--of the total victory of the noble ideas of internationalism and friendship among nations and of unity which knows no national friction or mistrust. Such unity is attainable in the socialist world. It can and must be achieved under the conditions of the existence of individual nations. This is one of the most important conditions for the conversion from socialism to communism and it will take place.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

YOUNG GROWTH OF OUR ART

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 70-75

[Article by People's Painter of the USSR T. Salakhov, first secretary of the board of the USSR Union of Painters]

[Text] Our art--the art of socialist realism--is based on the inviolable Leninist principles of party-mindedness and nationality. The outstanding accomplishments of the Soviet people, their great heroic past and their no less heroic current reality, imbued with labor enthusiasm, are inexhaustible sources of creative inspiration to the artist in the country.

This is a special year for every Soviet person. It marks the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR--an event which is the most visible embodiment of the triumph of the Leninist national policy of the communist party and the advantages and historical achievements of our social system.

The Great October Revolution inaugurated a new era in the history of mankind. It predetermined the historically common destinies of the peoples of the land of the soviets and the unbreakable fraternal alliance among all nations and nationalities within the socialist fatherland.

The CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Founding of the USSR" emphasizes that "the single international culture of the Soviet people is growing and strengthening on the fertile ground of mature socialism ... it encompasses everything of universal significance in the achievements and original traditions of the 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 nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union."

Today the painters in our country are reaching new creative levels. As figuratively expressed by Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, "a new tidal wave is rising" in Soviet art. Its power lies in the internationalist spirit of Soviet culture, the wealth of national forms and traditions and the socialist nature of its ideological content. The high rating of works of art is a confirmation of the broad social recognition of the work of the artist, who is actively contributing to shaping the spiritual world of the new man. The contemporary artist cannot be limited to resolving purely professional problems. More than ever before, today art is called upon to influence the

complex processes of the transformation of reality, the moral aspect and actions of people, their education in a spirit of communist ideals and their active struggle for peace on earth.

The many-thousands-strong USSR Union of Painters rallies masters working in all types and genres of the graphic arts and members of all nationalities in the country. The Soviet painters are making a substantial contribution to the treasury of domestic culture. Every one of them has his own creative way and style. Every one tries to find his own forms of depiction inherent in a specific national school. However, all of them are united within the positions of the artist-citizen of the new socialist society.

The resolutions of the 24th, 25th and 26th party congresses and the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Work With the Creative Youth" (1976) contributed to improving educational work with the young artistic intelligentsia and to the active shaping of its Marxist-Leninist outlook. The youth associations of the USSR Union of Painters operate lecture series and political training seminars. Problems of political education are closely linked to those of professional and creative growth. The youth are addressed not only by skilled propagandists but by prestigious masters belonging to the senior generation and by noted art experts. Discussions on topical problems of artistic culture and specific problems of creativity are debated in the creative clubs of the associations. Such discussions involve contacts with the party and Komsomol public of the local creative organizations and criticism sections. Special seminars are organized aimed at upgrading the skill of young critics and their active involvement in the life of creative collectives. Many organizations, the one in Leningrad above all, have created collective workshops for young painters, headed by acknowledged masters.

With the support of party and Komsomol organs, the establishments of the USSR Ministry of Culture and the USSR Academy of Fine Arts, the youth commissions and associations of the USSR Union of Painters, issue travel assignments to the members of the association, covering Komsomol construction projects in the eastern parts of the country, the BAM for example, and progressive industrial and agricultural enterprises located in various parts of the Soviet Union. Here entire brigades of painters are at work. In recent years such brigades have been sent to the BAM, the Northern Sea Route, the Nonchernozem, Central Asia and the Kuril Islands. They have produced a substantial number of works which were exhibited at an all-union exhibit in Minsk (1978); there have been annual accountability reviews in many local organizations. Such reviews alone do not account for all positive results of creative assignments.

It would be difficult to overestimate the role which such trips play in shaping the personality of the painter or designer. Many genres in which the painters work, including young ones, seem to "tie them" to the workshop, making meetings with fellow workers sporadic. Naturally, no middleman should exist between the painter and his canvas. It is equally obvious, however, that the creative life of an experienced master or a beginning talented painter should not be a kind of imprisonment which is always fatal to true art which reflects our life and shapes it actively. All possible support

should be given to work done by young people on site. For example, a group of Moscow designers helped to shape the worker clubs at the BAM. Leningrad artists, including young painters, visit Severomuysk every year. They have made a tangible contribution to the cultural life of one of the most important sectors in the construction of the Baykal-Amur Mainline which is sponsored by the city on the Neva. The creation of a painting gallery in Severomuysk, although small, yet extremely necessary in a youth shock construction project, has been a proper result of such sponsorship.

Such activities must be comprehensively expanded above all by the young. That is why we consider promising the work of the USSR Union of Painters and the USSR Academy of Fine Arts, together with the Komsomol Central Committee and the Komsomol city committees in organizing creative assignments. True, a certain decline has been noted today in this area. Practical problems must be resolved, which hinder its development. This is needed by the art and the country and is very important in the upbringing of the creative youth. However, no "objective" difficulties (which, alas, if investigated occasionally prove to be entirely subjective) should hinder this initiative.

This year, with understandable excitement, all of us waited for the opening of the "Youth of the Country" All-Union Art Exhibit, dedicated to the 19th Congress of the Leninist Komsomol, for it represented the young painters--the future of Soviet graphic art. The exhibit was preceded by extensive and painstaking work. Youth exhibits were held in cities, oblasts and all republics in the USSR, at which the best works which were shipped to the all-union exhibit were selected. The boards of the painters' unions in the individual republics and their youth commissions did a great deal to rally the efforts of the creative youth and to mobilize them in the creation of paintings, sculptures, graphic designs, works of decorative-applied art and design reflecting the life and work of the developed socialist society. Successfully exhibited were the works of young painters from the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Moldavia, the Transcaucasian republics, Central Asia, Kazakhstan, the Baltic area, Moscow and Leningrad. Their works give us an idea of the artistic aspirations of the young generation.

Each generation of creative youth gains its own social experience. An important aspect in the evaluation of the works is the active life stance of the young and their need to describe their own times and themselves. Topics of sociopolitical life and moral problems are originally described in their works.

The young are continuing the work of the senior generations. Their creative works are inseparably related to the common processes occurring today within the Soviet multinational graphic art. It is precisely the ideological and creative continuity that has always defined and is defining one of the essential features of our art.

The "Youth of the Country" All-Union Art Exhibit proved that the young masters can resolve broad problems and that they are in a state of creative upsurge. Many authors are aspiring to reach a temperamental and sharp stylistic solution and vivid and expressive forms in their canvasses,

graphics and sculptures. Turning to political topics, the painters are seeking new approaches and composition systems, combining them with a broad coverage of reality and a powerful and lively plastic shape. They focus their attention on problem situations, on facts of great human importance which affect the fate of the world.

Addressing himself to the delegates attending the 19th Komsomol Congress, Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev said: "You are the representatives of that segment of our great people who are to shape the future of the country. More than anyone else you must not feel indifferent to its shape. This affects not only the Soviet people but all mankind." It is precisely the profound and investigative interest in the present and the future of our planet and a response to the events affecting our contemporaries that are inherent in the works of the painters represented in the "Youth of the Country" exhibit. They dealt with problems of the struggle for peace, freedom and national independence of the peoples, and the life and labor accomplishments of the Soviet people; they sang of the beauties of nature.

The exposition was opened with the triptych by V. Arlashin and V. Chevereva, which passionately called for defending peace on earth. The dynamic composition and colors clearly revealed the main topic of the painting: "No to Nuclear Weapons on Earth!" and "Yes--Disarmament and Peace!" Such slogans unite today all peoples on earth. It is these ideas that imbue the works of the young Soviet painters.

By asserting life and its greatness and beauty they act against the imperialist policy of unleashing a nuclear war which could bring about the doom of all mankind and the violation of the freedom and national independence of the nations. The angry voice of the young can be heard in the paintings of S. Ovsepyan, "At a Photographic Exhibition," and N. Meshkov's "Ulster. No Trouble," V. Kalinin's "Palestine Refugees," the triptych by Yu. Rysukhin "Night Over Chile," and the graphic compositions by S. Get "Fragments of Most Modern History."

The social and spiritual progress of society and the increased complexity of the inner world of our contemporary demand of the artist the creation of philosophically profound works. This demand is an imperative of the time. The young masters raise in their works major philosophical problems: How to reach harmony between man and nature? What do contacts and reciprocal understanding among people mean? What is the essence of good and evil? What is the moral impact of the people's memory? Yet the memory of the people remembers and honors those who conquered peace for our homeland and for all of Europe. That is why the young painters deem it their civic duty to be in the leading ranks of the fighters for peace. Their firm and decisive stand is expressed in the monumental canvas by I. Lubennikov "We Demand Peace!"

Our creative youth is formulating its active life stance in a great variety of forms and genres. This is confirmed by the major social topics treated by painters, graphic artists, and sculptors, works dedicated to the work and life of our contemporaries, and their wide interest in portraits.

Particularly noticeable is the aspiration of the young to apply esthetic principles to their daily work. They are working with enthusiasm and obvious creativity on shaping the urban environment, the interiors of public and residential buildings and designing household items.

Labor is a main topic of the Soviet painters. We can clearly trace here the close ties which have developed between the masters of different generations and the particular emphases which distinguish the creative works of the young. The civic meaning of labor and its moral force are concepts which are precious and close to all artists regardless of age, nationality, individual characteristics and creative styles.

As to the young painters, sculptors and designers, I see in them a particular interest in topics such as the spirituality of labor. This is not expressed only in their frequent depiction of working people. What is important is that the young artists are trying to see and depict the spiritual principle governing the working people in all professions, whether workers, scientists or peasants. Noted examples are the canvases by V. Kharlov, K. Mullashev, A. Keskkyyula, T. Tskhoniya and Y. Kryzhevskiy and the sculptures of M. Pereyaslavets, A. Kushch, S. Kubasov and A. Fedotov.

There is nothing impersonal or vague in the best works by the young masters. In their portraits they try above all to depict the individuality of the character and through it reach what is typical and common. Their "formula" of esthetic vision is not the worker or the scientist in general but the specific person. Our tempestuous and complex period is refracted through the originality and uniqueness of the individual. Such a portrait concept yields impressive successes.

The portrait solutions of the young masters are varied. They can in no sense be put under any type of stylistic or typical "common denominator." The inner world of the characters is brought to life through difficult moral searches and lyrical enlightenment. Portrait solutions range from a sharp characterization to refinement and from a willful beginning to dreaminess. This very range is comprehensive and this too is one of its values.

The portraits created by the young clearly indicate that every person is interesting, worthy of attention and close and precious to the painter. This conclusion arises when we think of the works by sculptors A. Rukavishnikov, G. Gevorkyan and S. Kuzma, painters E. Belogurov, N. Tolpekina and A. Melder, and the graphic designers S. Kudryavtseva and A. Pakhomov. Other artists could be named as well but the task is not to provide an exhaustive list of all distinguished masters, for our objective is different--to sum up if possible the essential achievements of the art of the young.

The CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Creative Ties Between Literary-Artistic Journals and the Practice of Building Communism" (1982) emphasizes that "the new generations of Soviet people need a positive hero close to them in terms of spirit and time, who could be accepted as an artistic discovery, would influence the people's actions and would reflect the popular destiny." The creation of a positive character is today the central problem. It must

consist of our contemporary who is the bearer of the lofty ideals of the socialist society and a worthy example in shaping ideological and moral positions. In order to create such a character one must study our reality, the life of the Soviet people and the practice of building communism even more profoundly. This opens a broad field of activity, particularly to the young painters and this is the source of new creative accomplishments.

The young masters are actively seeking new ways of artistic expression and new shades in the depiction of characters. They are mastering a variety of means of expression, ranging from conventional to "documentary" and from lyrical to grotesque. Naturally, not all of them are successful.

We must always ask ourselves the positions from which the artist considers the eternal problems of life. Inevitably, the masters of the metaphor face the danger of weakening or losing their contacts with people. The creation of a coded puzzle or charade by an artist proves his isolation and alienation from life. In other cases we note a cautioning abstractness of thought, and vague nonspecific allegorical "loneliness," "sadness," and so on. Such incomprehensible hints do not help in the least to understand the complexities of the contemporary world. Conversely, they confuse and distract.

The young artists must consider the method which would best express the individuality of the contemporary characters, their spirituality and the reverence of the artist for the beauty of the real world. The firm interest shown by the young in the principles of the classical art of the past is not merely a fashion. The progressive artistic legacy bears a charge of high professional skill and deep civic-mindedness. Here again the study of today's reality helps, accomplished thoughtfully, attentively and lovingly. However, at this point the young artists should be warned that a tradition which has not been creatively reworked could turn into imitative craftsmanship.

Soviet culture is the heir of the best achievements of world culture of the past, and the contemporary young artist must be familiar with and make skillful use of the ways and means of the old masters. The entire question is how to accomplish this, for we also note manifestations of a rather superficial "museum style." We also come across the "retro" style and similar "kitchens" (the latter frequently assume the shape of pretentious exercises on "museum" topics). We must study the situation in art with extreme thoroughness and distinguish as attentively as we can between valuable findings and superficiality and various types of waste.

An entire range of problems is related to the development of "neoprimitivism." A number of painters have undertaken to study the experience of folk art, of graphic folklore. The experience of those who based their works on popular traditions, people such as N. Piroshmanashvili and Yu. Chestnyakov for example--have attracted the young. To this day the young people are sometimes carried away by conventionality, by the simplification of perspective and anatomy. Such processes have two sides. On the one side, folklore traditions teach the artist democracy and simplicity, directness and sincerity. The fruitfulness of the use of such traditions is noted in the works

of the young sculptor A. Monaselidze and the young painters N. Taktauov and I. Iltner. On the other hand, we cannot agree with those who pit folk traditions against the professional school of mastery. It is erroneous to believe that deliberate coarseness in graphics could take the place of the ability to create details and structure a form. Folk humor, folk optimism, vividness and a holiday spirit are by far not unnecessary or alien to Soviet art. However, we should not confuse decorativeness with tastelessness and love of life with the impoverishment of artistic means.

Some young artists use the so-called "photographic form" method. Some elements of a photographic "view" enable us not only to gain the impression of documentary accuracy but to realize the sharpsightedness of the artist and to depict the analytical strictness of the created phenomenon. Such valuable qualities may be noted in the works of A. Volkov, A. Petrov, M. Ombysh-Kuznetsov and R. Tammik. However, nor should we ignore some cautioning results of the dissemination of the "photographic form." In some cases the painter concentrates his particular attention on random objects or events, emphasizing the static, depressing and cold nature of his vision, which already borders naturalism. Most works in this direction prove that they are still not always able to rise to the level of a deep summation and that the symbolic solutions contained in many works remain on the level of a simple fact. So far the principle of "photographic vision" is quite limited in terms of artistic means and its thoughtless and mechanical utilization leads to the loss of plasticity. It is obvious that the language of painting demands advancement and enrichment based on new findings consistent with lofty artistic traditions.

The fact that one or another genre or stylistic trend may be controversial is entirely natural and, therefore, legitimate. This makes unquestionable our intolerance toward those who simply wish to duplicate such styles lacking their own talent and independent view on the world. Imitation clashes with the very nature of our socialist art.

Such critical remarks do not belittle in the least the achievements of the young artists. I merely wish to caution them against errors and blunders which hinder the purposeful and fruitful development of their creativity. This is particularly important today, on the eve of the Sixth Congress of USSR Painters, which will sum up the results of the development of Soviet multinational graphic art over the past 5 years and will discuss the question of the creative ties linking the artists to the practice of building communism. Together with their elder comrades, the young artists in the country are properly developing the traditions of our multinational art and are creatively interpreting our classical heritage. We see in their works with increasing frequency the aspiration to engage in the summation of current phenomena and to reflect vital problems. Those who are today entering the field of great art will tomorrow define the way of its further development. Here again the feeling of our legitimate optimism must be always backed by a feeling of tremendous responsibility shared by all Soviet artists regardless of the generation to which they belong.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

LESSONS BASED ON A HISTORICAL COMPARISON

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 76-85

[Article by Gr. Oganov]

[Text] For quite some time the West has mounted attacks on the art of socialist realism as on all spiritual life in real socialism from a great variety of positions, both from "the left" and "the right." Some of them may be also frontal, directly aimed against the basic feature in socialist realism--its historical optimism, confidence in the unquestionable accuracy of the path we have chosen and the historical justice of Lenin's cause. Even in the case of Western intellectuals who are not directly involved with the capitalist class but prefer to consider themselves "independent" progressive liberals, the integrity of our outlook, which nurtures the optimism of art, seems somehow prejudicial. They would like to see in the clarity of our view on the world and the optimistic nature of our thoughts on the fate of mankind the characteristics of a certain limitation or, at least, a weak sensitivity of art allegedly used for the utilitarian "interests of the state" and, therefore, lacking freedom, refinement and depth....

In this case, naturally, the Marxist views, postulates and concepts related to this matter become maximally distorted. Incidentally, the bourgeois scientists who oppose socialism are very pleased when they come across in our art studies individual cases and petty facts of a primitive straight-line approach to the interpretation of complex theoretical problems, a certain adaptive vulgarizing which is occasionally allowed for the best of reasons by our critics, literary experts and journalists. Such is the evil we must fight both because it gives grounds for fabrications on the part of our ideological opponents and mainly because it hinders us in appreciating adequately the extremely rich opportunities and variety of ways which socialist realism opens as a method to the artists in the esthetic mastery of developing reality.

On the other hand, flanking attacks are being mounted, which are far less noisy and lack any demagogic broad publicity or the unfurling of the banners of anticommunism and anti-Sovietism. In their "works," through secretive and confidential whispers the most "qualified" among the "Sovietologists" try to erect within our art a variety of partitions, artificially separating national literatures from the general flow of the art of socialist realism, "seeing" in one decade or another in our history almost hostile trends in the development of spiritual life and maliciously pitting traditions against

innovation and lyricism against publicism, pretending enthusiasm for some artists and deliberately ignoring others who are no less outstanding and talented, etc., etc. They also make great efforts to disturb the good relations existing between our art and the art of progressive Western painters, to "separate" socialist realism from democratic realistic trends and to depict us as narrow-thinking, allowing no variety of styles and manners, as "dogmatists of socialist realism."

Let me remark incidentally that our ideological opponents do not lose the opportunity to "encourage" some aspects in our art: they single out favorably above all works which turn out to be somewhat aside from the main stream of life, from creation and struggle, in which the range of the author's vision is limited to the fuss of daily life, thus defining the scale of moral problems.

For more than 6 decades the uninterrupted frontal attacks mounted by the bourgeois critics against our art and cultural policy have not only their own emotional coloring but their essential underlining; the scientific streamlining, purposefulness and humaneness of the communist outlook, which is having such a beneficial impact on the content and enthusiasm of Soviet socialist art, disturb the balance of our opponents.

The disharmony is so great and the optimistic qualities of socialism are so strikingly different from the universal pessimism and eclectically chaotic concepts inherent in many Western intellectuals that rejection, protest and denial of "urbi et orbi" are literally reflected in their views.

The young scientists who make a career of refuting socialism and the old men who preserve the legacy of all possible obsolete "systems" attack us with the same type of zeal. This observation which V. I. Lenin made even before the October Revolution quite accurately characterizes the "single front" of denigrators of socialism and socialist realism whom we are facing today. The fact that we see in this variegated conglomerate sincerely mistaken bourgeois philosophers, a kind of, once again to use Lenin's apt definition, "philosophical 'stupid'" and professional anticommunists--"Sovietologists"--and dissident renegades who have become inveterate in their views--is immaterial. Far more essential is the logic of such "pluralism." When supporting the wrong cause one always risks finding oneself in improper company and if some Western intellectuals suddenly find themselves on the same side as the criminal Bukovskiy or the writing bandits working for Springer's BILDZEITUNG, they should blame no one but themselves. Nothing unites people more than shared sin. Although it would not harm them to consider the deep meaning of such a "coincidence" or shameful "mixing."

Had they been able to make such an effort--not only "mental" but moral as well--they would have realized the deep obscurantist swamp in which they are sinking through their attempts to reject our culture, civilization and art on a "purely political" basis. They are rejecting without bothering to understand--impartially if possible--the most complex problems of a sociophilosophical order which are being resolved by socialist realism and to realize the extent to which the esthetic thinking of the new world is profound,

antidogmatic, responsible and humane. In addition to its party-mindedness and nationality--characteristics which today the Western intellectuals avoid like the devil runs away from incense, such thinking has most important qualities of historicism and a most attentive study of life in all its interrelationships, changes, transformations, contradictions and trends.

This alone enables us to speak of a rapprochement (naturally, not in terms of technology but of the extent of accuracy, social and artistic justice of results) between art and science. Incidentally, it is precisely on this matter that heated arguments have broken out. In the age of the atom and electronics art cannot remain as it was in the past, our opponents proclaim, using this generally unquestionable thesis as "proof" of the legitimacy of all oddities of modernism or apocalyptic visions. Although we are constantly being told that vanguard futurism and modernistic skepticism correspond by far more sensitively and timely to the "age of the scientific and technical revolution," we believe that the optimistic nature of socialist realism and its cognitive power still remain closer to the truth of scientific knowledge. In a word, turning essentially to the events of real history, and to the live, bubbling and multicolored reality, step by step our art masters it without feeling the need for any negative creation of myths. It does not need the mystique of rock which breaks its links with time. It has not lost faith in the power of the mind.

As early as the mid-1800s, Flaubert expressed in one of his letters a curious and at that time rather meaningless conclusion based on his observations on the course of contemporary developments. He wrote that "the more we advance the more art becomes more scientific and science becomes more artistic; although distant at the start, at one point they will meet at the summit."

Could the "magician of style" so perspicaciously predict in that very distant time, when the topic, today beautifully formulated as the "direct and indirect influence of the scientific and technical revolution on the content and language of contemporary art," and the influence of art on science, become the subject of so many articles, monographs and symposia? Actually, if the gift of prophesy had helped him guess the simplistic errors and clever speculations which developed in the 1960s and 1970s through the attempts to interpret "easily and happily" all the distortions and deformations of reality which were made at that time and all betrayals of the art of modern times by man and mankind through some kind of magic influence of the scientific and technical revolution, Flaubert would have most likely deleted with a shudder this kind of casually expressed brilliant statement.

And yet, he was right!

At all times, in one way or another, art has been related to social life, including the dynamics of human thought aspiring to knowledge. It has always helped to develop productive imagination, which is so greatly necessary in science and in all other areas of cognitive human activity. We owe to art not only sincere and most reliable confirmations of the different ages in the characters of contemporaries and paintings of their way of life and mores

but, if we speak of major artists, the possibility of gaining a profound, an integral idea of the socioeconomic nature of specific society, far more vividly and meaningfully than we find in other types of special studies and scientific treatises. Friedrich Engels was the first to make such a clear statement in referring to Balzac's genius.

This applies to all times. How greatly have we learned from the earliest discovered hieroglyphs and animal paintings on stone? Let us not burden ourselves with academic arguments as to how reliable it is to assume the accuracy of the realistic drawings of the primitive artists in which the "lovers of fine arts" see nothing other than primitive symbols-hieroglyphs. Yet it was reality itself which powerfully dictated to them the unembellished truth of their subjects and the strict brevity of forms, which encompass the philosophical (and totally practical) essence of the eternally conflicting, dramatic, tragic and beautiful human existence. Actually, at that time man did not have a more convincing way of describing to those around him, not to mention the future generations, the truth of his life. The artists of prehistoric times may perhaps instinctively, subconsciously, have developed the esthetic meaningful saga "of their time and themselves." They admired beauty or that which they felt was beautiful in the activities of their tribe. They answered the natural need to recreate themselves in the world which surrounded them, for, as Marx said, "it is precisely in reworking the material world that for the first time man truly asserts himself as a tribal being.... Man duplicates himself at this point not only intellectually, as takes place in the mind, but really, actively, contemplating himself in the world he has created" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 42, p 94).

Yes, such has always been the case. To the extent to which mankind progressed on and on through timelessness and with short respite in its historical advance, this was confirmed with increasing convincingness. Furthermore, reality, as reflected and reworked through the minds and feelings of the great artists--the truly progressive people of their time--helped to see the aspect of the inevitable future. This gift is one of the most valuable characteristics of esthetic thinking, which is occasionally independent of subjective intentions. That is precisely what Lenin wrote about in describing Tolstoy's creative power "who with tremendous strength, confidence and sincerity raised a number of questions pertaining to the basic features related to the political and social system of his time" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 20, p 38), and became "the mirror of the Russian Revolution," although his preaching of moral perfection of man and mankind rested on a purely utopian base.

It is senseless to formulate claims toward the artists of the past and the present, working in the capitalist West, regarding the inconsistency of their outlook and to expect that after proper criticism it would be possible, as representatives of "obsolete" cultures, either to be "pushed aside" or else, after they have loudly repented for their sins, master immediately and completely progressive scientific views and enter the fold of socialist realism. Lenin frequently mocked such pious intentions of "immediately getting rid of the stupid legacy" (op. cit., vol 36, p 181). Actually, the outlook is precisely a product of the social and spiritual development of man who is

not born perfect, who does not come out of the sea like Aphrodite. Artists should be accepted as they are, with a thorough study of the variety of complex ties linking their works with life and their time and feelings of the age, bringing up all their strong and weak sides. Strangely enough, the classical example of the profound and dialectically penetrating Leninist analysis of Tolstoy's work is somehow "forgotten" by some of our art experts when they discuss contemporary art and contemporary artists.

This is worth mentioning, for once in a while we come across a regrettable one-sidedness of assessments, quite underproductive from the viewpoint of determining the truth. In order to illustrate this situation, which in my mind is a kind of throwback to obsolete vulgar-sociological or normative-formal views on the nature, content and results of a work, which developed at the beginning of the 1920s and, alas, still have not been entirely eliminated, I would like to refer to the differences in the interpretation of the creative experience of Pablo Picasso, which has always paralleled attempts to interpret his works and which was revived on the occasion of the recently celebrated centennial of the birth of the great artist (as well as, actually, the already criticized statements of some Soviet and foreign critics, literary experts, philosophers and writers on the occasion of Dostoyevskiy's anniversary dates).

Picasso's creative path is complex and conflicting. It lasted more than 7 decades and encompassed within it all the concerns of the century, reflecting all unbalances of esthetic development, and has no analogue. By virtue of this fact such contradictoriness does not lend itself in the least to simple evaluations. As is usually the case under such circumstances, again and again views are expressed which are so extreme that they no longer merely become mutually exclusive but simply begin to contradict common sense and do not contribute to the clarification of the truth in the least. Some, admiring the energy, fruitfulness and variety of Picasso's works, pointing out his political views which never changed (this may seem the only thing which never changed in Picasso) and his affiliation with the French Communist Party, are ready to proclaim this artist as being the infallible genius of all times and nations, failing to see in his works either contradictions or experiment failures. Others depict Picasso as some kind of treacherous offspring of a modernistic hell, assuming from time to time more or less realistic features for the sake of concealing his almost necrophiliac attachment to the breakdown of form and the denigration of art. Subsequently, having confused, tempted and doomed realists holding a strong brush but for some reason weak in spirit, he makes them doubt the beneficial need to depict life in the forms of life itself and, like a stupefied drug addict, link themselves to accursed abstractionism or to some sort of ultrafashionable nonsense.

Today such polemical extremes may appear ridiculous. What is sad, however, is that such a significant and comprehensive phenomenon as Picasso's works, an art which is extremely interesting by the fact alone that its close and thoughtful study could offer the students a most detailed view of the dynamics of esthetic thinking, the struggle of directions, searches, losses, dead ends and discoveries, occasionally turns out to be merely a pretext for exorcisms. Needless to say, such "arguments" take place most frequently

within the narrow limits of an enclosed intraesthetic space and--worse--unrelated to the tempests and cataclysms which the world has experienced throughout the 20th century and which could not fail to influence most powerfully the outlook of the artist or his spiritual and esthetic searches. The blowing of such storms which affected the works of the truly great and honest artists in the capitalist West has helped them to define their political sympathies and artistic positions and to feel the concerns and hopes of the people. This, as we have frequently witnessed, becomes a live source for the creation of progressive and democratic works of art. Unfortunately, its influence is not always positive or constructive. It could also create destructive works and spread faithlessness and confusion, forcing the artist to escape, to desert the artistic front.

That is why in the same way that a philosopher must have the gift of poetry, as Hegel himself, without which he could turn into a moss-covered pedant, the esthetic expert, the person who studies the world of art, must be able to see, be familiar with, and understand the great philosophical meaning of occurring historical changes and their impact on the creative potential of our contemporaries and on the nature of the very perception of art. Here everything is in motion. We have an entire history of examples of striking changes in tastes, preferences and criteria of beauty! Had this not been the case, had such changes not taken place, to this day, as 150 years ago, Benediktov would have been a far more popular poet than Pushkin and Bizet's splendid "Carmen," which was booed by his contemporaries, would have been firmly forgotten and no sober atheist would have even conceived of restoring the brilliant frescoes of Rublev and Dionisiy in Moscow and Vladimir churches. We would have been far poorer and more primitive.

Fortunately, this assumption is inconceivable. Without breaking the continuity of time and not by the whim of fate but by virtue of a historical law art is in a constant state of dynamics. This same historical law determines the esthetic ideal of each society and specific socioeconomic and political novelty of the period. The need to express this ideal lead to a specific choice of artistic ways and means which, if sufficiently durable, represent in their totality the base for the development of more or less clear ideas as to the directions and styles consistent with entirely defined artistic tasks. In turn, as realized by the artist, these tasks are related to the problems of time, the problems which excite their contemporaries. That is why changes, developments and shifts of styles and the appearance of new directions are legitimate phenomena which mark the dynamics of life. That is precisely why the canonizing of one style or another and the attempt to interpret it as tradition and to absolutize its role turn style into dogma, make art stylized and, in the final account, lead to decline and degeneracy.

This also applies to more general concepts of art, including the artistic method. Each one of these methods, born under specific historical circumstances, has experienced changes in its development. We see also the method of socialist realism as a process of steady development, enrichment and advancement, a proof that the creativity of our acknowledged masters, who are able to have their say in art, are seeking new means of expression to represent eternally changing reality.

For it is precisely the content of popular life and the progress of society and the powerful currents of global development that determine the novelty of interests in our socialist art and the daring breakthrough of the searching mind of the artist within the thick of most complex processes of material and spiritual life and phenomena of the new world, looking for a character involved with everything occurring on earth and a corresponding persistent search and the testing of new forms. If art wants to develop and remain realistic, such forms are as needed as bread and the air we breathe. Without them we cannot express, we cannot depict the new content and the new reality in the same way that we cannot understand it without a profound social analysis. At the same time, we must clearly bear in mind that the new forms and styles do not exist by themselves in some kind of "secret" space. They cannot be "borrowed." They can be the result only of the interpretation of reality and the awareness of the need to express it adequately.

The progress of these truths was not simple, for the ways of development of art in the 20th century is complex and twisting, not only somewhere beyond the seas and the mountains but in our country as well, where a great variety of sometimes diametrically opposite, naive and militant views and currents clashed in a stubborn search for means of expression consistent with the new life. The picture was further complicated by the crisis phenomena in the culture of the bourgeois West, not always properly understood by our artists. We are familiar with artists--both in our country and abroad--whose creative style and attachments developed under the influence of these phenomena. By far not all of them were able to withstand or to have their say. We know the way the pale helplessness of decadence at the turn of the century captured many talents and destroyed them; we know about the noisy futurists who rushed "ahead of the century," proclaiming themselves the spokesmen for the future, failing to note how hopelessly behind they were; we are familiar with the decadents who had lost faith not only in mankind but in themselves: extreme pessimism, death, and silence became directly and figuratively the logical completion of their earthly and creative careers. We are also familiar with the cheerful lyricists who, as Mayakovskiy used to say, kept playing tear-jerkers on their mandolins even during the days of the universal flood.

In the West it was Picasso who was in the epicenter of these esthetic upheavals and unparalleled dissonance. He went through everything: idyllic carelessness, the upheaval of the greatest sadness, love and hatred alternating in his heart. Like another great Pablo--Pablo Neruda--he could say that "agonizing capitalism is filling the cup of creativity with a bitter drink. We drank this drink which contained all sorts of poisons." He was familiar with the most cruel, the most disgusting evil. He was also familiar with the immeasurable beauty and courage of man.

In 1937 Picasso created a painting which was destined to become the greatest painting of the century. Like his "Dove," which had flown over the entire earth, as we know, it was "Guernica," the lightning answer of the artist to the terrible news of the destruction of the ancient sacred Basque city in northern Spain, barbarically destroyed by the carrion-crows of Hitler's Kondor legion. People and animals throw themselves around on the canvas in cold and evil outbreaks; pieces of bodies and parts of objects, masked faces

distorted by inhuman pain, convulsive movements of figures, the cry of a mother holding the inanimate body of a dead child--the tragic artistic image of crucified and tortured Guernica strikes the mind. The very structure of the painting, the disorderliness of the forms, its monochromatic nature with a vague steely coloring make a strong, ineradicable and very odd impression. The painting does not call for mercy although it is as though the heart is ready to break from the shouts of pain and the horror depicted on the canvas. The even stronger impact of the painting is one of hatred. The disgusting and inhuman aspect of evil is depicted with incredible power. It is an evil which cannot be understood or forgiven.

"Guernica" enraged the fascists and forced into silence the art opponents of the painter. It was created by a rebellious painter and did not fit the procrustean bed of established academic styles. Nor did it fit the modernistic "isms" in order to canonize it in the realm of the abstract or any of the latest fashionable trends. It confused refined esthetes who were shocked by its passionate toxin, for this did not meet the "pure art of the form." In a word, no one could describe "Guernica" as a painting comparable to anything ever created before that. Its meaning, however, its angry flaming challenge, were understood by all.

Here is a most interesting testimony by Pavel Korin, people's painter of the USSR: "I disagree with Picasso about many things and would reject many of his things. However, here is something unexpected: As I was visiting the museum, I wanted to develop a negative impression from the works of this painter and came to 'Guernica.' When I saw this huge canvas, the splendid tonality and the willful and energetic details, I was captivated. I had come to 'Guernica' with a feeling of doubt, but unexpectedly the painting made a tremendous impact on me. I looked at it as a professional painter and having seen it I changed my view toward Picasso. I considered him a great master. I felt that he was a feeling, a rebellious and rebelling man. I felt how much pain and thought he invested in his art."

Yes, Picasso's "Guernica," however much the orthodox classical art scientists may be pursing their lips (those who consider Aristotle's "mimesis" an inviolable canon, the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end of all esthetics), is a far more realistic work than many fully traditional, "tranquil" and "normal" paintings by other artists who were working during that same restless age as Picasso's, but who did not feel within themselves the concerns and indignations, who did not feel the fact that the barbaric destruction of Guernica was the dress rehearsal for future "desert zones." To show a beautiful, totally undisturbed harmony or careless enjoyment of life, and to create idyllic pastorales during the terrifying time when fascism had begun to create its own bloody evil meant the total rejection of all reality, failure to see the rolling flames and to hear the moaning of dying victims. What kind of realism is this! It is a typical modernistic avoidance of life with the help of heavenly celebrations which please the eyes with their very natural illusions. Such are the malicious jokes which the inability to understand existing change and to respond to it may play on the "convinced traditionalists."

Such is the merciless dialectics of progress: one cannot plunge twice (and even less so a third, a fifth, a 20th time) into the same water of the fast river of life. Under different conditions and different historical circumstances, what is great and brilliant, borrowed and "duplicated" loses its entire initial qualities and risks looking like a distortion, a mockery, a sacrilege. For it is not consistent with these new conditions, it was not created by them, it is not the direct, live pulsating response to these specific circumstances and burning problems of our time.

Furthermore, such a "sacred" following of models, such an apologetic imitation and "repetition of the past" and such progress in a closed circle lead their participants into the swamp of uninspired repetitiveness, to the borders of decadence. Some of them take the path of academic pettiness. Others plunge into strange nostalgic visions which idealize something which has long disappeared, obsolete and surmounted. Actually, both rarely understand their true position, while our critics remain still rather timid in telling the honest truth. Although it may seem to them that they are properly advancing toward triumph, stepping on the smooth traditional road, and that it is precisely they who are the true spokesmen for the popular spirit, which they conceive as having no class or historical content (incidentally, strangely such "traditionalists" unanimously avoid the most essential feature in the traditions of Russian art--its idea-mindedness, social activeness and high civic-mindedness), in fact both rush away from live, rich and conflicting reality. They do not answer questions. They change the truth and thus the traditions themselves. Meanwhile, the real dramas of the century either become unrecognizably emasculated, as they acquire the features of a low farce, or else are entirely ignored.

At this point, usually the opponents of this idea formulate the seemingly unanswerable concept of the role of love of life and optimism which, they claim, should never disappear. We would like to tell them the following: speak of love of life with the mothers who lost their children in Guernica (in Lidice, Khatyn, Soweto, Song My or Beirut...), and contrast your well-developed optimism with the stern resolve of the people of Leningrad who were dying in the blockade without surrendering the city to the hated enemy. The heroes know as well as you do the meaning of optimism and how to experience it. As for us, the contemporaries of the great construction and the great war, we are familiar with the deep sorrow and the great passion of optimistic tragedies.

Let us point out that these lofty feelings and the collisions which created them were not speculatively structured or "invented," but were taken from life, from the historical current of time and were resmelted in a new esthetically interpreted entity and tremendously impressively expressed in outstanding works of which the spiritual culture of socialism can be justifiably proud.

The ocean of this article is infinite. As we note some points along its lengthy shores, let us note individual landmarks ranging from Sholokhov's "And Quiet Flows the Don" to Leonov's "Golden Carriage," from A. Tolstoy's historical trilogy to the chronicle research of M. Shaginyan, from

Mayakovskiy's immortal poems to Tvardovskiy's "Vasiliy Terkin," from Isayev's "Judgment of the Memory" to Martsinkyavichyus' "The Wall" and Fadeyev's "The Defeat" to the stories of Bykov and the novels of Aytmatov.... Each one of them has its own way, style, vision of the world and bias. The most important among them--something we must not forget--have become true revolutionary forms, such as Blok's "The Twelve," the "Black Sun" at the end of Sholokhov epic, and the lightning zigzags of Mayakovskiy's inspired lines, which are the initial confirmations of these forms. And this is just in literature. What about music, in which our Prokofiev and Shostakovich have become acknowledged world leaders; what about the theater, with its great reformers such as Stanislavskiy, Meyyerkhol'd, Vakhtangov and Tovstonogov, and the Georgian theater which impressed the English with the true Shakespearean power of its works; what about the cinematography which gave us "The Battleship Potemkin," "Chapayev" and "Ballad of a Soldier," the canvases of Petrov-Vodkin and the futuristic birds sculpted by Vera Mukhina....

Memory persistently drags me back to the middle of the century and even farther, to the 20th anniversary of the October Revolution. It coincided with the world exhibit in Paris and the decision was made to participate in it and to build on the banks of the Seine a Soviet pavilion. B. M. Iofan, the great Soviet architect, was its creator. According to his idea, the pavilion was to be crowned by a sculptured group--a worker and a woman kolkhoz member. The contest, participated in by outstanding sculptors such as Ivan Shadr, Vyacheslav Andreyev and Matvey Manizer, was won by Vera Ignat'yevna Mukhina. In this contest she proved to be the unquestionable leader, having understood best of all the intent and having resolved with a splendid feeling of harmony and dynamic unity the most complex problem of combining architectural forms with sculpture which did not in the least turn into the "completion" of the building and, naturally, not its decoration but a powerful manifestation of the main idea.

When everything was finished, "Worker and Woman Kolkhoz Member" won over the Parisians. Something new and unusual entered the life of Paris in its refined symbolism. We saw in the photographs which were sent throughout the world Mukhina's sculpture striving toward the Parisian sky, while in the distance stood the famous Eiffel Tower. Strange though it might seem, "Worker and Woman Kolkhoz Member," which represented a different world and a different perception and philosophy of the world, proved to be not something alien but here, on the banks of the Seine, began to live a rich and very interesting life. Families and groups of workers came to look at the sculpture. "Worker and Woman Kolkhoz Member" was welcomed as an honored ambassador of the state of the working people. Impassionate publicistic articles and enthusiastic artistic essays were dedicated to the sculpture which was compared with the antique masterpieces and the Victory of Samothrace.

It was a triumph. "On the banks of the Seine," Romain Rolland said, "were two young Soviet giants in an unrestrained thrust rising their hammer and sickle and we could hear them sing the heroic anthem which calls the nations to freedom and unity and which will lead them to victory."

Rarely, very rarely even a most brilliant artist can express the nature of his age so precisely, profoundly and inspiredly. Our century has had no more than a few such works, regardless of the genre! Two of them appeared in 1937 and both became famous throughout the world at the world exhibit in Paris: "Mukhina's 'Worker and Woman Kolkhoz Member' and Picasso's 'Guernica' which was exhibited in the pavilion of republican Spain. This was a great instant in the history of world art, an instant which will mark the century with two brilliant works, two most eloquent symbols of the age. Nothing seemed to be so different from each other, so diametrically opposite in terms of the choice of means of expression, artistic style, and esthetic principles on which the works were based. However, these items, different like day is from night; this sculpture and this painting-fresco, showed to mankind the dramatic truth of the great confrontation between the two worlds, two ideologies and two extremes of the 20th century. On the one hand, the heroic enthusiasm asserting the greatness of man; on the other, the "splash of death," the man-hating evil of the mongrels of the capitalist world who had proclaimed themselves "supermen."

Naturally, they lived and "worked," acting and by themselves enthusiastically leading us into the bright and healthy world, the world of creation and dreams: the sculpture of Vera Mukhina and the tragic, striking and searing Picasso canvas in which the strange deformations enabled us convincingly and almost physically to feel the entire savagery, the entire nightmarish absurdity of the very idea of murder, of mass destruction of people. Put together, however, compared, they triggered a current of the highest historical tension and assumed a prophetic meaning: these were the forces which only a few years later were going to engage in a mortal clash and was it not clear that the winner would not be the Teutonic horned monster, cursed by this fiery Spaniard, or the beautiful and strong people, the worker and the woman kolkhoz member, who had replaced the hammer and sickle for the sacred punishing sword and who had become the immortal soldier and the legendary partisan.

Never before had artists had the opportunity to create works of such great significance to mankind, works of such a highly imagistic, philosophically merging and with such a topical strict political meaning. They shake up the imagination, they excite us with the scale of the problems they raise, with their daring treatment of the eternal secret of the struggle between good and evil, presented not through abstract conflicting formulae or symbolic figures of mythical heroes but embodied in characters the reality of which could be confirmed by history itself.

In comparing these two unique works we must also not forget that each one of them is not simply a "composition," although brilliant, "on a given topic," but something born of an absolutely historically determined necessity and existing in a specific sociohistorical circumstance sincerely, directly and convincingly expressed by the artist-citizen. They are inseparable from their age, from the fate of millions of people and, by virtue of the same reasons, they belong to eternity. This is the destiny of the works themselves, a destiny which is alive and exciting and to which we are quite partial.¹

Following the world exhibition in Paris, Mukhina could say proudly, like Mayakovskiy, that through her art she had expressed something important "through the centuries of history and the world." She worked during a period which Gor'kiy described in lofty and inspired words: "We want to create a new mankind and have already begun to create it." Enthusiasm, dreams and mass heroism blended in the working lives of millions, in the creativeness, humanistic in nature and objectives, which had spread throughout the country.

Such was the atmosphere in which the perception of the world of Vera Mukhina --the person and the artist--developed. Her fate was happy: there was no separation from the world, society or the age. There are no rich and whimsical patrons of the arts, nor is there any need for the same. There is no handful of "elite" to whom one must dedicate one's work, when one would like to talk to the masses loudly and hope for understanding and response. The loftiness and the ideal are clearly seen in the mind's eye. They are not something "extraterrestrial," something of a dream and the imagination, something built by the imagination, but the reality of trends, the reality born of life:

"A fevered lip of paroxysm and of masters, caused by a river known as 'fact.'"

The capturing of this reality and its artistic interpretation and proper representation in characters which excite the imagination, which are vivid and memorable, is by far no simple matter. This requires a great deal of talent and a heroic structure of the mind which is the only one capable of providing an esthetic interpretation of the new reality. Socialist realism is the name given to such art.

Pablo Picasso's sharp and sensitive eyes saw entirely different features of the world. The obvious contradiction within bourgeois society, manifested above all in the stupid and inhuman world order which had "legitimized" the cruel exploitation, repression and the poverty of some and the fabulous profits, unlimited power and fantastic luxury of others were there. There were blood, pain and the senseless slaughter of the first imperialist war, the economic catastrophe which followed it, unemployment and millions of people going hungry in wounded Europe. There was spiritual devastation, the absence of a future, the breakdown of human relations, everywhere fear and terror of imperialist reaction and fascism which threatened mankind with physical and spiritual slavery. What could counter this nightmare, this terrifying mystery of suppression and murder in the mind of the European intellectual? Was it the hope of an alliance among all progressive forces headed by the working class? Was it faith in progress, in the future triumph of justice? Yes, naturally. However, the republic of Spain, with the connivance of the Western "democracies," was surrendered to be tortured by fascism. The Popular Front in France was betrayed by the social democrats, while in Germany Nazi terror was raging and the flower of the working class was in concentration camps.... Capitalist reality itself swept off on a daily and hourly basis the dreams and hopes of the people, showing the base yet powerful facets of the opposite to the masses.

Nevertheless, during those alarming times there was a powerful radiation of optimism, confidence and hope. It came from the Soviet Union, the first socialist country. The very fact of the existence of the new society which had rejected the path of private ownership and exploitation, which had enhanced the working man and which was implementing the most daring plans and intentions meant a great deal in terms of the fate of civilization. It was in our direction that everything that was best and progressive in world culture gravitated in our direction. There came to us Romain Rolland, Martin Andersen-Nexø, Henri Barbusse, Bernard Shaw, René Clair and Diego Rivera, not out of tourist curiosity but to draw from our reality spiritual strength and faith in man, and who knows what the spiritual aspect of Western Europe and the rest of the world at large would have been had the humanistic idea of the fraternity and solidarity among all honest people on earth not blocked the path of skillfully cultivated pessimism and the vision of the coming apocalypse, which paralyzed the will and the mind.

However, we shall not forget that during those prewar times to the millions of people in the West the USSR was something distant. Information about it was scarce or totally distorted: even then bourgeois propaganda frightened the people with fabrications regarding the "horrors of bolshevism" and the "Russian bear," so that today's slanderous propaganda escapades of Washington's administration may boast of a long history. Their purpose has always been the same--to conceal the truth.

One way or another, art during that period in the West was characterized by a search, troubled and spasmodic. The breakdown of habitual concepts and rejection of trodden paths, although seemingly blasphemous, was obvious. It was unclear what had to replace them. It was unclear how to express that period, that lack of period, how to reach the "new" art, how to reach the human heart. The time of the thaw was a time of all kinds of formalistic methods, including the open absurdity, the total loss of any tie with reality and with feelings, a time during which many artists went into mysticism, into meaningless yet "significant" creation of forms. It was precisely in that atmosphere, further artificially enhanced by degenerate bourgeois "ideologues" and clever merchants in the field of art, who pursued their selfish objectives, that there appeared exhibits at which the visitor could see as works of art a factory-produced porcelain urinal (on this specific occasion the role of the artist-"author" was to find a suitable name. This "exhibit" of his was named "Fountain" by Marcel Duchamp, who immediately was elevated to the rank of the masters of "vanguard" art), or the naturalistic depiction of a can containing tomato soup, repeated a number of times ("authored" by Andy Warhol, another famous personality).

One should not think that these "artistic" sallies were merely isolated manifestations of scandalous events. Alas, they were immediately given a "firm" critical and philosophical substantiation and, despite all logic, proclaimed masterpieces which marked the opening of some kind of new horizon in contemporary art. The basis for such conclusions on the occasion, let us say, of that same can of soup, was the basic rejection on the part of bourgeois esthetics to grant art a social-esthetic and humanistic function and ties with life, as well as its mission to engage in the objective and

truthful reflection of reality. The roots of this philosophical-esthetic position should be sought in the specific features of the sociopolitical order: the bourgeoisie, contemporary capitalism fears the knowledge of the truth by the masses. It particularly hates the ability which Chernyshevskiy himself noted, of art not only to reproduce and interpret reality but to pass a sentence on the phenomena of life.

It was precisely modernism, including its latest variety, passing for realism, in the nature of the new representation of physical objects, super-realism and photographic realism, that had the purpose of "distracting" the artist from this humanistic task. This precisely is the main dramatic clash within contemporary Western art.

What happens to the artist in this case? The old Marxist truth is confirmed, according to which the contradiction between his internal world and dominating social relations create in the artist a crisis, a drama, a split of the mind. Nevertheless, rallying all his spiritual and creative forces, he can carry out his duty without avoiding responsibility. He can, as Lenin proved, express the most essential features of this tragedy of life and cruel and base world structure. In order to achieve this he must reject modernism.

Such was the difficult mission which Picasso undertook.

The encounter between Picasso and Mukhina and the historical comparison between these two brilliant works, which entered the spiritual life of a world shaken up by cataclysms, on the same day and hour, were encounters, contacts and interactions between two branches of contemporary progressive art--socialist realism, which stood firmly on the strong foundations of the tradition of realism, steadily developing and encompassing within it everything which was most valuable and vital in world culture and, therefore, the most promising direction, and the new critical realism, a direction which could not fail to appear under the circumstances of 20th century capitalist reality and which, having appeared, gave mankind, despite the extremely adverse development conditions, great artistic values, particularly in literature. It is true that this direction experienced the strong influence of the decadent esthetics of modernism and even of its extreme manifestations, which left an imprint on many works and creative destinies. Furthermore, many honest artists inclined toward realism yielded, at one stage or another in their work, to modernistic temptations and occasionally their works show the clear disparities between intention and elected means of expression which, unquestionably, reduce the ideological-esthetic value of the work and its intended concept.

However, in precisely the same way that the nature of the contemporary epoch cannot be reduced merely to a crisis of capitalism, the condition of art in the world does not merely express a modernistic rejection of form content and breakdown. The process of revolutionary reorganization of the world, the acquisition of new horizons of life and new development prospects is the main, the determining line in the range of contemporary life. It not only fructifies the creativity of the masters of socialist art but is also a great

optimistic alternative which gives hope and strength to all honest-thinking people, including Western artists, helping them to surmount the decadence and sterility of vanguard esthetics.

The complexity of the real situation in contemporary art raises a number of urgent requirements facing Marxist criticism. In facing the contradictory picture of Western artistic life and studying the variety of philosophical and esthetic tendencies of individual artists, we must, as Plekhanov said, not cry or laugh but understand. Least of all should we hastily classify one person or another as a modernist. The task is not, yielding to the superficial impression, to provide an immediate and decisive simple assessment: this is progressive while that is reactionary. In the field of the graphic arts in particular, it is not very productive to judge of the nature of a work only according to formal characteristics (such as style, lifelike forms, truthfulness of details, and so on), ignoring most essential qualities such as the attitude of the artist toward specific social realities and the extent to which he has reached the depth of life as expressed in his work.

Unfortunately, it is precisely this that frequently happens in practice, even on the level of art expertise, and many works which are meaningless or quite distant from true contemporaneity and the thoughts, feelings and concerns of real people, are considered realistic only because of a single visible circumstance--the lifelike quality of the topic. This is the reason also for many erroneous assessments and sources of judgment limitations and all kinds of pseudotheoretical regulations which are so typical of vulgar-sociological concepts regarding the interconnections and interrelationships between art and reality.

Realism, including its most active and legitimate heir--socialist realism--does not require in the least as a creative method some kind of stylistic monotony. It is not limited by some kind of record of phenomena in life which must be selected by the artists. It has never considered art merely a form of knowledge but has seen in it an esthetic cognitive unity.² It has never demanded the imitation of nature or reality, or any "illusionism." Such concepts do nothing but slander our art, something zealously promoted by the foes of socialism. We can even say that such demands which are ascribed to us of duplication and imitation have precisely been embodied in the latest "vanguard" art currents such as, for example, photographic realism, and the naturalistic, dead reproduction of the external appearance of objects. Like any false phenomenon, it is very typical of modernism to ascribe its own sins to someone else.

There is an infinite distance separating all of this from the practice of the art of socialist realism, the comprehensive development of which has always been a most important structural component of the cultural policy of the party of the working class, of Lenin's party. As Lunacharskiy wrote, being a knowledgeable class, knowledgeable in terms of truthfulness, the working class is interested in the maximally accurate, in the proper interpretation of the realities, laws and contradictions of development, and its trends and prospects. In the final account, it is this that determines the grounds, the strict objectivity and depth of the artistic mastery of reality in the art of

socialist realism, including areas which previously remained untouched by art, and its ability extensively to broaden the range of the thoughts, feelings and responsibilities of the character. The ability inherent in the art of socialist realism to see in the phenomena of the present not only that which our contemporaries can note and not only the results of previous developments but the future as well, is the outstanding characteristic of its historical nature--a feature which is purely absent in modernism. Finally, the entirely real possibility arises of saying, as the philosophers say, the magic word which creates the character of the future. The unquestionable link between this future and real socialism and the building of communism is precisely what irks our ideological opponents.

As to truly progressive art, it has always been "mobilized and called upon." It has always fought for man. It fought on the barricades in Madrid and Picasso can be proud of the fact that the republican fighters went to battle with reproductions of "Guernica" carried under their shirts, the way the Soviet heroic soldiers carried the great book by Nikolay Ostrovskiy. The battle was waged on the screens of European workers clubs with the films "The Battleship Potemkin," and "Chapayev." The battle was waged with the murals by Siqueiros, which scoundrels paid by the reaction tried to whitewash. The battle was waged with the immortal reports written by Fucik and the courageous poetry by Hikmet. The battle was waged with Shostakovich's Seventh Symphony, which was heard the world over from blockaded Leningrad. The battle was waged with the songs of Paul Robeson and Victor Hara. Regardless of what the saying is, the muses do not remain silent even when the guns speak. However, nor do they stuff their ears with cotton in order to avoid the thunder of battle to turn into something good and careless pastoral games or disturb harmony with the moaning of the wounded and the clanging of metal.

The muses in our time must be much more courageous and severe. They must not be disarmed by nostalgic visions of a former stability of life obedient to the old patriarchal antiquity or by falsely sweetened appeals to universal goodness and touching good will; nor should they be frightened into a state of helplessness by apocalyptic premonitions or impudent demonstrations of power boasting of its readiness to commit any kind of evil.

No, the world of art, even in the most peaceful days, is not an area of flower gardens or a spaceless area for abstractionistic exercises. It is rather a battlefield. Art is a weapon. It is a blade honed on the touchstone of time. The great people in this world were well aware of this. They fought to the extent of their forces and talent. They fought alone, mocked by their enemies, confused by the intrigues of the jealous, surrounded, like with a wall, by the lack of understanding of doctrinarians. They fought refuting the ancient wisdom that "a single person in the field is not a soldier." He is! And potentially always, he is not alone.

FOOTNOTES

1. We are familiar with the dramatic history of the exile, the long years of forced "emigration" and, finally, the recent return of "Guernica" to its homeland, Spain. It resembles the fate of a fighter who kept his head unbowed. Let us hope that no repetition will occur of the action at the Museum of Modern Art in New York in which someone who was either half-insane or a surviving fascist threw paint at the canvas. The restoration of "Guernica" took a great deal of effort.

"Worker and Woman-Kolkhoz Member" was taken to Moscow many years ago -- immediately after Paris. During the Great Patriotic War it was protected from fascist bombs. However, it has other enemies -- oxidation and corrosion. A great deal has been done to protect the metal on the sculpture but much more remained to be accomplished and its location and the height of the pedestal.

2. See A. Yegorov. "Problemy estetiki" [Problems of Esthetics]; A. Zis'. "Iskusstvo i Estetika" [Art and Esthetics]; B. Suchkov. "Istoricheskiye Sud'by Realizma" [The Historical Destinies of Realism]; M. Khrapchenko. "Tvorcheskaya Individual'nost' Pisatelya i Razvitiye Literaturnoy" [Creative Individuality of the Writer and the Development of Literature].

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

MARXIST PHILOSOPHICAL LEGACY AND ITS DISTORTERS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 86-96

[Article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences S. Oduyev]

[Text] The clash in the world arena of two irreconcilable (not only in terms of class but gnosiology) ideologies--Marxist-Leninist and bourgeois--is acquiring an unparalleled gravity and scale, covering all realms of social and spiritual life. This is explained, in particular, by two factors which define the ideological atmosphere of our time: the extensive dissemination of Marxism-Leninism and the growth of its intellectual and moral influence in the contemporary world, on the one hand, and the crisis in bourgeois ideology and awareness, on the other.

"The bourgeois theories and scientific schools," the CPSU program stipulates, "failed to pass the test of history.... An increasing number of people in the capitalist countries are breaking away from the bourgeois outlook. Bourgeois ideology is in a state of profound crisis." The CPSU Central Committee accountability report to the 26th party congress offers a comprehensive Marxist-Leninist analysis of this process of permanent degradation of the spiritual values of capitalism and the breakdown of the bourgeois outlook.

Nor is it a secret that the bourgeois ideologues and politicians occasionally admit themselves that "the West is experiencing a vacuum of great ideas," the crisis of the "Western spirit" is assuming a global nature and the entire system of spiritual and conceptual orientation backed by the bourgeois way of life is being questioned and rejected by the toiling masses. Therefore, the search for an effective political philosophy which could push Marxism back or at least stop its victorious march and rising influence on the minds and hearts of the people, the search for an active outlook which could consolidate the capitalist world in the struggle against socialism, is the "general task" of bourgeois ideology. The basic impossibility to implement it motivates the bourgeois theoreticians to seek a solution by "resmelting" subjective with objective idealism, reassessing traditional philosophical values and, above all, engaging in further integration among the various anti-communist currents.

As we know, the defenders of the bourgeois system tried in their time to ignore the Marxist theory, to pretend as though no change had taken place in the field of social theory. This silence, however, was not only a tactical means of struggle against an ideological opponent but a consequence of an

arrogant error and of the insufficiently realized and understood explosive power of Marxism and its dialectical-materialistic method in the critical exposure of the capitalist production method and the knowledge and revolutionary reorganization of social life. After it became obvious that the silent treatment would be unsuccessful, bourgeois ideology tried to attack Marxism on the run, without plunging somewhat seriously within its system of arguments and narrowing its scope by proclaiming it an "error" of Western culture.

The situation has substantially changed since then. The Marxist ideas, which indeed became a material force transforming the world, are gaining more and more millions of new supporters. Marxist scientific and moral prestige today is so high and unquestionable that the bourgeois theoreticians cannot fail to acknowledge and take into consideration this political and spiritual factor of universal-historical significance. "Marx's thoughts," said W. Scheel, former FRG president, in his speech at the opening of the 16th World Philosophical Congress, "shapes the lives of billions of people, and not only in the socialist countries" (KONGRESSZEITUNG, Dusseldorf, 27 August 1978, p 2). This admission is quite typical.

For quite some time Marxism and its philosophy have been the target of the extensive and close study on the part of bourgeois philosophers, sociologists and politicians. "Marxology" has become one of the most extensive areas in the field of bourgeois social sciences. In order to fight Marxism one must be familiar with it (although to the extent to which such "familiarity" is accessible within the stereotypes of bourgeois thinking). However, there is more to it. The explanation for the growing attention which bourgeois theoreticians pay to Marxism should be sought mainly in the universal-historical fact that the social practice of mankind has entirely confirmed Marxist theoretical conclusions and forecasts: history is developing in accordance with the objective laws discovered by Marx and Engels. This cannot be ignored. The bourgeois theoretician, who tries to answer the questions raised in the course of historical progress, the scientific principles and methods the solution of which are already found in Marxism, is fabricating palliatives for answering them by circumventing historical experience.

Let us note another fact as well: taking into consideration the ever-rising scientific prestige and attractiveness of Marxism, many bourgeois social scientists (philosophers and economists above all) seek in Marxism and in their polemics against it theoretical postulates and means for their own self-expression and self-assertion. Therefore, we come across a rather paradoxical phenomenon: in order to express itself more completely and meaningfully, bourgeois theoretical thinking is frequently forced to speak a foreign language, to adapt to Marxism, its set of problems and even its conceptual apparatus.

The "acknowledgement" of Marxism is a most characteristic and fashionable tactical method in attacking Marxism. It would be difficult to find today a self-respecting bourgeois theoretician who would not say something praiseworthy about Marx. Marxism and its philosophy are willingly included in the mainstream of development of Western thought and culture as an ideological

current. Marx's name usually figures among the names of the 10 leading Western philosophers, starting with Plato or Aristotle and ending with Heidegger or Sartre. The bourgeois-objectivistic theoreticians are not reluctant to proclaim Marx a "teacher of life" (naturally, among many others) or "the father of many important thoughts" which have focused philosophical analysis on the "vital problems of his time."

However, what is really being concealed behind these formal acknowledgements of Marx's theoretical merits? A superficial look at the problem reveals that Marxism allegedly fails to answer the questions raised and that it merely "awakens the hope of resolving them," offering consolation in the distant unattainable communist future, that Marx's theory has largely become obsolete, for it belongs to the 19th century and that to a considerable extent it has remained an "unauthentic concept," which was "deformed" and distorted by its followers and students.

The offensive which bourgeois ideology has mounted against Marxist doctrine today, when it is winning one victory after another, is taking place on an extremely wide front. "The growth of Marxism and the dissemination and consolidation of its ideas among the working class," Lenin wrote, "inevitably triggers the increased frequency and aggravation of such bourgeois sallies against Marxism..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 17, p 17). This conclusion, which Lenin formulated more than 70 years ago, is particularly relevant today. One could hardly find a major conceptual or ideological problem which is not under fire by our enemies. The tactics and the ways and means of struggle may change quite operatively depending on the specific situation while the strategy remains the same.

As a rule, such apparent honor conceals the intention of distorting the revolutionary nature of Marxist theory, to merge it with the bourgeois ideological currents and to translate Marxism into a language of either alien or inadequate philosophical concepts. The way this is done was convincingly described by Lenin in his critique of "legal Marxism," of P. Struve in particular, who in his struggle against populism tried to "rely" on Marx. The objectivistic admission of one Marxist concept or another never extends beyond the statement of the need for a given historical process or given series of facts and "always runs the risk of switching to the viewpoint of the supporter of such facts" (see V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 1, p 418).

The bourgeois ideologues would like to prevent Marxism from appearing in its true light, as a strictly scientific theory which identifies the objective laws of the dynamics of nature, society and human thought. By declaring themselves supporters of pluralistic truth (claiming that there are as many roads leading to the truth as there are philosophical systems), they state that any gravitation of the human mind toward objective truth is groundless. Consequently, Marxism can be accepted only as one more trend of Western thought which reveals only its own "partial" truth and which, furthermore, has fallen far behind as it belongs to the 19th century. Naturally, such a "treatment" of the Marxist philosophical legacy, which is placed under the common denominator of social theories and attempts to integrate it with current bourgeois "isms," and all possible "refinements" and "improvements," emasculate the

revolutionary content of the proletarian doctrine. Such a "recognition" does not exclude in the least the open confrontation with Marxism and the futile efforts to "refute" or "outstrip" the Marxist method, logic and system of arguments with the help of open distortions which, it is true, are virtually always given an objectivistic coloring.

Side by side with the official theoreticians of "Marxology," but boasting of their imaginary independence and objectivity are the revisionist, "neo-Marxist" and social reformist interpreters of the doctrine, which are laying claims to its "creative" renovation. Ever since the times of E. Bernstein and K. Kautsky the revisionist (followed by the bourgeois) interpretation of Marxist theory and history has been manifested in the attempt to interpret it as the antithesis of Leninism. This is also the base of all contemporary revisionism, as represented by E. Fischer, R. Garaudy and A. Lefebvre, and the supporters of "praxology." Bourgeois "Marxology" actively supports this farfetched concept.

We know that the social democratic movement, which has been transformed into social reformism, completed the "historical evolution" of actually abandoning Marxism. Subsequently, this was codified by a program: in the postwar years the social democratic leadership thoroughly purged their programmatic documents from all Marxist ideas, proclaiming them, like faith in God, as the private business of the individual social democrat. This conceptual "neutralist" position is clearly expressed, for example, in the SED program, which it adopted at its Bad Godesberg 1959 program, was frankly aimed against the "vestiges of Marxism." The program stipulated that democratic socialism is the heir of Christian ethics, humanism and classical philosophy. However, the tempestuous growth of Marxist influence, which spread over increasingly broad circles of the working class and the progressive intelligentsia in the West, could not fail to influence the tactics of the social democrats who, although with a certain delay, responded to the neo-Marxist slogan of "back to Marx." Naturally, this was not only the result of "marching in step" with the time but the pressure of the rank-and-file social democrats who consider progress toward Marxism a natural process.

The popular method of reviewing the theoretical positions of Marxism and distorting its true history is helped by pitting Engels against Marx, on the basis that Engels' theoretical activities allegedly never rose to the level of the ideas of his friend and that frequently Engels led Marx "to sing out of tune." After Marx's death Engels was frequently forced to expose what he metaphorically described as the "petty fables about the bad Engels who had corrupted the good Marx" (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 36, p 12). Nevertheless, this petty fable was taken up by some theoreticians of the Second International. Bernstein in particular was one of the first to formulate the totally groundless position to the effect that certain division of labor existed between Marx and Engels, according to which the latter was entrusted with the development of philosophical problems and that, as the systematizer of dialectical and historical materialism, Engels allegedly uncritically followed in his works (in "Anti-Duhring" in particular) Hegel's dialectics, which frequently led him to distractions from the specific features of objects.

This version, which became quite popular, was zealously exploited by many social democratic and bourgeois historians of Marxism. At the beginning of the 20th century a similar interpretation (as for example the one of the Machists and others) became a leitmotif. Afraid of openly attacking Marx's theoretical authority, these "historians" promoted a diversion against Marx's philosophy secretly and indirectly: they attacked mainly Engels as the creator of a philosophical doctrine which allegedly was based on the simplified interpretation of Hegel and tried to separate Engels from Marx, accusing Engels of a liking for "naive dogmatic materialism," "grossest materialistic dogmatism," and so on. Following the publication of Engels' "Dialectics of Nature" (which made him the "vulgarizer" of the true Marx) these attacks intensified further and became just about the main line followed in the misrepresentation of Marxism and distorting the true nature of its philosophy.

Objective dialectics, the dialectics of real phenomena and processes, which is described in this work with the help of extremely rich natural scientific data, is presented in the forgeries of bourgeois "Marxology" and revisionist comments as something which does not fit in the list within the parameters of the "accurately understood" Marxist philosophical doctrine. Such a forced deformation was applied to Engels' "Anti-Duhring" as well, which is justifiably considered the encyclopedic presentation of Marxism in all its structural components. It is from such historical-philosophical excursions, the petty models of which are studies of M. Lang, F. Marek and P. Vranitskiy, the summing up conclusions are drawn to the effect that, although they shared the same political views, Marx and Engels had different philosophical views and that it was not Marx but Engels who had a decisive impact on the contemporary communist movement. L. Kolakovskiy is an active promoter of this false version. His "methodological" system is extensively presented in his three-volume work "The Basic Currents of Marxism. Its Upsurge, Growth and Downfall" is full of anticommunist insinuations and forgeries. The gross tendentiousness of this "research" becomes apparent from the title itself. The author does everything possible to prove that contemporary communism is not in the least "the legitimate heir of Marxism," that an insurmountable wall divides "the Marxism of Marx" and the "Marxism of the Marxists," and that the latter have entered a stage of profound crisis. Characteristically, the fabrications of the renegade Kolakovskiy are warmly supported by bourgeois propaganda and presented as the latest word of Western "Marxology." Incidentally, an abridged version of this work (condensed into a single volume) was hastily translated into Polish and is being disseminated free of charge by the counterrevolutionary ideologues.

If we are to believe such misrepresentations, Marx was neither the founder nor a supporter of dialectical and historical materialism. Allegedly, he considered that his task as a philosopher was to surmount the traditional one-sidedness of idealism and materialism and to rise above both. Furthermore, Marx is frequently depicted as the opponent of any kind of philosophy in general, as a supporter of the "free creative thinking" and of the anti-philosophy of Kierkegaard or Nietzsche. On the basis of this ideological stipulation, the bourgeois and "neo-Marxist" interpreters of Marx's works are trying in this case to prove that his theory is socially based on the values and traditions of the Enlightenment and, theoretically, on the philosophical

views expressed by Hegel and Feuerbach. The entire wealth of scientific ideas expressed by Marx are usually found in his "Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844" and other early works, which are furthermore presented in a distorted fashion in the spirit of the concept of total alienation which, it is claimed, imbues his theoretical activities. The very concept of alienation is considered not a socioeconomic phenomenon but anthropologically, as a permanent characteristic of man himself, something which Marx firmly rejected.

Therefore, the economic, historical and political factors of the Marxist concept of alienation are not only totally ignored but depicted as secondary, as the product of some kind of ideal and abstractly unreachable object, as the result of a purely speculative deduction. As we can see, here the cart is put before the horse: the real history of the appearance and development of Marxism is distorted in such a way as to appear that his theory was developed before the objective conditions which Marx used as prerequisites for a scientific study had been studied and analyzed.

It is simple to guess that such "research" methods are not dictated in the least by the requirement to engage in a serious study of the historical-philosophical process of the development of Marxist theoretical thinking. They are entirely determined by ideological and class reasons and are a clear manifestation of the "struggle among parties in philosophy." The objective is far-reaching, i.e., the aspiration "to prove" that Marx had nothing to do with dialectical and even less so with historical materialism, and that the essence of his philosophical concept is nothing but "humanism" and "naturalism," based on the theory of alienation. The historical fate of Marx's philosophy is presented as though its subsequent development, thanks to Engel and, subsequently, Lenin, who inherited from Engels the "simplified" dialectical-materialistic "system," departed from the path traced by the founders themselves through "historical naturalism" and "normative humanism," and the theory of alienation led to the misinterpretation of the dialectics of nature and the "mechanistic" theory of reflection, in the direction of a "scientific positivism."

The main line of attack against Marxist philosophy is being mounted along the line of discrediting dialectical materialism, which is not only an instrument of consistent scientific study of actual reality but a powerful incentive for the reorganization of social relations, the focal point of the philosophical interests of Marx and Engels and their joint theoretical activities, coordinated in terms of all basic aspects and starting principles (see V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 24, p 264). This problem is "resolved" by either rejecting all dialectics in general in Marx's theoretical arsenal or identifying his specific approach to knowledge with Hegel's dialectical method or else, finally, reducing it to relativism. The choice of the strategic direction of this "strike," the motivation for which was identified by Marx himself in the conclusion to the second edition of "Das Kapital" is understandable: "In its rational aspect dialectics instigates in the bourgeoisie and its doctrinary ideologues nothing but hatred and horror, for in its positive understanding of what is extant it also includes an understanding of its rejection, of its necessary doom. It considers each achieved form in its dynamics and,

consequently, in terms of its transient aspect. It does not yield to anything and is critical and revolutionary by its very nature" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 22).

It would be unnecessary extensively to prove the obvious, i.e., that Marx was a philosopher who organically blended dialectics with materialism and systematically extended the dialectical-materialistic perception of the world to the area of historical phenomena and social dynamics. Let us merely refer to a familiar Marxian concept. Noting the attacks mounted by E. Duhring, who accused Marx of uncritically following Hegel, in a letter to L. Kugelmann, dated 6 March 1868, the leader of the proletariat wrote, displaying his essential clarity: "He understands perfectly well that my research method is not the one used by Hegel, for I am a materialist while Hegel is an idealist. Hegelian dialectics is the basic form of all dialectics but only after it has been freed from its mystical form. It is precisely this that constitutes the distinction between it and my method" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 32, p 448).

The revolutionary content, the very essence and direction of Marx's theory is based on the cornerstones of dialectical and historical materialism in its full integrity and consistency. "If," as Lenin wrote, "Marx abandoned 'Logic' (with a capital letter), he retained 'logic' in 'Das Kapital'" (op. cit., vol 29, p 301), the type of dialectical-materialistic logic which imbues literally all of his works.

One of the main objectives of the allegedly "authentic" interpretation of Marx is to separate Lenin from it, relating the Leninist stage in the development of Marxist philosophy to a deliberately distorted philosophical view of Engels, turned upside down, and to pit Leninism against Marxism. Naturally, the supporters of this approach obviously understand that Lenin is Marx's student and follower. Nevertheless, they consider Leninism merely one of the possible interpretations of Marxism, which grew on "specifically Russian soil." Incidentally, based on this conclusion our ideological opponents are trying to provide a theoretical substantiation for the allegedly inevitable polyvariance of Marxist theory, and to prove that contemporary Marxism is a branch of Marx's ideas and does not reflect what he thought and wrote. Such ideological concepts are considered basic by some authors of the four-volume "History of Marxism," published by the Italian publishing house Einaudi ("Storia del Marxismo," Turin, Giulio Einaudi, editore, vols I-III, 1978-1980).

Without engaging in an overall assessment of this major work, which contains sections of uneven scientific value, written from different ideological positions, let us consider the claims which illustrate such ideological concepts. "As an all-embracing outlook, Marxist materialism," states one of the chapters most firmly, "has its origins in the works of Friedrich Engels. It was precisely to Engels that we owe the synthetic theory which is usually described as dialectical materialism and which is the main source of philosophical thinking of the German social democrats and, to an even greater extent, to the by far more monolithic Soviet Marxism."

Other authors of the same work dislike mainly the dialectical-materialistic understanding of freedom as knowledge and realization of historical necessity and the theory of reflection or, as they describe it, of "duplication." Ignoring the proofs offered by Marx himself (his very familiar stipulation that the kingdom of freedom can blossom only on the basis of the kingdom of necessity as its base and that the "ideal is nothing but the material replanted in the human mind and transformed by it"), they claim that such basic principles of Marxist philosophy reach their total victory in the "Dialectics of Nature" (rather than in Marxism as a whole), in works which, following their publication, became "the true textbook of the future Soviet Marxism." They clearly proceed on the basis of the idealistic postulate which excludes the objective dialectics of real objects and processes, whatever their manifestations, particularly in historical dynamics, and the recognition of the objective laws which, allegedly, means "the triumph of nature over history and the triumph of the object over the subject or over subjective practice," and close the door to real freedom.

Hence the old and long-annoying typical "Marxological" twist: Engels' system of views, representing an arbitrary combination of "scientism, materialistic metaphysics and communist ideals," were subsequently most consistently developed by Plekhanov and Lenin, who included Engels' "theory of social determinism respectively into a kind of technological philosophy of historical determinism and materialistic epistemology, the origins of which lie in evolutionist materialistic metaphysics." The conclusion is thus suggested to the reader that Plekhanov and, consequently, Lenin turned Marxist philosophical thinking backward, toward the contemplative materialism of the 18th century and Spinoza's philosophy of substance and "interpret" Marxism precisely along this "channel" "intending to prove that the legacy of Hegel, the 'objective idealist' could make materialism more consistent."

As a Marxist theoretician, Lenin placed in the same ranks not only with Kautsky and Labriola but even with the anarchic syndicalist Sorel the philosophical concept which, allegedly "in the final account represents a slice of Marx's theory in its totality, which was lost in the orthodox theories of historical materialism," while Leninism--the universally acknowledged model of "tactics for all," adopted by the communists of all countries, becomes a bolshevik invention which absolutizes its own experience and which elevates Lenin's thought to the rank of a mandatory rule in all areas of social knowledge. In opposing Leninism as the Marxism of our epoch, and in trying to "delete" the Leninist stage in the development of Marx's theory, the supporters of "Western" Marxism would not hesitate to purely eliminate Lenin's role above all in the area of the creative enrichment of Marxist philosophy, its theory and its method. Avoiding the specific analysis of Lenin's contribution to dialectical and historical materialism and the development of the methodology of natural and social sciences and the logic of scientific knowledge and revolutionary practice, such "researchers" prefer, in their confrontation with Leninism, to engage in monologues in which scientific arguments are replaced with sophistry or empty rhetoric which allows no appeals. What is the value of their unsubstantiated statements that Lenin "was not strong in philosophy" and, with the exception of "Materialism and Empiriocriticism," he wrote no special philosophical works

which he edited himself; and even "Materialism and Empiriocriticism," is alleged to be below "academic standards" and the result of "political clashes."

It is well known that Lenin firmly and consistently defended and developed the principle of unity of theory and practice formulated by Marx and Engels, and the organic combination of objective conditions and subjective factors in philosophical analysis. However, some authors of the "History of Marxism" are trying to distort historical reality in such a way as to create the impression that Lenin's philosophical views were based above all on the "voluntaristic principles which were called upon and able to speed up the course of history." They attach this label also on Lenin's "Materialism and Empiriocriticism" which, allegedly, like the other theoretical works written by Lenin, is the result of his "politically centralizing (antifaction) and bureaucratic considerations based on his typical organizational voluntarism." The authors are not disturbed in the least by the fact that they cannot tie the ends and do not even try to do so. Actually, why is it that Lenin who, as they claim, was a voluntarist in theory, would be defending so firmly "materialistic determinism" and would create, after Plekhanov, "the extreme variant of materialistic epistemology and materialistic metaphysics" which, in their view, paralyze all creative activities, both theoretical-cognitive and practical-reorganizing? Why is it that in his struggle against the factionalism of the mensheviks Lenin used precisely Plekhanov as one of the "philosophical guidelines," although he was their ideological and theoretical instructor? Naturally, there are no answers to such questions. Furthermore, the authors do not shy away from the open distortion of facts. For example, they write that Lenin, who was guided in writing "Materialism and Empiriocriticism" by Plekhanov, Engels, Feuerbach and Dietzgen, refers to Marx on only one or two occasions. However, suffice it merely to look at the name index in that work to realize that, to say the least, this is contrary to the facts: Lenin refers on 77 pages to Marx, 35 to Dietzgen and 30 to Plekhanov; furthermore, as one can easily see even as we skim through the work, Dietzgen and Plekhanov are the subjects of a substantial number of critical remarks.

Through this approach Lenin becomes a metaphysicist, a mechanistic materialist, whose main postulate consists, according to the authors, of asserting the "primacy of the external world over knowledge and the identification of 'noumenal' with 'phenomenological' levels of reality," "totally abstracted from Marx's categories of practice and labor." Therefore, Lenin, who followed Engels, is placed on the side not only of the young Marx's "philosophical anthropology" but its ties "with the concepts of his political economy," defending and supporting in his "Materialism and Empiriocriticism" the "Marxist equivalent of 18th century materialism" which was suggested and substantiated by Engels.

One can easily see that a number of authors of the "History of Marxism" were inspired less by scientific than purely ideological grounds of presenting the true history of Marxist philosophy in an imaginary and false light. Another confirmation of the accuracy of the general conclusion is found in their at least equivocal attitude toward Hegelian dialectics. On the one hand, they seem totally to reject the prejudicial attitude toward it and toward

Hegelianism, widespread among the theoreticians of the Second International, which has entered Marxism as a "makeweight" or a "vestige" (Bernstein), and was one of the main reasons for Engels' "fall" and his "retreat" from young Marx's "philosophical anthropology" and the adoption of positivistic scientism. Engels' "Dialectics of Nature" was (according to Adler) the "'materialistic' imitation of the Hegelian system, and his theory of knowledge, as a duplication, was nothing but a gross forgery of Hegel's 'absolute knowledge'." Nor has Plekhanov fruitfully used Hegelian dialectics. While "praising Hegel," he restored behind its back the old "philosophical materialism, based on a model similar to that of Spinoza's substance." On the other hand, as though sensing the positive significance of Hegel's dialectical method in addressing themselves to Lenin's "Philosophical Notebooks," there is an "attempt" to rise with the help of dialectics above the old contemplative materialism. However, this "new" evaluation does not explain in the least the acknowledgement of the inimitable Leninist mastery in the materialistic interpretation of dialectics and the ability organically to blend it with materialism, something which he learned, unquestionably, from Marx and Engels. In this case the "new" assessment called for reemphasizing the imaginary groundlessness of materialism in its contemporary form, without which today neither scientific knowledge nor the revolutionary-reorganizing practices of the toiling masses, carried out under the sign of Marxism-Leninism, are possible. Could we forget the prime importance which Lenin ascribed to the objective dialectics of objects and processes, and to dialectical knowledge and activities in his philosophical testament--the work "On the Significance of Militant Materialism," as well as in many other works! In a word, here again we come across not a scientific statement but an ideological speculation cunningly aimed at distorting the historical path and experience of Marxist philosophy.

All of Lenin's theoretical activities constitute a single unbreakable chain of inspired philosophical creativity, from which not even a single link could be removed. Essentially, all of his works are imbued with a most profound philosophical enthusiasm. In creatively developing Marxism under the new historical circumstances, Lenin understood and applied philosophy as a spiritual weapon of the proletariat in the struggle for liberation from social oppression and for embodying the ideals of communism. Unity between theory and practice is the most characteristic feature of Leninism, its content and style. That is precisely why Lenin became the greatest Marxist theoretician: while enriching the Marxist doctrine he not only developed the theoretical problems which had accumulated after Marx and Engels but went further--as a propagandist of ideas and as a brilliant innovator. Following the revolutionary method and the live spirit of Marxist dialectics in theory and politics, and relying on Marxian principles, defending and preserving their purity, Lenin formulated and substantiated a number of concepts and conclusions which are the philosophical summation of the liberation struggle waged by the working people in the new historical era and an anticipation of the general and specific patterns of this revolutionary age.

Today neither a fruitful elaboration of this theory nor any strategic or tactical success in the struggle against capitalism and for peace and socialism and a communist renovation of the world are possible without

mastering Lenin's theoretical legacy and the wealth of Lenin's thinking, or without ignoring all that Lenin has contributed to the theory of Marxism. "Everything accomplished by Lenin," wrote P. Togliatti, "is of theoretical and practical interest to and directly affects the working class and the peoples the world over.... There is no single thinking person of our age, a single historian, scientist or philosopher who could be compared to Lenin from this viewpoint.... Lenin's tremendous activities have been reflected in his fundamental and classical philosophical and political works. No one can do without the study of such works if he wishes to understand anything which has happened over the past 50 years and is happening today" (P. Togliatti, "Izbrannyye Stat'i i Rechi" [Selected Articles and Speeches]. Vol II, Moscow, 1965, pp 362-363). It is entirely obvious to anyone who is loyal to Leninism that any belittling of Lenin's role in the creative development and enrichment of Marxist theory and any "relativization" of Leninism inevitably lead to the distortion of Marxism as a whole.

The main directions followed in the bourgeois and revisionist distortions of Marxism are determined by the logic of the class struggle. The main problem of this struggle is that of the future of mankind: is capitalism the "natural and eternal" condition of human life or is it declining, yielding to the new social system, communism, which is bringing to light its real content in the interest of the working people? According to Marx, history develops in accordance with objective laws. However, the theoreticians whose task is to provide ideological support to the class ruling the capitalist society and its institutions cannot accept this circumstance. That is why, contrary to the materialistic understanding of history as the natural-historical progress from lower to higher forms of social development, a variety of pseudotheoretical myths are being encouraged, according to which capitalism and socialism will inevitably blend within a kind of "superindustrial" ("postindustrial," "technotronic," etc.) society, which, in the final account, will be modeled on the bourgeois system, although somewhat modernized and "improved." As one can easily note, this social utopia is aimed against real socialism.

The class hostility toward socialism, the new social system which is replacing capitalism, and which is created by the toiling masses, inspires our ideological enemies to engage in an active onslaught on the Marxist theory of the universal-historical mission of the working class. We hear from all sides of their camp proclamations to the effect that this theory is allegedly obsolete and that the proletariat itself no longer exists, for it has long become "integrated" within bourgeois society and represents a conformist conservative force.

In their attempts to "refute" Marxism and to discredit real socialism, which has grown and is developing on the basis of its theoretical foundations, the ideologues of the contemporary bourgeoisie and revisionism are trying to avoid giving open support to the capitalist system. They do everything possible to stifle the class characteristics and to convince the working people that that same capitalism, the social vices of which are exposed by Marxist theory, is a phenomenon which has irrevocably disappeared into the past; today, allegedly, class antagonisms are eliminated in the course of the "equal partnership" among all social strata and groups. The entire criticism

is aimed at socialism, in the hope of accomplishing the ideological "erosion" of the socialist comity headed by the Soviet Union--the pioneer in the communist renovation of the planet. To the West, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress, the ideological struggle "is not reduced to the confrontation of ideas. It is using an entire system of means aimed at undermining the socialist world and weakening it. The imperialists and their accomplices are systematically mounting hostile campaigns against the socialist countries. They are defaming and distorting anything occurring in these countries. Their main purpose is to make the people disgusted with socialism."

However, the imperialist bourgeoisie and its theoretical henchmen cannot turn history back. Life has confirmed Marx's scientific prediction of the historical doom of the capitalist system and the final triumph of socialism. Marxist philosophy, which discovered and interpreted the objective laws of social progress--the philosophy of active construction and struggle waged by the working people, which has become a powerful material force in the emancipation of man and is frightening our class enemies--is the true and reliable way to human progress. Marxist philosophy is tempering and sharpening its weapons in the fierce clashes with hostile ideological currents. In this "battle of philosophy" for the minds and hearts of the people, the party is winning one victory after another, for not only does it properly reflect the objective needs of social development but interprets the essence of human life, the prospects of life and struggle, the meaning of life and the measure of responsibility for the future.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

WHOM 'REAGONOMICS' SERVES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 97-108

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Kudrov]

[Text] Basing his political course on drastically increasing the confrontation with the forces of peace and social progress and ensuring for the United States and American capital dominating positions on a global scale, R. Reagan, the U.S. president, and the circles related to him, have paid from the very beginning of the present Republican administration, essential attention to problems of internal economic policy. This is understandable: first of all, the economy has become the weak spot of the United States; secondly, as in all other capitalist countries, the specific characteristics and intensity of the internal political struggle in the United States during one time segment or another, and the general course followed by the government, including the area of international problems, are determined, above all, by the situation in the socioeconomic area. This is manifested with particular clarity in the current period of aggravation of the crisis afflicting the capitalist economy.

Therefore, there is nothing accidental in the fact that the Reagan government has invested a great deal of effort to implement its announced program for extensive reform aimed at strengthening the positions of big capital in the economy and the entire life of the country--a reform which the Western press ironically christened after its author as "Reaganomics." What specifically did this mean? We know that in many countries traditional state-monopoly regulation of the capitalist economy over a number of decades was based on Keynesianism. As early as the mid-1930s the promoter of this economic doctrine which was named after him, the British economist J. M. Keynes, reached the conclusion of the expediency and the need for extensive interference of the bourgeois state in the economy and economic processes in order to increase the capacity of the market. He suggested the pursuit of a type of taxation, structural and other policy which would influence the shaping of reproduction ratios (the consumption and accumulation ratio in particular) in accordance with the requirements of economic growth and increased production efficiency. According to Keynes the main object of governmental incentive should be demand and he appealed not to be afraid of deficit financing and for increasing the share of the state in the country's economy.

In our time, first the Thatcher conservative government in Britain, followed by the Reagan administration in the United States, not only openly proclaimed the abandonment of such postulates of government regulation but undertook the implementation of legislative measures aimed at introducing different postulates and criteria in the economic life of their respective countries. What triggered this so-called "anti-Keynesian revolution," particularly in the United States?

Unquestionably, it should be considered against the background of both objective trends of socioeconomic development as well as the essentially conservative shifts in social consciousness and the ideological-political concepts of the ruling circles, which took place in the United States of late. It is also important to take into consideration internal and external prerequisites for such changes, the result of which is a turn in the economic thinking of the leading groups of monopoly capital and their political representatives.

During the past decade retail prices and the unemployment rate doubled in the United States; the rate of economic growth declined by one-half, the population's living standard dropped and scientific and technical progress slowed down. The lowering of the growth rates of labor productivity--the most important factor in maintaining production efficiency and competitiveness and countering the development of inflation--which began in the mid-1960s, was considerably accelerated after 1973 and, during the past 3 years, has resulted in its real decline. In the course of the same decade the country had three crisis declines. The growth of capital investments came to a standstill; corporate profit declined, the country's power availability became less reliable while the cost of energy itself increased. Reproduction conditions substantially changed as a result of all this.

The efficiency of the state-monopoly control methods declined considerably as well. Currently the view that the old state control system proved to be ineffective and that it has exhausted its potential is widespread among so-called academic circles in the West and in big business circles. By stimulating demand, traditional Keynesianism controlled the increased share of state expenditures in the gross national product (GNP), and contributed to higher taxation, foreign trade and budget deficits, and the increased amount of money in circulation, which intensified inflationary processes. Inflation became the main economic problem facing the United States in the 1970s. Combined with the declining rates of economic growth, it triggered a new phenomenon in the country's economic life--stagflation (a combination of stagnation and inflation). It was the latter that discredited the traditional Keynesian principles of state economic control.

In 1976 Carter promised the electorate to see to it that the level of unemployment would not exceed 4 percent of the active population and to limit the growth of inflation to 3 percent annually. To a certain extent, this helped him to become president. By the end of his stay in power, however, the average annual growth of retail prices was between 12 and 13 percent, unemployment had reached 7-8 percent, and the growth of the GNP did not exceed 0.2 percent. The weakening of the foreign economic positions of the United States was manifested in the relative drop in the competitiveness of a number

of American goods on world markets and the reduction and, in a number of cases, the elimination of the previously existing not only economic but "technological" gap which favored the United States versus Western Europe and Japan, and the increased share of imported goods and foreign capital in the domestic U.S. market. Starting with 1971 the traditionally positive American balance of payments turned into a chronic deficit which reached huge amounts.

In this respect the study conducted by the journal INDUSTRY WEEK is characteristic. The journal pointed out that whereas in 1950 the United States was in a leading position in the world in the production of machine tools, accounted for 47 percent of the world steel production and for 76 percent of the worldwide production of automobiles, by 1970 it accounted for no more than 20 percent of the global steel production and one-third of the automobiles, and was third-ranking in terms of machine tools in world production. By 1980 the situation had become even worse. It was impossible to buy on the U.S. market a radio or black-and-white television set produced in the country; 40 percent of color television sets, 25 percent of all passenger cars and 16 percent of household electrical appliances sold on the U.S. market were imported. The U.S. share in world steel production dropped to 18.7 percent and that of automobiles to 29.2 percent. The United States began to fall behind its rivals not only in terms of overall rates of economic growth but growth rates of labor productivity, accumulation and savings and the dynamics of exports of industrial commodities; it began to lose its leading positions in the pace of scientific and technical progress.

American capital, which had become accustomed to enjoying unchallenged leadership in the economy of the capitalist world, began to feel a certain discomfort and concern and to insist on less government supervision. It demanded more decisive support of its activities and the restoration of lost positions in the world. Briefly, U.S. big business undertook active efforts in the struggle against what it considered excessive government interference in private enterprise and social concessions to the working people.

Reagan was elected president on the wave of disappointment of influential groups of the ruling U.S. class in Carter's economic policy and the belief that they would have in the former governor of California a "strong" president who promised, in particular, to draft a new efficient economic program. Soon after Reagan's advent to power the program was announced under the pretentious title of "A New Beginning for America. A Program for Economic Rebirth."

What did the program consist of and what were its objectives and mechanism?

Before engaging a detailed analysis, let us immediately say that the class meaning of the program was comprehensive support of the interests of big capital, the redistribution of the country's national income in favor of the latter and, as the other side of the coin, an extensive offensive mounted by the monopolies against the vital interests of the working people and, in a number of cases, those of small and medium businesses. The main advantages of the "economic upsurge" promised as a result of the implementation of Reagan's program were to benefit the big bourgeoisie. As to the remaining

population strata, they were to receive the crumbs which, as described by conservative Reaganites, would be "benefits filtering from the top to the bottom."

Reagan's economic program included basic items such as tax reform, depreciation reform, anti-inflationary monetary policy, and a "deregulation" reform. After an extensive discussion by various committees, last July the U.S. Congress approved the basic measures stemming from the first two items. According to the administration, it is precisely the tax reform that is the key point of the entire program. The reform stipulated a general lowering of the income tax by 23 percent over 3 years, a drop in family income taxes and taxes on unearned income (interests and dividends). This entire group of personal or individual taxes, as intended by the administration, was to ensure savings totaling \$551.8 billion by 1986. Furthermore, property taxes were to be reduced as well, which would have saved another \$12.9 billion.

With the help of the tax reform the administration hoped to increase the amount of savings and, consequently, it assumed, the share of accumulations, thus reviving the investment process and accelerating the pace of economic growth. However, even if the reform were to be messed up and essentially made invalid under the pressure of the stern realities of the economic crisis --about which later--was it possible to consider that the bulk of the funds which would thus become available to prospective investors would be channeled into productive capital investments? According to views expressed in the United States, no less than two-thirds of this amount would have gone not into the real renovation of the production apparatus but into personal consumption which, let us add, under inflationary conditions is entirely admissible, and the development of new production facilities which would be profitable only in the short term, as well as into real estate speculations, the inflation of nonproduction accumulation, which is quite profitable under inflationary conditions, the purchasing of stock paying high dividends and, finally, would have simply gone to the foreign branches of American multinational corporations.

The class sense of the tax reform, as conceived by its authors themselves, was the redistribution of funds "saved" by reducing taxation rates in favor of big capital and the rich U.S. population strata. Thus, about 35 percent of the planned tax reduction was to the advantage of 5.6 percent of the population with an income in excess of \$50,000 annually; 31.7 million taxpayers earning under \$15,000 would have received no more than 8.5 percent of the overall tax reduction.

In our view, the depreciation reform is of some interest. The following formula for capital depreciation was adopted: 3-5-10-15 years. As of 1 October 1981 the cost of passenger cars and panel trucks and special equipment, scientific in particular, was to be depreciated in full over a period of 3 years; industrial machinery and agricultural equipment, in 5; capital operating within the production and distribution of electric power and gas and water supplies, over 10 years (in some cases 15); the cost of most buildings was to be depreciated over 15 years. As we can see, this meant major changes in depreciation policy. Suffice it to say that until

recently most of the value of U.S. industrial equipment was amortized over 5-15 years, while real estate was amortized over 32-43 years. As a whole, depreciation writeoffs were accelerated by approximately 40 percent while the cumulative effect consisting of additional funds for the renovation of the production apparatus in the country was to total \$147.5 billion by 1986. The depreciation reform also involved the hope of upgrading the rate of capital investments by 1-2 percent and increasing investments in the private economic sector by \$9.5 billion in 1982 and \$59.3 billion in 1986.

Naturally, this does not mean that the actual deadlines for replacing productive capital will be entirely consistent with the official figures. The latter were established legislatively essentially in order to encourage private business, the big corporations above all, to engage in technical production restructuring. Consequently, the social meaning of the depreciation reform can once again be reduced to state support of private capital. We can easily understand that the written-off equipment will be actually not discarded and that it will be used far beyond the planned depreciation deadlines.

The monetary policy conceived as part of Reagan's economic program is reduced to lowering the growth rates of the money in circulation to the level of the real GNP and to controlling interest rates. This policy pursued by the American administration, aimed at fighting growing inflation, began to be seriously applied under Carter. As a result, the growth rates of the money in circulation declined substantially. In recent years the U.S. Federal Reserve system substantially tightened up credit restrictions, triggering a drastic increase in the interest rates charged by commercial banks, which started giving loans to so-called prime borrowers at the fabulously high rate of 20.5 percent. Such measures somewhat reduced the growth of consumer prices (which averaged 10.4 percent in 1981 and will be approximately 6 percent this year as estimated by the American economists), and a sharp increase in the rate of exchange of the dollar on the international monetary markets. However, this was a blow at the investment process. The obvious unwillingness of business to borrow money at such high interest rates, according to many American economists, contributed to the decline in output between 1980 and 1982, which was particularly badly reflected on the situation in house-building and the automobile industry. Currently the interest rate charged by commercial banks has dropped to 13.5 percent. The administration is hoping that as the growth rates of inflation are reduced and the economy begins to recover, the rates will continue to decline, thus making reductions in the budget deficit possible.

In the final account, the social purpose of Reagan's monetary policy is not only to lower price increases but the growth of wages as well. This policy affects not only the working people but also increasingly small and average businessmen and farmers, who usually need loans. As to monopoly capital, it has a system of protective barriers to protect itself from any restrictive monetary policy, consisting of self-financing, and has little need of bank loans.

Under the present circumstances the stipulations of the Reagan program related to the "deregulation" reform have assumed particular importance. Naturally, it is not a question of eliminating state control of the economy as such, or of any dismantling of state-monopoly capitalism--the objective reality of historical developments today. What is meant by "deregulation" is changing priorities within the state-monopoly capitalist system, a certain decentralization of regulating functions and the aspiration to make governmental expenditures more efficient in the course of establishing stronger ties between the state apparatus and business. Essentially, this is a regulatory reform. Its basic components include measures to curtail previously earmarked social outlays and reduce the size of the state apparatus and the cost of its maintenance, measures to decentralize management, struggle against bureaucratization, and the elimination of many state and administrative stipulations regarding environmental protection and labor safety.

By stipulating considerable reductions in the growth rates of social outlays, the Republican economic program tries to shift the main burden of the struggle against inflation on the shoulders of the working people. We know that over the last 15-20 years, as a result of a persistent struggle, the U.S. working people have been able to achieve a certain increase in state allocations for a variety of social programs. Such increases were mainly at the expense of the increased number of people receiving pensions and aid. Furthermore, the principle of indexing the nominal amounts of old-age pensions and unemployment aid, based on the growth of consumer prices, was applied. This more or less preserved their real level under inflationary circumstances. Today the president and his administration have already deprived the working people of many such gains and intend to continue their firm attack on their living standards.

As a whole, the sum total of this "blood-letting" of social programs has exceeded so far \$63 billion. As a result, last year alone the number of Americans living below the official "poverty level" increased by more than 2 million people--the greatest increase in the number of poor over the past 15 years. According to the draft budget for the 1984 fiscal year social expenditures will be reduced by yet another \$40 billion.

The reform calls for reducing the number of employees in government departments, some of which will be closed down (such as the Departments of Energy and Education, the Environmental Protection Agency, and others). Allocations for the energy program and programs for assistance to public transportation and culture will be curtailed substantially as well.

The Republican administration is also taking steps to decentralize the administrative hierarchy and eliminate a number of bureaucratic rules. Some of the functions previously performed by federal departments have been transferred to the states and the local authorities. This applies mainly to education, the communal economy, and a number of areas within the social infrastructure.

In one of his speeches Reagan admitted that the "structure of federalism" had become "twisted," and that the central government had "usurped the rights which belong to the state and local authorities." A special group, headed by Vice President Bush, in charge of abolishing what was described as unnecessary regulations, was assigned the review of thousands of governmental instructions covering a broad range of regulations, from the production of foodstuffs to the noise pollution caused by plant equipment and the designing of new structures, in accordance with the principles of correlation between these objectives and the outlays they would create. At the same time, rules in the areas of environmental protection, labor safety and health, consumer rights, and others were to be drastically weakened. What is noteworthy is the fact that although many of the measures announced by the administration on reorganizing the functions of state administration appeared attractive on the surface, they did not affect in the least the interests of the military-industrial complex and the powerful military bureaucracy in Washington.

The reform of the state regulation system implemented by the Reagan administration is based on the aspiration traditional in conservative circles to limit the role of the state and to stimulate the "freedom" of extracting profits. In academic circles this course, which today had the upper hand in domestic U.S. policy; is approved by the supporters of so-called monetarist concepts in the field of political economy, in particular, who emphasize the prime importance of eliminating budget deficits which they consider the strongest inflationary factor.

Politically, today the problem of the U.S. federal budget deficit has become one of the most sensitive problems of "Reaganomics." According to the initial estimates the federal budget deficit was to be eliminated by 1984. However, in the circumstances of an economic crisis, reduced output and, consequently, lowered budget revenues and the tremendous increase in military expenditures, the size of the deficit is not only not being reduced but, conversely, is rising rapidly. Instead of the "planned" deficit of \$42.5 billion for 1982, in reality the deficit will exceed \$100 billion. According to the Office of Management and the Budget, unless special measures are taken, the 1983 budget deficit will reach \$152 billion while the 1984 budget will total \$162 billion. According to H. Stein, former chairman of Nixon's council of economic advisers, "the deficits will be substantially higher than President Reagan expects.... Nothing in the 1983 presidential budget is blocking deficit increases."

It is entirely clear today that the U.S. government has obviously failed in its aspiration to eliminate budget deficits. Faced with its merciless growth, the administration was forced to increase a number of taxes, thus retreating from the principle proclaimed by the president of steadily reducing them. In August 1982, i.e., 10 months after the decision to lower taxes was enacted, the U.S. Congress passed in both chambers, on the suggestion of the president himself, a law on increasing federal taxes totaling \$98.3 billion over the next 3 years. Naturally, it is not a question of raising the income taxes of the rich population strata or the corporations. We know that corporate contributions to the overall U.S. federal revenue has dropped from 25 percent in the mid-1960s to one-fifth or less at present. It

is a question of raising indirect taxes, i.e., the most unfair and regressive consumer taxes. In particular, new fees will be charged on cigarettes, fees for telephone use will be increased, and so on. At the same time, with a view to reducing the budget deficit and lowering interest rates over the next 3 years the growth of state outlays totaling \$280 billion will be slowed down entirely and fully at the expense of the nonmilitary part of the federal budget.

As the U.S. press notes currently, an atmosphere of dark insecurity prevails in American economic circles. The recovery from the crisis, extensively promised by the President and his retinue, has not materialized. Furthermore, economic indicators do not confirm its advent. American industry is operating at no more than 69.5 percent of capacity. The army of unemployed is rising and so is the number of bankruptcies. According to the experts, the recovery process will take place very slowly and unstably unless a new crisis breaks out. The American press has begun to discuss with full justification the failure of "Reaganomics," and the absolute disparity between the general objectives formulated for the immediate future and the actual situation.

Therefore, the vicious circle in which "Reaganomics" has found itself in an effort to deal with the acute current problems of economic life in the United States and to find a solution to the contradictions of economic development by strengthening the power of monopoly capital, has become obvious. The question of the viability itself of Reagan's program is being raised with increasing urgency in the course of aggravating theoretical disputes and political clashes. In turn, this makes it necessary to consider the problem in a broader context rather than its inability to influence current economic processes.

A distinction should be made in the economic program formulated 2 years ago by the U.S. Republican administration, which has brought about such pitiful results today, first of all between its theoretical and applied sides and, secondly, between its short-term and medium- or long-term practical aspects.

From the viewpoint of economic theory "Reaganomics" does not have and has never had any firm base whatever. It was a rejection of the Keynesian concept and, consistent with the overall conservative turn in U.S. social consciousness, it proclaimed the rule of the "supply economics"--an eclectic concept which includes the elements of monetarism and neoclassicism. The supporters of "supply economics" call for restricting state intervention. They preach the essentially reactionary-utopian slogan of return to free enterprise and self-regulation of the market system. They call for "taking the government off the back of the people." Unlike the Keynesians, they would like to stimulate not demand but supply of commodities and services, above all those which are essentially new and consistent with new social requirements, to accelerate the growth of labor productivity, to deal with inflation, and to put an end to state "philanthropy," i.e., to all concessions granted the working people in the social area, and "to liberate free enterprise from its chains." Their increased popularity during the first stage was helped by the fact that Keynesianism, which was consistent

with the spirit of its time, had proved its groundlessness faced with the stagflation of the 1970s. Monopoly capital developed the need to convert to new principles of state economic control. "Reaganomics" was the attempted answer to this need, an answer which, as reality has indicated, was as groundless as all other attempts to ensure economic recovery without infringing on the profits of the military concerns and the huge defense expenditures.

In its applied or practical aspect Reagan's economic program includes regulatory measures which, had circumstances been different, may have yielded certain results. Naturally, it is not a question of any abandonment of state economic controls. It is a question of changing priorities and the style and methods of such control with a view to the efficient stimulation of business.

However, both the theoretical and applied aspects of "Reaganomics" include a number of internal reciprocal contradictions, and even if we were to ignore its failures related to the current economic crisis, in themselves they do not create any type of comprehensive base for state-monopoly economic control as was provided by Keynesianism over a long period of time. The basic contradiction in Reagan's economic concepts is the deep conflict between taxation and monetary policies. The lowering of taxes and adoption of new depreciation withholding norms were aimed at encouraging investments in production, while the purpose of credit restrictions was to fight inflation actually by hindering investments and economic growth. This is precisely the main dichotomy not only of the theoretical "substantiation" but the practical implementation of the new economic program of the United States.

Essentially, the country's government does not know how to encourage production without simultaneously increasing inflation or how to reduce inflation without hindering production. It is no accident that W. Heller, who was the chairman of the council of economic advisers under President Kennedy, believes that under Reagan "monetary policy is at war with taxation policy, like two scorpions in a jar. The result will be that one of them will die and there will be a new acceleration of inflation." TIME Magazine writes that Reagan's program is like an automobile whose driver is pushing with equal strength both the gas and the brake pedals. The only possible result is that either the brakes or the engine will give up. Such sober forecasts are already being confirmed by reality.

Essentially, there is nothing new in the conflict between anticrisis and anti-inflation control: it existed through the Keynesian regulation of demand and had become a characteristic symptom of stagflation: it is equally present in the attempts to implement the "supply economics." It is a truly insurmountable, an "eternally living" contradiction! We cannot fail to see another internal contradiction in the initial intent of "Reaganomics" as well. On the one hand, it called for freedom for private enterprise and state "deregulation." On the other, through state measures, it tried to stimulate business and business investments.

The most important contradiction in the economic program of the American conservatives is the one between anti-inflationary measures and the requirements of the social policy dictated by the entire course of social development. As we pointed out, the struggle with inflation is being waged

at the expense of the working people who, naturally, are resisting such policies. Typical in this connection is the sharply anti-Reagan position held by Kirkland, the president of the AF of L-CIO, who is famous for his reactionary views, a position which he assumed at the trade union congress held at the end of last year and was dictated by the rapidly increasing discontent of the toiling masses with the administration's economic policy. At the same congress, clearly feeling this discontent in the interest of the political struggle, Senator Kennedy described the Reagan administration as "the most anti-union and antilabor administration in modern history."

The curtailing of social outlays is accompanied by the growth in unemployment, caused by the crisis situation in the U.S. economy and the rigid state anti-inflationary and antilabor control measures. "Reaganomics" has resulted in the fact that under the current administration the country's number of unemployed increased by nearly 4 million, reaching a record postwar level. A wave of protest is spreading, expressed by the working people through union, youth, black and other social organizations. As time goes on, and as the social part of the budget continues to be reduced the protest will grow, for the interests of increasingly broader strata of the toiling population will be affected.

The relations between the Reagan administration not only with the working people but with the local authorities, which are receiving increasingly declining financial aid from Washington, are becoming aggravated as well. Thus, for the first time in 35 years, federal subsidies to the states were reduced by \$9.1 billion in 1981. Characteristic in this respect is the sharp anti-administration statement made last December by New York Mayor Koch, who criticized Reagan for reducing federal expenditures for education, Social Security, Medicare and transportation, which are of national importance, the high interest rates, which are undermining urban renewal, and the reduced aid to states and cities in the development of their urban economies.

The organic incompatibility between the desire to reduce budget deficits and the uncontrollable wish to gigantically increase defense expenditures is the most serious internal conflict within Reagan's economic program. Thus, the growth of defense expenditures in the 1982 fiscal budget virtually absorbed the savings in federal expenditures for social items. In accordance with the 1983 budget, which was passed in May, allocations for defense purposes will total \$263 billion, compared with \$182 billion for the 1981 fiscal year. Naturally, this will block any effort to lower the budget deficit. However, there is more to it. In its recent study the U.S. Council of Economic Priorities reached the conclusion that the increase in military expenditures by the Reagan administration is harming the U.S. economy to such an extent that as a result of hindering the growth of capital investments and the one-sided development of science, the consequences will be felt for many decades. The council made a comparison among the basic economic indicators of 13 developed capitalist countries over the past 20 years and reached the accurate conclusion that the lesser the share of its GNP that one country or another uses for military purposes the faster its economy expands. The countries under consideration could be clearly divided into three groups: the first included Japan, Austria and Canada, whose expenditures for defense

purposes are less than those of other capitalist countries and whose economic situation is far more satisfactory: the second includes the FRG, Belgium and Sweden, who occupy a middle position; finally, the third group includes the United States and England which, spending more than others for defense purposes, show the worst general economic indicators.

The Pentagon claims that increased armament expenditures allegedly stimulates the growth of capital investments in scientific and technical progress. However, the results of the study made by the Council of Economic Priorities indicate that the actual growth of military outlays takes place precisely at the expense of capital investments, for it leads to a redistribution of productive capacities, scarce materials and finances and highly skilled manpower, scientists and engineers who switch from nonmilitary to military industry sectors. A respective lowering of investments in nonmilitary economic sectors, where they can yield major economic results, hinders overall economic growth and increased production efficiency in the country.

Let us also mention the tremendous inflationary result of military expenditures which undermine the anti-inflationary measures of Reagan's economic program. Furthermore, the growth of defense expenditures and orders placed with the military sector by the government in themselves clash with the initial premise of this program which calls for an orientation toward private business and its internal reserves, the comprehensive reduction of state interference in economic life and the need for a balanced budget.

By cutting down nondefense state expenditures, the Reagan administration holds back and stops the growth of outlays for science and education. This creates a conflict between the hopes for accelerated economic growth and scientific and technical progress and the factors (science and education) which have a direct impact on this growth. It is impossible to increase labor productivity--a powerful anti-inflationary lever and factor in upgrading production efficiency--by reducing appropriations for science and education. It is true that according to "Reaganomics" the main reliance in financing science is transferred to the private sector and to its initiative, while some of the federal outlays for education are shifted to the states and the local authorities. However, it is no secret that the private sector is unable efficiently to develop basic research and research into the socio-economic sciences, which is directly related to prospects for the country's overall economic development. Therefore, in this area again "Reaganomics" cannot fail to undermine the effect of important tools for ensuring the long-term growth of production efficiency and upgrading the competitiveness of American output.

These internal conflicts within the economic program of the current U.S. administration, which have led to its failure under the circumstances of the aggravated crisis, reflect the objectively existing antagonisms in the economic mechanism of state control, which are manifested the more sharply the more serious become the consequences of the intensification of the general crisis within the capitalist system. Such internal contradictions also determine the growing disparities among the various groups of the American bourgeoisie and the country's rulers concerning Reagan's economic

policy. Characteristically, even some of its initially zealous supporters are beginning increasingly to express doubts in its efficiency and applicability. Quite indicative in this case was the incident with D. Stockman, head of the Office of Management and the Budget in the Reagan cabinet. Although one of the architects of "Reaganomics," and a supporter of a firm line in tax policy, budget outlays and budget deficits, more than 1 year ago in a talk with a correspondent of the ATLANTIC MONTHLY, Stockman criticized quite sharply the administration's economic course, letting it be understood that it was unable to eliminate the current economic crisis, reduce unemployment and eliminate the budget deficit. Recently M. Widenbaum, chairman of the president's council of economic advisers, and another architect of "Reaganomics," Jordan, another member of that council, Rashish, deputy secretary of state for economic affairs, Hormats, assistant secretary of state for the economy and enterprise, and others, have recently resigned as well. Regardless of the reasons they gave, it is obvious that it is a question of an actual admission on their part of the failure of an economic policy they actively promoted.

The eclectic nature of the "theoretical" foundations of the "supply economics," with its numerous conflicting and even mutually exclusive elements borrowed from various bourgeois political economic schools of thought, made the economic program of the Republican party from the very beginning the result of a "collective" project, artificial compromises and political passions, which is a very unreliable foundation for state control of the U.S. economy. With complete justification "Reaganomics" has been described as a policy of risk, for it contains more voluntaristic elements of "resolve" than results of a planned analysis. Reality has confirmed the entire substantiation of the warnings formulated by its critics both within the United States and abroad.

The "Heritage Foundation," a right-wing influential research organization, which formulated the Republican electoral program, is already charging Reagan with "administrative bankruptcy" and "insufficient political sensitivity." The American press is criticizing his administration for trying simultaneously to be chasing three rabbits running in different directions--increasing defense expenditures, reducing taxes and balancing the federal budget. The journalist J. Harsh has openly written that "according to the logic of things Reagan's party should be punished for making promises which, as everyone knows, cannot be fulfilled."

However, one should not ignore the fact that, judging by their actions, the Reagan administration and the ruling class circles backing it, have decided at all costs to squeeze the country's economy through the press of anti-inflationary measures and budget cuts, shifting their main burden on the shoulders of the working people. It is at their expense, by lowering their real living standards, a means to be achieved through the attempt to return to the methods characteristic of the period of totally unrestricted arbitrary monopoly rule in terms of manpower exploitation, the U.S. ruling circles are hoping to preserve the forces of capitalism in continuing the struggle for the survival of their socioeconomic system. It is for this sake that they are resorting to extreme adventuristic measures of not only economic but political and military nature.

To sum it up, the following conclusion may already be drawn.

First: despite the failure which, under the circumstances of a deepening crisis, is being experienced by attempts at its practical implementation, the economic program of the Reagan administration expresses the aspiration of ruling U.S. circles toward a sharp turn in the economic and social policy of the largest capitalist state of our time and the mechanism of state-monopoly economic control. This a basic departure from Keynesianism and economic liberalism in general which, incidentally, is far from over. Judging by all available data, "Reaganomics" is the beginning of a strategic reorganization which, if continued, would obviously take a long time, with its ebbs and flows. In any case, U.S. state-monopoly capitalism is departing from the policy of certain social concessions to the working people and charting a course of attacking their most important vital interests. Within the "state-business" system of practical interrelationships, the emphasis is being shifted to the latter.

Second: the main course charted by the Reagan administration in economic problems is consistent with the interests of big American capital. Its purpose is not merely to preserve but decisively to strengthen U.S. economic leadership in the capitalist world. It is its answer to its competitors in the other leading bourgeois countries. Characteristically, the formulated economic objectives are synchronized with the political and military aspirations of American monopoly capital to global hegemony--aspirations which have become particularly clearly apparent in the policies of the current administration.

Third: the characteristics of the contemporary stage of U.S. economic development is that the country's economy, oriented toward the excessive use of resources, is entering a long-term period of aggravation of a number of most important problems, the solution of which through the old methods and means is already proving to be impossible. The U.S. economy must be restructured, as a result of which complex problems of reorganizing the state-monopoly control system arise. This process is not only lengthy but painful. In the final account, it must take place through the method of "trial and error," under the circumstances of aggravating contradictions. As available experience already indicates, the current American administration has neither adequate strength nor possibility of realizing its specific objectives.

Nevertheless, the process of reorganization of state economic control, initiated in the United States and based on objective factors, may be considered as historically predetermined, for which reason it draws the widespread attention of global Marxist thinking.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

WORK BORN OF THE REVOLUTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 109-110

[Review by Prof N. Tyapkin, doctor of economic sciences, of the book "Zadachi Pobedivshego Proletariata" [The Tasks of the Victorious Proletariat]. by R. M. Savitskaya (on V. I. Lenin's work "The Forthcoming Tasks of the Soviet System"). Mysl', Moscow, 1981, 253 pages]

[Text] The purpose of this book is to describe the way Lenin's work "The Forthcoming Tasks of the Soviet System" enables us to understand more profoundly the constructive tasks of the socialist revolution and the nature of real socialism and to interpret the topical events of domestic and international life, the tasks of the CPSU and the fraternal communist and worker parties in the field of building communism and socialism today and the entire course of the global revolutionary process and to serve the cause of the struggle against the contemporary falsifiers of Marxism-Leninism" (see page 15).

In order to achieve her objective, the author has ignored the traditional consideration of Lenin's work on a chapter by chapter basis. On the basis of a thorough study of the work itself, as well as its "First Draft," blueprints and other variety of sources related to this material, she has divided her study into two topics: "Role of the Proletarian State in the Process of Conversion from Capitalism to Socialism" and "Program for Building a Socialist Economy."

The first deals with problems related to the leading and organizing role of the communist party and the role and significance of the proletarian state in building socialism; it discusses the soviets as a political form of a new type of state and proletarian democracy and the principle of democratic centralism in the administration of the proletarian state.

The author clearly describes to the readers Lenin's idea to the effect that only a party equipped with a scientific theory, unbreakably linked with the toiling masses, the working class above all, and tempered in the battles for the ideals of communism is the only political force which can perform the historical role of leading society during the period of building and strengthening socialism. Only such a party can protect the working people from various self-described "tutors" such as mensheviks, Trotskyites and the left-wing S.R. of that period or from the contemporary preachers of false "solidarity."

The author consistently describes the integral streamlined system of views expressed by Lenin on the role and significance of the dictatorship of the proletariat in building and strengthening socialism, based on the need to handle the "elements of breakdown of the old society" (see "Poln. Sebr. Sech." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 36, p 195). The actions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, entirely consistent with the dialectics of the revolution, also represent the actions of socialist democracy: the soviets are not only a state form of proletarian dictatorship but an autonomous organization of the masses, a manifestation of democracy in action.

The author particularly concentrates on Lenin's theory of the soviet system. Its power, Lenin pointed out, lies in discipline--state, economic and labor--from top to bottom, both collective (in factories, plants, establishments and organizations) and individual--at each work place, in performing specific assignments and specific actions. Any case and fact of violation of order and discipline must be exposed and tried in court or by public opinion. The development of the discipline and self-discipline of the working people and the development of democracy and initiative of the masses, on the one hand, and cases of bureaucratism, bribery and eye-washing, on the other, are incompatible. Lenin taught that a conversion to socialist democracy must be accompanied by strengthening rather than weakening the struggle against manifestations radically alien to it and against all other distortions of the organization of the soviet system.

The second topic deals with problems which were vitally relevant during the first years of the Soviet system and remain no less topical today in terms of our country and the other fraternal states: increasing labor productivity, organizing the socialist competition, nationwide accountability and control, and the role of cooperation in building and developing socialism.

The author emphasizes that Lenin considered higher labor productivity the actual manifestation of the economic nature of socialist ownership and the prime source for the satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of the people and the growth of the power and the defense capability of the country. The social organization of labor under socialism and communism is its highest historical form which radically distinguishes it from any type of exploited labor, above all from hired labor under capitalism. The basic nature of such labor includes collectivism, mutual aid, reciprocal support, work by all for all and the real implementation of the principle according to which "he who does not work does not eat."

The book imbues us with Lenin's conviction and pride in the fact that it is precisely the Soviet person who has been called upon to set the example of organization and discipline, efficiency and initiative-mindedness and ability to work and to understand the public interest. While demanding strict and decisive measures for establishing order in the organization of the country's economic life and in observing discipline everywhere and by everyone, Lenin was absolutely convinced that such measures are justified by the conscious work of cultured, disciplined and skilled efforts of the toiling masses. Indeed, the socialist foundations, the very nature of collective toil neither can nor do

tolerate cases in which the joint efforts of dozens, hundreds or thousands of people are disorganized, weakened and deprived of the expected results as a consequence of irresponsibility, negligence, slackness, eye-washing, boastfulness or pursuit of profit on the part of individuals.

The author discusses in detail the Leninist ideas of the nature of socialist competition and the nationwide consideration and supervision of production and distribution. Universal control is the other inseparable aspect of the universality of labor. The honest attitude toward labor and daily concern for the preservation, proper distribution and utilization of the labor product are indivisible and nonantagonistic. It is those who work who must protect the results of their work. Such is the basic idea of the Leninist principle of nationwide control and accountability of production and consumption.

The actual data cited in the book shows that "The Forthcoming Tasks of the Soviet System" became the bedside reading of millions of party members. In our country this work was issued 207 times in 55 languages and in a total of 9,217,500 copies from 1918 to 1980. Abroad it has been published in 78 editions in 25 countries and 19 foreign languages (see pp 95-96). It is natural for this work to be so popular.

The book under review enables us to understand and interpret more profoundly the ideas of the brilliant philosopher and greatest revolutionist in history. It indicates the ways and means leading to the liberation of the toiling masses from capitalist oppression, the creation of a socialist society and its advance toward communism.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE NEW SOCIETY; METHODOLOGICAL RESEARCH ASPECTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 110-116

[Review by Professor O. Vasil'yev, doctor of economic sciences, and Professor M. Dobruskin, doctor of philosophical sciences, Kharkov, of the following books: "Formirovaniye Sotsial'noy Odnorodnosti Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva" [Shaping the Social Homogeneity of Socialist Society]. F. R. Filippov and G. A. Slesarev, responsible editors. Nauka, Moscow, 1981, 169 pp; "Dialektika Razvitiya Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva" [Dialectics of Development of the Socialist Society]. Yu. A. Krasin and Kh. N. Momdzhyan, responsible editors. Mysl', Moscow, 1980, 276 pp; "Razvitoy Sotsializm i Aktual'nyye Problemy Nauchnogo Kommunizma" [Developed Socialism and Topical Problems of Scientific Communism]. Ts. A. Stepanyan and A. S. Frish, responsible editors. Nauka, Moscow, 1979, 334 pp; "Sotsiel'naya Struktura Sel'skogo Naseleniya SSSR na Etape Razvitogo Sotsializma" [Social Structure of the Rural Population in the USSR on the Developed Socialist Stage]. By V. I. Staroverov. F. R. Filippov, responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 326 pp; "Sotsial'naya Struktura Sovetskogo Obshchestva i Sotsialisticheskii Obraz Zhizni" [Social Structure of the Society and Socialist Way of Life]. Materials of the Ninth World Sociological Congress. T. V. Ryabushkin, editor. Moscow, 1978, Part I, 207 pp; Part II, 213 pp]

[Text] One of the main laws of transition from socialism to communism is the elimination of socioclass differences in society and the establishment of its total social homogeneity.

This process is objective in nature but takes place not spontaneously but deliberately, through the purposeful activities of the toiling masses headed by the communist party. Knowledge of the processes governing the development of social relations and changes in the social structure, described by V. I. Lenin as early as in the pre-October period, is a major prerequisite governing the party's social policy. "The social structures of society and the system," he pointed out, "are characterized by changes without the clarification of which no single step can be taken in any area of social activities. The clarification of such changes determines the question of the future...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 20, p 186). The importance of such a clarification has immeasurably increased under mature socialist conditions, when the party is successfully resolving the most important problems of the comprehensive scientific management of society and the state and long-term improvements in the system of planning and forecasting Soviet economic and social development.

As was pointed out at the 26th CPSU Congress, our party has always paid constant attention to problems of development of the socioclass structure in Soviet society.

The 26th CPSU Congress profoundly studied the development of the social structure of Soviet society and its socioclass, demographic, professional, and territorial aspects, pointing out the increasing interrelationship between economic, sociopolitical and spiritual progress, on the one hand, and the accelerated process of elimination of socioclass boundaries.

In this respect the idea expressed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the congress to the effect that "the establishment of a classless social structure will take place in its main and essential features within the historical framework of mature socialism" is of major theoretical and practical-political significance. This conclusion is an example of the creative development of the theory of scientific communism and a profound summation of the processes of social development in the USSR and the results achieved in their study.

Relying on the basic concepts elaborated at the 24th and 25th CPSU Congresses, during the 1970s the Soviet scientists did extensive work to refine the concepts of the social structure, its basic components, internal breakdown and definition of the leading role of the working class and, particularly, the processes of elimination of social boundaries within society. A study of some scientific works in this area has already been published in KOMMUNIST (No 9, 1978).

The present review considers the new works published over the past several years.

They cover a broad range of problems. Thus, the theoretical study "Razvitoy Sotsializm i Aktual'nyye Problemy Nauchnogo Kommunizma," prepared by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy, deals primarily with the sociopolitical problems of socialism. The two-volume publication by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research "Sotsial'naya Struktura Sovetskogo Obshchestva i Sotsialisticheskiy Obraz Zhizni" considers a number of problems of socialist social relations, including the social structure of Soviet society and its ties with the socialist way of life in their various aspects. The book "Sotsial'naya Struktura Sel'skogo Naseleniya SSSR na Etape Razvitogo Sotsializma" by V. I. Staroverov discusses the same topic on the historical and long-term levels. The book "Formirovaniye Sotsial'noy Odnorodnosti Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva" deals with the methodological and theoretic problems of the study of the social structure of Soviet society.

The characteristics of the last three works is a combination of specific-sociological and theoretical studies and a summation of extensive factual and statistical data covering many parts of the country. Unlike all the works mentioned, written on the level of the theory of scientific communism, the work "Dialektika Razvitiya Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva," prepared by the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, is a philosophical-methodological study of the laws of developed socialism, including changes in the social structure of Soviet society.

In continuing the study of this structure, the scientists consistently apply Marxist-Leninist methodology, which has been developed and embodied in our party's policy and comprehensive theoretical activities. Here the dialectical-materialistic principles of the universal connection and development among phenomena are of determining methodological significance.

The nature and unity of these principles were described by Lenin as the "inseparable ties connecting all aspects of each phenomenon (with ever-new sides discovered by history), a connection which provides a single natural global dynamic process" (op. cit., vol 26, p 55). This objective law determines the most important methodological requirement that "in order to be truly familiar with the subject one must cover and study all of its aspects, relations and intermediate links" (ibid., vol 42, p 290). It is only the comprehensive study of a given phenomenon in its development that blocks the adoption of an erroneous one-sided approach.

Lenin's methodological concepts are the base of the systematic approach to the study of the social structure, for "essentially the systemic approach is the concretized requirement of dialectical-materialistic methodology which considers the studied objects in their integrity and totality of relations with the conditions governing their existence and their environment" ("Formirovaniye Sotsial'noy Odnorodnosti Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva," p 14).

The books under review thoroughly describe the organic ties among economic and social processes in the development of Soviet society as the foundations for the rapprochement among all classes and social strata. On this level the study of changes in the social appearance and professional structure of all social groups under the influence of production concentration, the development of the agroindustrial complex and interfarm associations is of great theoretical and practical interest. Also considered are interrelationships between the social structure of society and the socialist way of life, on the one hand, and the development of labor collectives, on the other. A certain analysis is provided of internal relations among the separate parts of the social structure.

We do not intend to undertake the analysis of the great variety of content of these works. We shall restrict ourselves merely to some problems, above all that of the elimination of socioclass differences in Soviet society.

The books "Sotsial'naya Struktura Sel'skogo Naseleniya SSSR na Etape Razvitiya Sotsializma" and "Sotsial'naya Struktura Sovetskogo Obshchestva i Sotsialisticheskii Obraz Zhizni" describe the main way leading to the establishment of a single communist ownership, developed through the rapprochement and subsequently the merger between the two basic forms of social ownership. They describe the determining importance of state ownership on kolkhoz-cooperative ownership, the qualitative reorganization of labor tools and the organization and management of its production process. Using materials from the Moldavian SSR and some RSFSR oblasts, the authors analyze the gradual rapprochement between the content and conditions of labor in agriculture and industry, the curtailed share of workers engaged in unskilled physical labor,

and the increased share of essentially intellectual skilled workers. A certain share of kolkhoz members has acquired industrial skills. Greater opportunities exist for the fuller utilization of rural manpower and for eliminating the seasonal nature of kolkhoz labor. Thus, the annual working time of working people in agroindustrial complexes has reached 95-98 percent and, respectively their overall annual earnings have become considerably greater than those of kolkhoz or sovkhoz workers. The intensification of these processes is assisted by the activities of interfarm, kolkhoz-sovkhoz and other associations. Here, as the authors of "Dialektika Razvitiya Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva" point out, a marginal social worker stratum develops whose work is based on the combination of both forms of socialist ownership, while most of the kolkhoz members become even closer to the sovkhoz workers in terms of labor conditions and way of life.

Agroindustrial integration led to the creation of a new type of labor collective in which all Soviet classes and social strata are directly represented and in which favorable conditions are created for contacts among them and for reciprocal exchange of production-technical experience, knowledge and cultural values, and for the elimination of social boundaries. Few studies have been made as yet of such collectives and their tremendous opportunities have not been defined. It is already clear, however, that they reformulate and resolve anew many problems related to production, culture, and the social development of the working people. The appearance of such large and complex labor collectives has brought about the question of creating large sociocultural institutions consistent with the new requirements and able to satisfy the growing cultural needs of the working people.

The further development of the country's agroindustrial complex, stipulated in the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, is a qualitatively new level of agroindustrial integration. It includes agriculture, its servicing industrial sectors and a consistent infrastructure and must develop as an integral entity. This will offer new opportunities for the social development and rapprochement between town and country and the working class and kolkhoz peasantry. The same direction is followed in the systematic implementation of agricultural production specialization and concentration based on interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration and the creation in sovkhozes and kolkhozes of auxiliary industrial enterprises for processing agricultural commodities.

The further technical retooling of agriculture on the basis of a new technology, planned by the party, will narrow even more significantly the gap between the labor intensiveness of the worker and the kolkhoz member. This will be one of the important material prerequisites for the advancement of our society toward total social homogeneity.

The book by V. I. Staroverov provides a thorough study of the social nature and professional structure of the kolkhoz peasantry. The author defines it as a socialist class which developed as a result of the implementation of Lenin's cooperative plan, the reorganization of petty-peasant production into a large-scale collective highly mechanized socialist production system. The

author emphasizes the common basic interests shared by the working class and its ally--the kolkhoz peasantry--in the struggle for building a socially homogenous communist society.

Also described are the characteristics of the peasantry which distinguish it from the working class. The author notes that the kolkhoz-cooperative form of socialist ownership, related to the group socialization of productive capital, determines the specific nature of the peasantry in the areas of production and distribution. Other class differences are indicated as well.

The definition of the peasantry includes an important characteristic which, according to the author, enables us to distinguish it from the kolkhoz intelligentsia: the fact that it is engaged primarily in physical labor. The work "Dialektika Razvitiya Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva" describes this characteristic in the study of intraclass differences within the kolkhoz peasantry from the viewpoint of the nature of their work. Three groups of workers may be distinguished within the structure of the kolkhoz peasantry: (1) Skilled mechanized workers; (2) Skilled manual workers; (3) Underskilled and unskilled workers. The author provides interesting data on the dynamics of the development of these groups and changes in their percentage among the kolkhoz members between 1960 and 1978. Its share in the first group more than doubled; in the second it increased by almost one-half while in the third it declined by nearly one-half. Therefore, skilled cadres today account for 63.3 percent of the entire kolkhoz peasantry. Let us note for comparison's sake that the share of workers with average and high skills account for 64.5 percent in the sovkhozes and 73 percent in industry (see pp 33, 75, 77).

The work "Dialektika Razvitiya Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva" describes the ways to surmount intraclass differences within the working class and the peasantry and leads to the substantiated conclusion that "the trend toward an increased social homogeneity imbues both interclass and intraclass relations and the entire system of social relations within developed socialism.... Such is the most important dialectical law governing the development of the social structure of the mature socialist society" (p 103). The establishment of the full social homogeneity of society also presumes the elimination of social disparities between workers engaged in mental and physical labor in terms of nature and content.

One of the directions in resolving this problem, as is pointed out in "Razvitoy Sotsializm i Aktual'nyye Problemy Nauchnogo Kommunizma," is to improve the organizational forms of economic and production management. The book describes the economic and social consequences of the creation of scientific-production associations which combine production with scientific research and engineering design. In the course of the transformation of science into a direct social production force a process of elimination of major disparities between workers engaged in mental and physical labor takes place and a new type of worker develops, organically combining within his activities the elements of both varieties of labor (see p 198). As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has pointed out, today our working class consists of dozens of millions of educated, technically knowledgeable and politically mature people

whose work is becoming increasingly similar to that of engineering and technical personnel. The social activeness of the workers and their participation in the administration of the country have increased considerably.

The substantial changes which have taken place in the cultural-technical and educational standards of the working class and the peasantry have led to the appearance as part of the social classes of large groups of people whose activities combine highly skilled physical labor with mental work. Such groups bordering the intelligentsia are described in our publications as "intellectual workers" and "intellectual kolkhoz members," in the course of whose activities the social boundaries separating individual classes and intelligentsia strata disappear most rapidly. Studies have indicated that "the real growth of such border strata ... clearly proves the existence and growth of elements of social homogeneity and embryos of the merger of social groups already today" ("Dialektika Razvitiya Sotsialisticheskogo Obshestva," p 101).

The idea of the "merger embryos" expresses the dialectics of changes within social groups, the appearance of elements of the new within the old and their gradual ripening and development, for in any social phenomenon "in the course of its development ... one always finds vestiges of the past, foundations of the present and embryos of the future...." (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 1, p 181). The authors justifiably oppose the underestimating of the new phenomena in the development of the social structure and anticipations expressed in premature conclusions, against which the party cautions.

Let us emphasize that as a whole the process of elimination of boundaries between mental and physical labor is rather complex and lengthy and will be completed only during the higher phase of communism, as anticipated by Lenin, who pointed out that the quality of "specialists" "will remain a special stratum until the highest level of development of communist society has been reached...." (op cit., vol 44, p 351). Let us point out that, as they cite Lenin's statement, the authors of one of the works (as many others not considered here) use the word "specialist" instead of "intelligentsia," thus groundlessly extending Lenin's stipulation to the entire intelligentsia at large (see "Dialektika Razvitiya Sotsialisticheskogo Obshestva," p 106). In the light of Lenin's prognosis, however, there are grounds to assume that such groups of the intelligentsia as, for example the engineering-technical and the agrotechnical, whose work is closest to that of workers engaged primarily in physical labor, could merge with them even within the framework of developed socialism.

The working class, which constitutes the majority of the toiling people and which has reached ideological-political maturity and high cultural-technical and educational standards, is the leading force in the process of establishing a classless structure within Soviet society. Since this matter has been already especially discussed in KOMMUNIST let us mention merely a few of its aspects.

In the CPSU Central Committee accountability report to the 26th party congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev particularly noted the need to equalize

social disparities on the territorial level, so to say. Along with other features, the elimination of such disparities presumes a rapprochement, an equalization of the social structures of the populations in the union republics and large economic rayons in our country. The book published after the 26th congress ("Formirovaniye Sotsial'noy Odnorodnosti Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva") notes that today in virtually all union republics the working class already accounts for more than one-half of the employed population. The working class in the Uzbek, Kirghiz, Tajik and Moldavian republics increased by one-half; it increased by more than one-third in the Armenian, Azerbaijani and Turkmen republics between 1970 and 1979. The lesser increase in the other republics is explained by the higher percentage of the working class among the employed population, achieved previously. Also important is the fact that the number of native workers has increased considerably. Disparities among republics in terms of the educational level of workers and other working people have been reduced (see pp 27, 117).

These processes are of major importance not only in terms of the further development of the working class itself but strengthening its leading role in establishing our societal homogeneity.

The books under review analyze the leading role of the working class in terms of the peasantry and the intelligentsia. However, they should have described more completely and directly the organizing role played by the most progressive and conscious industrial segment of the working class in building communism, as the most consistent bearer of communist ideology and morality. Sociological studies conducted in recent years in a number of industrial centers in the country show that the sociopolitical and labor activeness of the workers and their participation in socialist competition and rationalization efforts are, as a rule, higher than the social activeness of the engineering and technical intelligentsia. Equally legitimate is the fact that as a rule it is the progressive workers, who lead the entire toiling mass through their example, who initiate the largest movements for a communist attitude toward labor.

The intelligentsia, the employees and the kolkhoz members take from the working class its high-level organization, communist attitude toward labor and uncompromising struggle against the vestiges of bourgeois ideology and morality. Its revolutionary ideology and morality, collectivistic mentality, interests and ideals, as was emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress, are being accepted today by all Soviet social strata. Specific sociological studies conducted in Latvia and Stavropol Kray have indicated that the bulk of the kolkhoz members have adopted sociopsychological qualities of the working class such as the acceptance of the idea of communism as the highest social value, feelings of collectivism and internationalism, and durable interest in acquiring new specialized knowledge (see "Sotsial'naya Struktura Sovetskogo Obshchestva i Sotsialisticheskii Obraz Zhizni," part II, pp 128-129). The profound changes in the living and working conditions of the Soviet peasantry and the growth of its professional and cultural standards were noted at the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The authors of the works under review, who focus their attention on the increased elements of social homogeneity, do not belittle the still-existing socioclass differences. They draw the proper conclusion that the main feature in social development is not what is still dividing social classes and strata but that which unites them--their common economic and political interests, the collectivistic production and distribution method, ideological unity and shared socialist way of life.

The efforts of the authors to establish the correlation between the social structure and the socialist way of life, something which essentially is being done for the first time on a broad scale, is worthy of approval. This is discussed most thoroughly, on the basis of extensive factual data, in the work "Sotsial'naya Struktura Sovetskogo Obshchestva i Sotsialisticheskii Obraz Zhizni." Most of the articles in this two-volume work sum up considerable specific-sociological data on the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the way of life of all social groups and, partially, of some intraclass strata.

All Soviet researchers have adopted the classical formulation of K. Marx and F. Engels in interpreting the concept of "way of life:" "...The production method ... is a specific means of activity of given individuals, a specific type of their activity and their specific way of life" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," [Works], vol 3, p 19). This very definition emphasizes the link between the way of life and the socioeconomic system and its economic foundation--the production method--with the entire system of social relations which determine both the way of life and the social structure of society, objectively establishing their interrelationship and reciprocal influence. "The production method, the system of production relations and the political structure of society," states the book under review, "are determining in terms of the nature of the way of life" (part II, pp 54-55).

The authors of some of the works emphasize the characteristic of social relations described by Lenin as "organizational." He used this term to indicate the social relations among people in the course of their constructive activities in the building of socialism, pointing out that such relations cover "planned production and distribution of products needed for the existence of dozens of millions of people" (op. cit., vol 36, p 171). This concept, formulated during the very first years of the Soviet system, is of major methodological and theoretical importance in understanding the social structure of Soviet society. Lenin's thought is extensively discussed in the book "Razvitoy Sotsializm i Aktual'nyye Problemy Nauchnogo Kommunizma," whose authors write that "organizational relations ... are direct social manifestations of objective relations which constitute the nature of a specific production method" (p 81).

Let us also bear in mind that the significance of organizational relations under developed socialist conditions increases as a result of the increased complexity of the economic-organizational problems resolved by the party and improvements in the country's management system. The need for the development of a proper economic situation and organizational prerequisites was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress.

The Leninist approach to the study of social relations enables us to understand the organic tie between the social structure and the socialist way of life, for all activities of classes and social strata are directly dependent on their social nature and position within the social structure and on the basic and specific interests and level of consciousness and social relations which develop between them.

The socialist way of life, which developed only as a result of the victory of socialism, becomes the same for all classes and social strata within Soviet society under developed socialist conditions. Since its social structure still retains socioclass differences, they are reflected in the characteristics of the way of life of the individual classes and social strata and in their sociopsychological and cultural aspects.

The elimination of the socioclass differences and the progress of society toward total social homogeneity leads to improvements in the socialist way of life and to its gradual development into a communist way of life. At the same time, the existing way of life influences the social structure as well as the entire system of social relations, for it is precisely in the course of work for the good of society that the people themselves change, all classes and social strata gain their fullest and most progressive development, gradually eliminating their social disparities and merging within a single classless collective of working people, into a society of workers of a new type.

All the works under review study the question of the correlation between the social structure of society and labor collectives, industrial above all. The formulation of this question is determined by their increased role in the developed socialist society, which has been repeatedly pointed out by the party. The labor collectives are the basic cells of our entire economic, political and social organism. Their activities reflect the entire economic, political and spiritual life of society.

In studying the activities of production collectives in light of the party's documents, the Soviet sociologists bring to light their social nature. They analyze the processes occurring in the collectives and clarify their functions. The labor collective is considered a form of manifestation of the social structure of Soviet society, as a social organization for the labor and social activeness of the people characterized by coincidental social, group and individual interests and objectives.

The works try to break down the basic processes which characterize the activities of labor collectives--improvements in working and living conditions, ensuring the manifestation of creative forces and satisfaction of requirements, improvements in the means of activity of the working people, enhancement of the level of consciousness and activeness, and improvements in the social structure, i.e., the elimination of socioclass differences and the strengthening of unity among all groups of working people (see "Sotsial'naya Struktura Sovetskogo Obshchestva i Sotsialisticheskiy Obraz Zhizhni," part II, pp 41-42).

While positively assessing the study of labor collectives, let us also point out that the study does not include an important aspect of the activities of labor collectives such as their political function which was discussed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his speech on the draft USSR Constitution and at the 17th Trade Unions Congress. The works under review do not take into consideration the role of the labor collective as a structural element of the political system of Soviet society and as a subject of administration at different levels, which has been legally codified in the new constitution.

Naturally, like the economic and social, the political functions are far from identically manifested among the different labor collectives (industrial, institutional, scientific, and others) or at different levels (plant, shop, brigade, etc.). That is why they must be correspondingly differentiated in the study of labor collectives. Such studies are absolutely necessary in managing the activities of labor collectives and implementing the party's social policy aimed at eliminating socioclass disparities and strengthening the social and ideological-political unity within society.

The book "Razvitoy Sotsializm i Aktual'nyye Problemy Nauchnogo Kommunizma" studies the objective foundation of this unity--the common basic interests and objectives of all working people. It describes the common nature of the basic interests and objectives of all working people and their subjective foundation--the socialist position taken by the allies of the working class--the peasantry and the intelligentsia--their high political consciousness and their acknowledgement of the leading role of the working class and the guiding role of the CPSU.

The social and ideological-political unity of all classes and strata within Soviet society has been clearly manifested in the strong and unbreakable alliance among the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry and the people's intelligentsia, as one of the main laws of the developed socialist society.

As we know, Lenin ascribed great importance to the objective consideration of the sum total of relations among classes and strata within a given society, pointing out that without this the formulation of accurate tactics by the working class would be impossible (see op. cit., vol 26, p 77). Lenin's view is particularly important under contemporary conditions, when the alliance among working people in the USSR has also become the social foundation of the Soviet society and state, as reflected in the new USSR Constitution.

The stronger and more monolithic the union among working people in the USSR becomes, the more rapidly does the social homogeneity of Soviet society develop. "The ideological unity created as a result of the victory of socialism..., is being strengthened, cemented, improved and raised to an increasingly high level as a result of the comprehensive activities of the communist party" ("Razvitoy Sotsializm i Aktual'nyye Problemy Nauchnogo Kommunizma," p 158).

In the course of its management activities, the communist party comprehensively strengthens the unity among all classes and strata and all nations and nationalities within our society. It skillfully combines and coordinates the

specific interests of all social groups with the nationwide interests. The 26th CPSU Congress reiterated the comprehensive development and rapprochement among nations and nationalities, the strengthening of the social homogeneity of society and the strengthening of the ideological and political unity of the Soviet people as a new historical community as one of the main tasks in the economic and social development of the USSR.

The book "Razvitye Sotsializm i Aktual'nyye Problemy Nauchnogo Kommunizma" proves that the establishment of the alliance among workers, peasants and intellectuals took place in a state of organic relationship with the shaping of the Soviet people as a new historical community in which their common moral-political and ideological features and social appearance develop regardless of social and national disparities. The more extensive description of the process of formation of the alliance among the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry and the intelligentsia at the different stages of the building of socialism, a comprehensive complex process which plays a tremendous role in the life not only of our country but of the fraternal members of the socialist comity, is a topical subject.

The unity and cohesion among the working people in the USSR and their unbreakable alliance are steadily strengthened by their creative cooperation in the economic, sociopolitical and cultural areas of Soviet social life.

At the mature socialist stage this cooperation takes place not only in the course of social but of professional activities as well. It is permanent and systematic. It has become a mass movement of the working people with the leading role of the working class. It expresses the nature of collectivistic social relations inherent in socialism. These are the "new superior forms of human community" created by socialism (see V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 26, p 40). This outstanding cooperation, which is one of the most important elements of the Soviet way of life, is a manifestation of the new standard of human relations, inherent only in socialism, based on reciprocal understanding, trust, collectivism, mutual aid, comprehensive spiritual enrichment of the working people and elimination of social disparities among them.

As a whole, the books under review are a definite contribution to the study of a number of important aspects of the social structure of Soviet society. The 26th CPSU Congress drew the attention of Soviet social scientists to the need for further research in this area. Its resolutions and the profound analysis it provided of social changes within Soviet society, as well as the scientific program within the party's social policy, arm the social scientists and define the basic directions and key problems for further studies in the area of the social structure and all systems of social relations within the USSR.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

SOVIET BIBLIOGRAPHIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 117-119

[Review by Prof P. Fateyev, doctor of historical sciences, of the book "Knigovedeniye. Entsiklopedicheskiy Slovar'" [Bibliographic Encyclopedia]. Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, Moscow, 1982, 664 pages with illustrations]

[Text] The communist party and the Soviet state pay tremendous attention to books and publications. Immediately following the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin told Lunacharskiy, people's commissar of education that "The book is a tremendous force. The attraction for books as a result of the revolution will increase greatly.... In all likelihood books will be in short supply to the mass of our people, the literacy of which will begin to grow, and unless the quick distribution of books is organized and their circulation is increased manyfold a hunger for books will develop" ("Vospominaniya o Vladimire Il'iche Lenine" [Recollections on Vladimir Il'ich Lenin]. In 5 volumes. Vol 3. Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, p 107).

The permanent concern for the Soviet book--a powerful weapon for ideology, politics, education and upbringing, science and culture, and the strongest possible lever for scientific and technical progress--reliably to serve the building of communism--led to an unparalleled blossoming of book publishing in the USSR. Under the Soviet system books and pamphlets have been published in 56 billion copies or almost 2 billion per year. Our country averages seven books and pamphlets of different types, nature and purpose per capita. In 1981 works were published in 123 languages of the peoples of the USSR and of foreign countries. It would be no exaggeration to say that in terms of degree of printed matter saturation our country is unequalled in the world.

The tremendous scope of publishing created conditions and triggered the need for the development of bibliography--the science of books and book publishing. Bibliography enjoys all the traditions in our country. However, its development as a comprehensive socioscientific discipline is related mainly to Lenin's assessment of books as tools for communist upbringing and scientific progress and the writings of Lenin's fellow workers--N. K. Krupskaya, A. V. Lunacharskiy, V. V. Vorovskiy, M. S. Ol'minskiy, N. L. Meshcheryakov and others, who started the various types of publishing and who did a great deal to ensure the theoretical development of bibliography.

Guided by the resolutions of the communist party on problems of ideological and educational work and relying on extremely rich practical experience, and having critically studied the best global experience and publishing achievements in the fraternal socialist countries, our bibliographers in VUZs, USSR Academy of Sciences institutions, the All-Union Chamber of Books, and the largest libraries and publishing houses, created a number of valuable studies on the development of book publishing.

The publication of the first "Bibliography" encyclopedia is another convincing proof of the successful development of Soviet bibliography. Published in a 100,000 copy edition, and beautifully presented, the encyclopedia includes detailed and thoroughly selected information regarding the history, theory and practice of bibliography in general and the individual publishing sectors in particular--publishing, printing, book trade, library work and bibliography. Articles on publication activities in union republics and in foreign countries are presented as historical essays.

The authors have included thorough individual bibliographic references on book workers either virtually or totally unknown to the readership at large but nevertheless worthy of attention. Particularly well described are Soviet book publishers, printers, illustrators, librarians and bibliographers.

Information on publishing houses and printing presses is of unquestionable interest--ranging from the Moscow printing press which was set up in the 16th century to the contemporary Izdatel'stvo "Khudozhestvennaya Literatura." The compilers have extensively researched previously virtually unknown publishing houses.

The encyclopedia includes information on periodicals and other publications dealing with problems related to various book trade areas.

This new encyclopedia, which is the result of great successes in the area of Soviet bibliography, enjoys a number of unquestionable merits. Let us mention above all the clear ideological and methodological positions of the compilers, authors and editors. A number of articles of basic importance, such as "Marx, K., Engels, F. and Books," "Lenin, V. I. and Books," "The Book Trade," "Journalism," "Newspapers," and "Journals," describe the most important concepts of the Leninist theory of books and printing and the stipulations of the communist party which, at all stages, has considered it its task to make use of the tremendous opportunities offered by book publishing in molding a socialist-type personality, and most important book trade principles such as party-mindedness, nationality, idea-mindedness, internationalism and humanism.

Today the Soviet Union is a great socialist multinational state, a country with the highest standards of culture, education and instruction. As the authors of many of the articles justifiably write, Soviet books deserve tremendous credit in this respect. It is precisely books that became the strongest tool in eliminating the existing backwardness, illiteracy, semiliteracy and lack of culture.

The major article on "Publishing," and the essays on the individual Soviet publishing houses (unfortunately some of them excessively brief) provide an overall clear idea of the efforts to develop book publishing, a publishing system of a new type and the creation of literature of interest to all categories of Soviet people.

Lenin's ideas of library development and book distribution, and the party's specific program for work in these areas are the foundations of articles such as "The Book Trade," "The Library," "Bibliography," "Libraries of Union Republics," "The USSR Library imeni V. I. Lenin," and others.

The idea of the ideological line pursued in the dissemination of books and the fact that under contemporary conditions the book trade is a structural component of overall party and state work in the communist upbringing of the working people runs through a number of items in the encyclopedia. In particular, the article "The Book Trade" emphasizes that "The direct sale of books--the most important act in the book trade--involves methods of propaganda such as verbal recommendations, the use of printed and other advertising, radio and television information, and bibliographic book trade combined with mass measures aimed at book dissemination--book celebrations, readership conferences, book sales-exhibits, and others" (page 270).

A description is provided of these important ideological institutions and their tasks in the communist upbringing of the working people and the area of scientific and technical progress, entirely consistent with the Leninist understanding of the role and significance of libraries in a socialist society. The library, the article bearing the same title states, is "a cultural institution performing an ideological-upbringing, educational, information, cultural-educational and other tasks" (page 56). In exposing the groundlessness of the claims by bourgeois bibliographers to the effect that a library should not be political but should serve society as a whole, regardless of social status, convictions, race and nationality, the authors convincingly prove that in a bourgeois society the library is one of the ideological means ensuring the domination of the exploiting classes. In a socialist society the library serves the interests of the building of communism, subordinating its work to the lofty objective of the entire people. "It is the promoter of progressive Marxist-Leninist ideology, a base for the communist upbringing of the working people and their continuing education, and a means for the dissemination of the achievements of science and technology and best practical experience" (page 57).

We know that in the past decade the construction of libraries has faced substantial difficulties caused by a number of circumstances. The growth of the culture and education of the Soviet people triggered an unparalleled increase in demand for books, bibliography and information. Today the virtually entire active population in the country uses our libraries. The avalanche of publications has aggravated the problem of the storing and effective utilization of printed matter. The book is not only a product but a tool in the intellectual activities of the people, in scientific and technical progress and in providing scientific information. This purpose has its tasks, difficulties and unresolved problems. Clear and scientific answers to them are found in the CPSU

Central Committee decree "On Upgrading the Role of Libraries in the Communist Education of the Working People and in Scientific and Technical Progress," which was passed on 8 May 1974. The political relevance and specific and practical nature of the articles on library work included in the dictionary are based on this document of durable significance and effect. This is confirmed by the specialized, short yet content-rich articles "Centralization of Library Work," "Centralized Library System," "Centralized Processing," and others.

The work contains a cycle of articles significant in terms of volume and quite pertinent in content on book illustrations, on bibliographic art and on some of the most essential problems related to printing, interpreted in accordance with the tasks of book publishing, not from the specialized technological viewpoint but precisely in terms of their broad bibliographic aspect. Let us name in this connection the articles "Graphics," "Graphic Design," "Book Art," "Illustrations," "Printing" and essays on outstanding book illustrators and designers, describing aspects of book publication in the USSR and in union republics.

An important feature of the work is the approach to the interpretation of the problem of books. Indicative in this respect are the articles "The Book," "Bibliography," and "Book Work," in which this approach is described clearly and consistently. This is not only a successful accomplishment on the part of the compilers but proof of specific bibliographic success as a whole, and a guarantee that in the future such work will be able to meet practical requirements.

The encyclopedia includes the fullest possible terminology related to editing, publishing, book trade, bibliography and library work. Printing terminology, which is of a special technical nature, is presented only to the extent to which it may be of interest to nonspecialized readers. Concepts in the areas of informatics, journalistic and other related sectors include the main terminology.

The conclusion, therefore, is that this is a valuable methodologically accurate and quite original work. In terms of concept, structure and content the bibliographic encyclopedia is an unquestionable success on the part of a large group of scientists and practical workers and editors headed by noted bibliographer Prof N. M. Sikorskiy. It is the result of the efforts of the entire collective of Izdatel'stvo "Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya," which in recent years has pleased the readership by producing an increasing number of books of major social significance.

This does not mean in the least that the encyclopedia is free from shortcomings. Let us consider its glossary alone, in which we find substantial gaps. We do not find among the thorough surveys of book work abroad articles on Spain which, as we know, has long traditions in this respect. Book work in Latin America, Australia and the Arab countries has been insufficiently described. Obviously, this is the result of the insufficient study of this problem affecting individual countries and entire areas, something which our largest bibliographic centers should consider.

We find annoying omissions in the area of personalities. No articles are found on a number of noted workers in socialist culture, editors and publishers, such as M. Kol'tsov. The list of contemporary book workers in the members of the socialist comity must be expanded as well.

Also noticeable is the uneven nature of surveys of book work in union republics. Some of them (the Ukraine, Belorussia) are profound and thorough while others (some republics in Central Asia and the Transcaucasus are excessively descriptive and insufficiently analytical).

Also noteworthy are index shortcomings. The index is excessively brief and, for some reason, many terms and concepts it should contain have been excluded. This may have been the result of the limited size of the encyclopedia. We believe, however, that it would have made sense to achieve such brevity not at the expense of the index, the completeness and thoroughness of which is a primary requirement in such publications.

Today Soviet book work faces major complex and responsible assignments. In accordance with the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Further Improving Ideological and Political-Educational Work," the increased requirements of the Soviet people regarding books must be satisfied better. The book standards of the broad readership circles must be upgraded and the quality of publications must be improved.

Turning to the participants and guests of the third Moscow International Book Fair Exhibit, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said that "A good book is a powerful means for the spiritual communication among people, which could and should actively contribute to social progress, to improving reciprocal understanding among nations and to strengthening peace on earth."

Let us hope that this encyclopedia, together with all other Soviet books, will make its contribution to the solution of such noble tasks.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

SCIENTIFIC ANALYSIS OF THE WORLD'S REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 119-124

[Review by L. Arskaya, candidate of economic sciences, and Professor I. Pantin, doctor of philosophical sciences, of the following works: "Mirovoy Revolyutsionnyy Protsess i Sovremennost'" [The World Revolutionary Process and Contemporaneity]. N. N. Inozemtsev, editor in chief. Nauka, Moscow, 1980, 469 pp; "Dvizhushchiye Sili Mirovogo Revolyutsionnogo Protsessa" [Motive Forces of the Global Revolutionary Process]. V. V. Zagladin, responsible editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 392 pp; "Revolutsionnyy Protsess: Obshcheye i Osobnoye" [The Revolutionary Process: The Common and the Specific]. V. V. Zagladin, responsible editor. Mysl', Moscow, 1981, 255 pp; "Revolutsionnyy Protsess Sovremennosti" [The Revolutionary Process of Our Time] by Yu. A. Krasin. Politizdat, Moscow, 1981, 270 pp]

[Text] Problems related to the study of the laws governing the revolutionary process, interpreted through the experience of the revolutionary struggle and the transition from capitalism to socialism, have been actively discussed in our country and in Marxist publications in other countries in recent years. This is entirely natural, for each major turn in the revolutionary struggle not only means that new lines have been reached but that new problems have inevitably appeared. They require a study of the experience which has been acquired in accordance with changed circumstances, and the refinement of tasks and directions in the struggle, correlated with other factors and conditions. That is why the collective works recently published on the global revolutionary process and its basic laws and characteristic features at the contemporary stage have drawn the attention of historians, philosophers and specialists in scientific communism.

The authors of such works, noted Soviet scientists, were faced with the complex and responsible problems of providing a summed-up theoretical interpretation of the revolutionary experience acquired by the progressive forces over the last decade and their strategy and tactics. This type of integral yet broad view is necessary so that, in the words of V. I. Lenin, to enable us "to see the link binding the entire development of capitalism and the entire road to socialism...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 47).

Naturally, the individual authors and groups of authors resolved these problems their own way. Thus, whereas the book "Dvizhushchiye Sili Mirovogo Revolyutsionnogo Protsessa" outlines above all the problem in its integrity, and its general basic aspects, the work "Mirovoy Revolyutsionnyy Protsess i

Sovremennost'" considers the revolutionary movement mainly on the level of the unity of its objective content, which expresses the laws governing the transition from capitalism to socialism. The characteristic feature of "Revolyutsionnyy Protsess: Obshcheye i Osobnoye" is to trace the laws of the contemporary age through the lens of the solution of practical problems of the liberation movement. Finally, the essays by Yu. A. Krasin, "Revolyutsionnyy Protsess Sovremennosti" draw the attention of the reader to thoughts of a conceptual nature and are an attempt to analyze the mechanism governing the development of the revolutionary process.

Naturally, these analytical aspects are closely interrelated. This circumstance, however, does not exclude but rather presumes the possibility of focusing our attention on one aspect or another and the possibility of emphasizing a specific feature. Scientifically, such a "division of labor" has proved to be quite fruitful: it has made it possible to penetrate more deeply into the mechanism of revolutionary changes and to bring to light their external and eternal development factors. Despite the abundance and variety of topics the authors, it seems to us, have been able not simply to create a number of essays on the revolutionary process but to intensify the main idea differently treated in the individual works: to depict socialism as an objective guiding force in universal-historical progress and as the center of attraction of all contemporary forces fighting for social progress.

The linchpin of these works is the problem of the unity of the revolutionary process and the interaction among its various currents, considered by the authors with a view to clarifying the overall laws and mechanisms of contemporary social progress.

Today there are at least two circumstances which make the study of this problem particularly important. The first is the broadening of the global revolutionary process in the 20th century. Thanks to the Great October Socialist Revolution the boundaries of the revolutionary movement today-- both geographic and social--were broadened even further and cover literally the entire earth, all mankind. However, the main feature of the process is not merely its widening. The apparent variety of the liberation movements in different countries and areas, different in terms of sources of antagonisms, motive forces, levels of organization and means of struggle, oppose not merely the individual imperialist trends but the entire system of imposed dependence and the domination of economic, social, political and spiritual life by the monopolies.

Secondly, the very picture of universal-historical development has become more complex. Today in considering the revolutionary process within an individual country and its course and future we must take increasingly into consideration not only the internal prerequisites for social change but the changes which are taking place in the ratio among class forces in the international arena, the most common manifestation of which is the transformation of socialism into the driving force in universal history.

Naturally, the revolution within the individual country ripens on the basis of internal class contradictions. However, "wherever it may be, and whatever

forms it may assume, each revolution experiences the impact of the universal process of development of a new communist civilization" (Yu. A. Krasin, op. cit., p 212).

The very fact of the existence of and interaction among the various currents of this transforming movement of our time is based on the nature of the new stage in universal history initiated by the Great October--the transition from capitalism to socialism. The movement of a considerable share of mankind along the way to socialism becomes a determining feature in today's world history. The revolutionizing influence of real socialism on global developments is intensified as the new society moves away from its starting point, i.e., as the material and spiritual resources inherited from the previous formation change radically and as it comes increasingly close to reaching its mature forms, at which point the reorganization of the sum total of social relations on a collectivistic basis specific to the new society is completed. This thought is shared one way or another by all the books under review.

The development of real socialism as a system of countries in which the general, the decisive feature in terms of the communist system is repeatedly refracted and embodied through national specific features is of particular importance. The 26th CPSU Congress emphasized the importance of the reciprocal enrichment of the socialist countries through the experience and theory of building a new society. In terms of the revolutionary forces in countries which are as yet to take a decisive turn in their history this provides a clear example of the possibility of combining the overall significant features of socialism with the specific conditions of the individual country and to translate, as Lenin said, "the communist doctrine ... into the language of the individual nation...." (op. cit., vol 39, p 330).

At the same time, while increasing our concepts as to the ways and means of building a new society, the historical experience of the individual countries again and again proves the significance of the Great October Revolution as the broadest and most important turn ever taken in history. It proves, again and again, that the revolution in Russia, which was geographically and socially on the borderline between West and East, had gathered within it all revolutionary currents of our time and synthesized their course and results. "... The October Revolution was a kind of prototype of the contemporary revolutionary process in its entire depth and fullness," we read in "Revolyutsionnyy Protsess: Obshcheye i Osobennoye" (p 11).

The author draws our attention to the unquestionable fact that the universal-historical role of real socialism today is defined not only by the extent of its impact on economic and political processes in the contemporary world but also its attitude toward the most vital problem the solution to which determines the problem of the existence of mankind. This aspect of the contemporary revolutionary process has enriched our concepts of the historical mission of the proletariat and its communist vanguard: today it includes not only the struggle for the reorganization of social relations and their radical transformation consistent with the objective trends of historical progress but responsibility for the preservation of life on earth itself. The link

between revolutionism and historical humanism is basic and unbreakable. In order to fight for a better social future we must be firmly convinced that such future exists. In this connection the development of the struggle for peace and its course and results assume a tremendous, one could say a decisive importance in terms of the revolutionary movement.

In the second half of the 20th century history has gained a previously unknown type of "dimension." Today mankind has the technical facilities which could result in the general destruction of civilization. Peace is the prime condition for human constructive activities. As L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, said at the 26th party congress: "By defending peace we work not only for the people living today and not only for our children and grandchildren; we work for the happiness of dozens of future generations."

It is precisely thanks to the forces which can rally around themselves those who share the responsibility for the destiny of the world that the conditions which restrict the possibility of war develop on a broad scale. As the revolutionary process grows, note the authors of "Mirovoy Revolyutsionnyy Protsess i Sovremennost'," the conditions and possibilities of the struggle for their elimination change (see p 101). With the birth of real socialism and its conversion into a system of countries a situation has developed which could be described as follows: the peace initiative of socialism is converting into a permanent factor in universal history.

To the communists the struggle for peace and for detente in relations among countries is inseparable from the tasks of social progress.

The fact that the most important "internal" objectives of the struggle for social change in the progress from the capitalist to the socialist system objectively coincide with the tasks of limiting the danger of war is profoundly logical. Thus, the struggle against the social oppression of the monopolies and for the preservation and expansion of democracy is organically related to the struggle against militarism and to counteraction to the passing of a variety of "emergency" laws which, under the pretext of external threat, could bring about at all times and frequently do lead to the elimination of acquired democratic freedoms and the establishment of reactionary regimes. Equally closely interacted are the struggle for peace and the national liberation movement. Consequently, the struggle for peace and the progress of the revolutionary process are, as a whole, organically and inseparably interrelated.

The working class in the industrially developed capitalist countries is engaged today in a struggle for its liberation under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution. The bourgeois ideologues and reformists use the very fact of the tempestuous scientific and technical progress to deny the need for social revolution. Actually, as the book "Dvizhushchiye Sili Mirovogo Revolyutsionnogo Protsessa" emphasizes, "the scientific and technical revolution, which is developing under the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism, is unable radically to resolve a single sociopolitical problem. It has only aggravated and intensified capitalist contradictions.

The contradiction between labor and capital has assumed new broader dimensions and has preserved and stabilized the trend toward a further widening of the gap between poverty and wealth" (p 166). More than ever before today the instability of capitalism becomes apparent: a protracted production decline, continuing inflation, and unparalleled growth of unemployment. All of this proves that the scientific and technical revolution has not relieved in the least the working class from the tremendous burdens related to its social status.

We know that the revolutionism of the working class appears and grows long before the revolution and takes shape in the course of its daily class struggle. Before the working class has the possibility of becoming the leading political force in its country it must go through a lengthy and complex political self-education and master all forms of class confrontation, reaching step by step the level of the social problems it must resolve.

Proletarian class consciousness does not develop in a direct line by any means. A number of factors prevent the working class from realizing the liberation movement assigned to it by history. One of them is the increased complexity of the mechanism of capitalist economic and political power. Furthermore, the external appearance of the ruling class does not remain fixed. "The working people directly confront less individual owners-capitalists than the impersonal bureaucratized system of monopoly and state management in which the identification of the real carriers of economic and political power is no simple matter" ("Revolyutsionnyy Protsess: Obshcheye i Osobnoye," p 58). However, the increased political activeness of the working people in the 1970s indicates that the struggle for radical social change and for basic reorganization of society has sunk deep roots in the consciousness of the masses.

The possibility of a revolutionary transformation of a highly developed bourgeois society into a socialist society through a number of intermediary stages for which no proper prerequisites existed in the past is characteristic of the liberation movement of the working class in the capitalist countries. The essence lies not in the forms of struggle against the monopoly bourgeoisie, although this problem is of great importance as well, but mainly and essentially the dynamics of social change and the scale, pace and sequence in the implementation of the tasks related to the socialist revolution.

This substantially increases the importance of the transitional measures and requirements which may be supported by maximally broad toiling strata. The role of reforms which represent something more than a simple reformist "following the beaten track" of the old order increases. In this connection Lenin's evaluation of one or another action undertaken by the proletariat, based on conditions and timing, becomes of great interest. Understandably, one reform or another may assume a different significance according to the circumstances. As we know, under certain conditions Lenin considered strikes, even though extensive, as no more than an embryo of the class struggle, and no more than one small step higher than the simple "opposition" of the capitalists by the workers (see op. cit., vol 6, p 30); in other cases

he considered economic strikes part of the "revolutionary mass actions" (see op. cit., vol 27, pp 111-112). The differences in such assessments are based mainly on the actual role played by the economic struggle under specific circumstances, increasing its significance and saturating it with a political content.

Under the conditions of the developed class struggle of the proletariat possible changes appear which, although not directly socialist, far exceed the framework of usual bourgeois reforms and "presume changes in the class nature of the political system and the participation of the working class and its allies in it" ("Mirovoy Revolyutsionnyy Protsess i Sovremennost'," p 201). Naturally, it is difficult to predict whether a given reform will become a real step toward socialism or will turn into a halfway hypocritical concession on the part of the bourgeoisie with a view to preventing an explosion. In this connection, the level of the class struggle, the activeness and consciousness of the masses and their persistence and political will are of decisive significance. However, possibilities for such a conversion of democratic changes into milestones on the way to socialism exist. As the authors of "Revolutsionnyy Protsess: Obshcheye i Osobennoye" point out, an orientation to such a change is found in the concept of antimonopoly ("progressive," "renovated") democracy, which pits state-monopoly reforms against a program for such changes which can essentially be achieved within the framework of bourgeois society but which are also "the beginning of the struggle for socialist change" (p 78).

One of the focal points in the books under review is the description of the political struggle waged by the working class today. The working class is having a tremendous impact on all aspects of social life, not only during revolutionary periods but periods of peaceful evolutionary development. However, the realm of the political struggle here is distinguished from other areas by the fact that in this case a more or less substantial progress presumes the steady growth of awareness on the part of progressive forces. It is only to the extent to which the working class has raised to the level of ripe problems and the extent to which it is politically conscious and capable of independent historical creativity that its actions will be determined not merely by circumstantial events but by its own political reasons and long-term interests.

From this viewpoint neither the development of the working class as a majority of the population nor the growth of its education and cultural level guarantee by themselves the development of the revolutionism of the proletarian masses. The aspiration of the working class for change may be blocked by the ruling circles on the political level unless the country has a revolutionary party capable of converting this aspiration into a conscious political struggle against capitalism.

Understandably, in this case the authors of the books under review ascribe prime importance to the strategy and tactics of the communist movement at the contemporary stage. The communist movement gained new positive experience in the 1970s. The communist parties are developing the principles of pursuing a systematic revolutionary course under the complex conditions of our time and

are defining the possibilities and means of gaining the historical initiative regardless of circumstances and the great variety of ratio of forces, involving the broadest possible alliances and political blocs. The search for "transitional forms of political relations and relations based on common interests realized by different class and social groups representing the mass forces of the revolution" are of particular importance (Yu. A. Krasin, op. cit., p 171). In this case it is precisely a question of realized interests, for the objective interests of such mass forces can go beyond what they have realized at a given moment through their own political experience.

The course of events indicates that the implementation of revolutionary changes formulates particular demands regarding the art of political activities on the part of the communist parties. In this respect a great deal must be relearned. The tactics must be changed depending on changed circumstances and positive experience must be gained bit by bit. The refined forms of opposition on the part of the big bourgeoisie in each country, linked with international capital through thousands of ties, have become more varied and refined. Today the conflict within the ruling class and even the "crisis at the top" frequently do not mean that the ruling circles have totally lost their initiative and ability to maneuver. The bourgeoisie is also learning. It is learning particularly intensively during periods of aggravated class struggle. In summing up the experience existing in this respect (Chile, Portugal), one could say that there is nothing more difficult or more important to the revolution than to preserve and retain the unity and cohesion of the working class and its allies in the face of raving bourgeois pressure.

The vital importance of such unity and cohesion on the part of the popular majority is dictated by the socialist changes. However, achieving the unity of the working class and the other social forces in the struggle for common interests does not eliminate in the least the ideological differences separating them or the economic and political contradictions which divide them. "... Unity within the framework of the revolutionary majority," writes Krasin, "means the live and dynamic unity which presumes a comparison and even clash between various positions and views, and the search for compromise which do not affect the autonomy of the allies and which consolidate the majority around the working class" (p 116). In each case the problem of unity assumes an original aspect.

We know that the existence of such unity represented by a bloc of left-wing forces offers most favorable opportunities for establishing and strengthening the alliance between the working class and the other toiling strata and involving them in revolutionary activities. Naturally, it is not a matter of indifference to the communists whether or not their party will benefit from its alliance with other left-wing forces. Both they and their partners are naturally interested in the victory of their political principles. However, as practical experience has indicated, the general shift of the political situation to the left, achieved on the basis of agreements, rarely turns into a superiority of strength on the part of the communist party. Matters are more complex: the conversion of the masses from their support of the bourgeois parties to a support of the program of the leftist bloc may initially be accompanied by a strengthening in the positions of the reformist parties.

The authors of the monograph "Revolutsionnyy Protsess: Obshcheye i Osobennoye" note that this should hardly be a cause of astonishment. Neither the ideology nor the politics of the masses which become involved in the struggle but which, only yesterday, were supporting the bourgeoisie can go forth instantly rejecting the burden of prejudices which have taken years to accumulate under the influence of refined bourgeois propaganda. This requires not only time but their own practical experience. In other words, the development of their consciousness and the broadening of their political outlook have their gradual and inevitable stages which cannot be ignored but which could and should become landmarks along the progress of the masses toward supporting the communist party. "In order for the masses to have the real opportunity to compare and evaluate the programs and slogans of the revolutionary and the reformist segments of the leftist bloc the Leninist strategy recommends, without allowing for ideological compromises, an open declaration on the difference of positions on problems of the future and forms of the class struggle; such differences must be made clearly and precisely aware to the broad popular masses; in the course of the development of events, agitation and propaganda must help the masses to understand the entire inadequacy of the programs and limitations of the reformist parties" ("Revolutsionnyy Protsess: Obshcheye i Osobennoye," p 117).

It would be erroneous, in discussing the contemporary communist movement, to limit ourselves to the problems and tasks facing the communist parties of only the developed capitalist countries. The books under review prove the way the communists in the liberated countries are participating today in the solution of the complex problems of reorganizing the social structures inherited from the past. The characteristic of the contemporary communist movement in the liberated countries is that it must frequently be organized and grow under the conditions of an undeveloped labor movement. Adding to this the existence of other class bearers of anticapitalist trends, the difficulties encountered here by the communists in their activities in creating a unified anti-imperialist front of leftist forces become clear.

Today in the majority of young states the acquisition of political independence is a prologue to the struggle for economic liberation and for one type of socioeconomic development or another. The facts prove that conditions of dependent development in general do not disappear with the disappearance of the colonial type of dependence. Capitalism adapts to the new conditions and continues, among others, to influence the economy of many Asian, African and Latin American countries. The dependent nature of economic development of these countries is ensured above all by the leading role played by foreign capital in their industry. The developed capitalist countries impose upon the liberated countries their own concept of industrialization focused on the private capital investments of multinational corporations. They do not simply find advantageous the investment of capital and the gain of new markets. The main thing is for the liberated countries to become involved in a new colonialist "partnership" which ensures the constant exploitation of the peoples of these countries by the monopolies.

However, the plans and practices of neocolonialism include a basic error. Imperialism is unable to "eliminate" the growth of class contradictions and,

on this basis, the aggravation of the struggle waged between the working people and all progressive forces in the developing countries against imperialism and its local allies, a struggle which could defeat such plans and practices.

Lenin predicted that the oppressed colonial peoples will become an "active factor in the global policy and revolutionary destruction of imperialism...." (op. cit., vol 44, p 5). The accuracy of this assessment was confirmed with new strength in the 1970s. The struggle waged by the peoples of the former colonies and semicolonies against imperialism continued and their influence in the international arena increased substantially.

The liberated countries are developing in a variety of ways. Some of them choose a socialist orientation, a line of restricting the activities of foreign capital and a progressive foreign policy. Others retain their ties with global imperialism which is trying to convert them into a political appendage and a kind of auxiliary shop in contemporary capitalist production.

Unquestionably, the fall of the colonial regime and the establishment of national states in many liberated countries were accelerated by the development of capitalism which is helping to establish a new group of class forces. However, the experience of recent decades clearly indicates that no economic growth achieved within the framework of private enterprise can put an end to the poverty and deprivation of the masses inherited from the past. This is explained in particular by the fact that the interests of the individual capitalists and of the bourgeoisie as a whole clash with the basic needs of social development. The unification within a single entity of the scattered elements of a mixed economy and ensuring the economic growth and restructuring of the old colonial economic structure, as well as the elimination of the gap between economic and social development and surmounting the horrifying poverty of the popular masses along with many other urgent economic and social problems cannot be resolved through capitalism. Furthermore, "the leading circles of the national bourgeoisie consider as a rule the revolution as completed and are trying to resolve the problems of economic independence only along the track of reformist development with greater or lesser cooperation with global capitalism (which, naturally, does not eliminate the contradictions between it and them)" ("Dvizhushchiye Sili Mirovogo Revolyutsionnogo Protsessa," p 293). It is precisely the inability of the bourgeoisie to assume the implementation of the functions based on the fact that production is of a public nature that creates the conditions which determine the leading role of revolutionary-democratic parties in the liberation movement, parties of a vanguard type with a noncapitalist and anti-imperialist orientation.

As Lenin pointed out, a scientific social theory "cannot be fabricated. It develops on the basis of the sum total of revolutionary experience and revolutionary thinking throughout the world" (op. cit., vol 27, p 11). The value of the books under review is that they do not simply provide a study of the various directions followed in the contemporary revolutionary process but are a serious attempt to synthesize its most important features.

Not all the authors have been equally successful. Thus, in our view, problems related to the development of so-called new social movements (youth, ecological and others), processes which are taking place today within the trade union movement, and others, deserve a more profound interpretation. As a whole, we could say that the works under review broaden our outlook, sharpen our vision of the characteristics of the contemporary stage of the revolutionary process and help us to draw from the experience acquired in the liberation struggle lessons leading to its further upsurge.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

SHORT BOOK REVIEWS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 125-126

[Text] B. G. Luk'yanov, "V. I. Lenin i Khudozhestvennaya Kritika" [V. I. Lenin and Artistic Criticism]. Sovremennik, Moscow, 1982, 222 pages. Reviewed by Prof M. Ovsyannikov, doctor of philosophical sciences.

This year the Soviet public celebrated the decade of the publication of the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Literary-Artistic Criticism" (1972). Since then a number of meaningful and interesting works on the nature of artistic criticism and its role in shaping the esthetic culture of communism have been published. The turn to Lenin's philosophical legacy and the use of the methodological ideas of Leninism in strengthening the theoretical foundations of artistic criticism have played an important role in the intensified study of all such problems. The monograph by B. G. Luk'yanov is one such study.

The author has been able to master a number of new data and systematically to present the Leninist ideas related to the study and evaluation of works of art. The aspiration to present such ideas in a systematic and comprehensive nature, based on the philosophical foundation of Marxist-Leninist esthetics--the theory of reflection--is a characteristic feature of this work. The author describes the significance of Lenin's esthetic legacy in terms of all basic artistic-critical categories such as artistic truth, typical nature, ideals, ideology, party-mindedness, nationality and form and even more general concepts which play an important role in criticism--artistic value, integrity, and others.

The fact that a number of Leninist ideas ignored by many researchers have been brought to light by the author for the first time as an integral system is one of the book's merits. This is found, for example, in the sections on the importance of criticism in the cognitive process and in its characteristics, and in the nature and role of polemics, wit, ability to bring to light the idea-mindedness and nationality of art, and others.

The enthusiasm in the book lies in the substantiation of the vitality and relevance of Lenin's ideas in terms of contemporary esthetics and art criticism. That is what makes it useful in the current ideological struggle characterized by fierce attacks on Marxism-Leninism as a whole and the theory and method of

socialist realism in particular. The book not only enables the reader to master a certain number of ideas but once again brings to life the image of Lenin the philosopher, Lenin the polemicist, Lenin the expert on the best examples of world art and, finally, Lenin the art critic.

A good literary style makes even rather specialized esthetic studies "comprehensible" and frequently simply interesting. Such is, among other, the chapter on Lenin's articles on Tolstoy, considered as an organic blend of an outstanding example of Marxist artistic criticism.

Clearly, the limited size of the book has prevented the author from discussing more extensively some properly formulated problems (see, for example, the chapters "Summing Up Categories of Art Analysis and Evaluation" and "Assessment as an Esthetic Problem").

This small book is distinguished by its profound knowledge of the material, the attentive and precise analysis of Lenin's writings, convincing logic and party spirit in defense of Lenin's philosophical-esthetic legacy. We believe that it will play a positive role in the assertion of Leninist ideas in esthetics.

I. B. Bugayev. "Slavnym Traditsiyam Verny" [Loyal to the Great Traditions]. Moskovskiy Rabochiy, Moscow, 1981, 64 pages. Reviewed by S. Toytanbayev.

The legendary Krasnaya Presnya... is an area rich in outstanding revolutionary, combat and labor traditions.

Z. Litvin-Sedoy and F. Mantulin, the heroes of the battles at the barricades in 1905, I. Slesarev and F. Shenogin, the inspirers and organizers of the struggle for Soviet power in Moscow in October 1917, Ye. Maslennikova and V. Snegirev, shock workers of the first five-year plans, N. Kachuyevskaya and A. Klimashkin, heroes of the Great Patriotic War, M. Shamova and Z. Tyurikova, the heroes working in the rear, and the leaders in the socialist competition today... are those from whose revolutionary, combat and labor exploits today's generation of Krasnaya Presnya is learning how to live and work.

The practical implementation of this is described in the book under review. Igor' Borisovich Bugayev, Moscow City Party Committee bureau candidate member and head of the organizational-party work of the Moscow City Party Committee, its author, was first secretary of the Krasnopresnenskiy Rayon Party Committee for a period of more than 5 years. His story of the great accomplishments and people of Krasnaya Presnya is thorough, interesting and filled with the passion of the propagandist.

With vivid and memorable examples the author describes the tremendous mass political work done to promote the ideological-moral upbringing of the working people, conducted by the rayon party organization over a long period of time.

History is created by the people. The essence of this formula is continuously felt as we leaf through the pages of the heroic chronicles of the

Krasnopresnenskiy Rayon in the capital. After reading the book we walk with new emotions the streets bearing the names of the Presnya heroes and read in the Moscow press reports and articles from the "Trekhgorka" and the "Proletarskiy Trud" plant.... All of this constitutes Krasnaya Presnya, which is preserving its great traditions sacredly and proudly.

The work acquaints the readers with the ways and means of propaganda work the organizers of which try to make use of every single fact of the rich and comprehensive life of this Moscow rayon and its extremely rich history. With specific examples the author convincingly describes the manner in which the rayon propagandists are conducting their work. Let us take as an example the education of its young people in the spirit of fraternal friendship among the peoples of the USSR, which is now celebrating the 60th anniversary of its founding. It is illustrated with vivid examples of friendship between the people of Krasnaya Presnya and those of Kazakhstan, the origins of which go back to October 1917. "The party members of Kazakhstan sacredly honor the memory of party veteran N. V. Deyev," the author writes. "Beginning his revolutionary career in December 1905 as the head of a combat unit in Presnya, in October 1917 he was one of the active fighters for a Soviet system in Kazakhstan" (page 31).

During the dangerous period of the Great Patriotic War, side by side with the Russian brothers, the best sons of Kazakhstan and the other Soviet republics defended the capital of the Soviet state. When the party led the people to the hard exploit of mastering the virgin lands, people from Krasnaya Presnya were among them. They founded two sovkhoses--"Krasnopresnenskiy" and "Zheleznodorozhnyy"--in the uninhabited steppes. "The entire country," the author points out, "is familiar with the names of the order bearers honored mechanizers of the Kazakh SSR V. V. Maslennikov and A. S. Salmin. To us their names are precious also because both of them came from Krasnaya Presnya, which they made famous through their dedicated toil" (page 31).

The baton of friendship is being passed on from one generation to another. To this day plants, institutes, construction organizations and automotive enterprises in the rayon are assisting the rural toilers of Kazakhstan. Every 7 November representatives of the "Krasnopresnenskiy" Sovkhoz in Kazakhstan march on the main square in the country along with the working people of Krasnaya Presnya.

The author describes with great warmth labor dynasties and sponsors whose dedicated efforts and tireless concern for the youth are creating the glory of the famous "Trekhgorka," the Krasnaya Presnya and Proletarskiy Trud plants and others.

The author describes the extensive socialist competition and great constructive and creative efforts to make the rayon model, carried out by the working people of Krasnaya Presnya under the leadership of the rayon party organization.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 82 pp 126-128

- [Text] 1. Lenin, V. I. "O Velikoy Oktyabr'skoy Sotsialisticheskoy Revolyutsii" [On the Great October Socialist Revolution]. Collection prepared for publication by A. I. Barmenkov, N. P. Mamay and A. I. Gorbacheva. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 398 pp.
2. Obichkin, G. D. and Pankratova, M. Ya. "Pis'ma Vladimira Il'icha Lenina" [The Letters of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin]. Across the pages of the Complete Collected Works. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 252 pp with illustrations.
3. Olesich, N. Ya. "V. I. Lenin i Revolyutsionnoye Studenchestvo Rossii" [V. I. Lenin and the Russian Revolutionary Student Movement]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 254 pp.
4. "Vizit Ali Nasera Mukhammeda v Sovetsiy Soyuz, 14-16 Sentyabrya 1982 Goda" [Visit of Ali Nazer Mohammad to the soviet Union, 14-16 September 1982]. Documents and materials. A. M. Aleksandrov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 40 pp with illustrations.
5. "Vizit Prem'yer-Ministra Indii Indiry Gandi v Sovetskiy Soyuz, 20-26 Sentyabrya 1982 Goda" [Visit of Indian Prime Minister Indira Ghandi to the Soviet Union, 20-26 September 1982]. Documents and materials. A. M. Aleksandrov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 48 pp with illustrations.
6. "Vizit v Sovetskiy Soyuz Partiyno-Gosudarstvennoy Delegatsii Sotsialisticheskoy Respubliki V'yetnam, 4-8 Oktyabrya 1982 Goda" [Visit of the Party-State Delegation of the Socialit Republic of Vitenam to the Soviet Union, 4-8 October 1982]. Documents and materials. A. M. Aleksandrov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 40 pp with illustrations.
7. "Vizit Mengistu Khayle Mariama v Sovetskiy Soyuz, 12-16 Oktyabrya 1982 Goda" [Visit of Mengistu Haile-Mariam to the Soviet Union, 12-16 October 1982] Documents and materials. Ye. M. Samoteykin in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 39 pp with illustrations.

8. "Trudovoy Geroizm i Bratsvo Narodov -- Istochniki Mogushchestva Rodiny" [Labor Heroism and Fraternity Among Peoples -- Source of Power of the Homeland]. Visit to Baku by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU General Secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, for the ceremony of awarding the Order of Lenin to the Azerbaijan SSR on 24-27 September 1982. A. M. Aleksandrov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 48 pp.
9. Grishin, V. V. "Izbrannyye Rechi i Stat'i" [Selected Speeches and Articles]. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 736 pp.
10. Grishin, V. V. "Moskva -- Stolitsa Sovetskogo Soyuz" [Moscow -- Capital of the soviet Union]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 143 pp (In the single fraternal family).
11. Gromyko, A. A. "Otstoyat' Mir na Zemle" [Safeguarding Peace on Earth]. Speech at the 37th UN General Assembly delivered on 1 October 1982. A. S. Chernyshev in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 32 pp.
12. Chernenko, K. U. "KPSS i Prava Cheloveka" [The USSR and Human Rights]. Second expanded edition. Izdatel'stvo Agentstva Pechati Novosti, Moscow, 1982, 296 pp.
13. Shcherbitskiy, V. V. "Sovetskaya Ukraina" [Soviet Ukraine]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 32 pp (In the single fraternal family).
14. Rashidov, Sh. R. "Sovetskiy Uzbekistan" [Soviet Uzbekistan]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 152 pp (In the single fraternal family).
15. Rusakov, K. V. "Obostreniye Ideologicheskoy Bor'by na Mirovoy Arene i Politicheskoye Vospitaniye Trudyashchikhsya" [Aggravation of the Ideological Struggle in the World Arena and the Political Education of the Working People]. Report submitted at the All-Union Practical Science Conference on 12 October 1982. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 47 pp.
16. "Aktual'nyye Problemy Deyatel'nosti Mezhdunarodnykh Organizatsiy" [Topical Problems of Activities of International Organizations]. Theory and practice. By a group of authors, G. I. Morozov responsible editor. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1982, 352 pp.
17. Blagikh, B. M. and Vazhnov, M. Ya. "Partiynaya Rabota v Usloviyakh Razvivayushchegosya Promyshlennogo Rayona" [Party Work Under the Circumstances of a Developing Industrial Area]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 63 pp (Party worker's library, No 5).
18. "Boyevoye Sodruzhestvo Sovetskikh Respublik. 1919-1922 Gg" [The Combat Cooperation Among Soviet Republics, 1919-1922]. I. I. Mints in charge of publication. Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 248 pp.
19. "Bor'ba SSSR za Mir i Razoruzheniye" [The Struggle of the USSR for Peace and Disarmament] By a group of authors. G. M. Lokshin responsible editor. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1982, 176 pp.

20. "Vneshnyaya Politika Sovetskogo Soyuza i Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, 1981 God" [The Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union and International Relations in 1981]. Compiled by I. A. Kirilin and N. F. Potapova. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1982, 240 pp.
21. "Vo Imya Rodiny" [In the Name of the Homeland]. Second edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 415 pp with illustrations.
22. "Vospityvat' Ubezhdennykh Patriotov-Internatsionalistov" [Raising Convinced Patriots-Internationalists]. Based on the materials of the All-Union Practical Science Conference on "Development of National Relations Under Mature Socialist Conditions. Experience and Problems in Patriotic and Internationalist Education" (Riga, 28-30 June 1982). Ye. M. Tyazhel'nikov general editor. Compiled by V. A. Pechenev and A. A. Kozlovskiy. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 336 pp (Experience and topical problems of ideological work).
23. Ghandi, I. "Vneshnyaya Politika Indii" [India's Foreign Policy]. Selected speeches and addresses, 1980-1982. Translated from the English and Hindi. P. V. Kutsobin compiler and general translation editor. Progress, Moscow, 1982, 351 pp with illustrations.
24. Golikov, G. N. "Velikiy Oktyabr'. Nachalo Novoy Ery" [The Great October. The Beginning of a New Era]. Second revised and reworked edition. Molodaya Gvardiya, Moscow, 1982, 207 pp with illustrations.
25. Grazgin, D. I. "Za Temnoy Noch'yu Den' Vstaval..." [Dawn After a Dark Night]. Memoirs of an old bolshevik. Second edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 271 pp.
26. Gurevich, S. M. "Karl Marks -- Publitsist" [Karl Marx as a Publicist]. Mysl', Moscow, 1982, 237 pp.
27. "XIX S"yezd Vsesoyuznogo Leninskogo Kommunisticheskogo Soyuza Molodezhi, 18-21 May 1982" [The 19th Komsomol Congress, 18-21 May 1982]. Minutes. In two volumes. Molodaya Gvardiya, Moscow, 1982. Vol 1, 415 pp with illustrations; vol 2, 415 pp.
28. Dubinin, N. P., Karpets, I. I. and Kudryavtsev, V. N. "Genetika, Povedeniye, Otvetsvennost'" [Genetics, Behavior and Responsibility] (On the nature of antisocial actions and means of preventing them). Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 304 pp.
29. "Zhenshchiny Russkoy Revolyutsii" [Women of the Russian Revolution]. Second revised edition compiled by L. Stishova. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 254 pp with illustrations.
30. "Ideologicheskaya Komissiya Partiynogo Komiteta" [The Ideological Commission of the Party Committee]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 64 pp (Party worker's library No 4).

31. Kas'yanenko, V. I. "Sovetskiy Obraz Zhizni" [The Soviet Way of Life]. Research problems. Mysl', Moscow, 1982, 215 pp.
32. "Kommunist, 1983" [Communist, 1983]. Callendar-reference compiled by I. A. Shvets. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 302 pp.
33. "Kommunisticheskaya Partiya Finlandii" [The Communist Party of Finland]. Documents and materials 1970-1981. Translated from the Finnish by I. A. Makeichev, S. V. Smirnov, V. G. Fedorov and A. V. Fedorov. S. V. Smirnov general translation editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 312 pp.
34. Kravchenko, O. A. "Idu k Lyudam" [Going to the People]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 184 pp (Stories of party actions and people).
35. "Kratkiy Slovar po Filosofii" [Short Philosophical Dictionary]. I. V. Blauberg and I. K. Pantin general editors. Fourth edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 431 pp.
36. Laurinchyukas, A. "Vrata Strakha" [The Gate of Fear]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 287 pp with illustrations.
37. Lebedev, N. I. "SSSR i Mirovoy Politike. 1917-1932" [The USSR and World Politics, 1917-1932]. Second expanded and revised edition. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1982, 366 pp.
38. Lyubarskiy, A. V. "Rozhdeniye Velikogo Soyuzha" [The Birth of the Great Union]. Documentary story. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 288 pp with illustrations.
39. Mints, I. I. "God 1918-y" [The Year 1918]. Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 576 pp.
40. "Mir i Razoruzheniye" [Peace and Disarmament]. Scientific studies, 1982. N. N. Inozemtsev editor in chief. V. Ye. Aper'yan, G. A. Arbatov, O. N. Bykov et al. editors. Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 399 pp.
41. Mchedlov, M. P. "Religiya i Sovremennost'" [Religion and Our Time]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 272 pp.
42. "Narodnoye Khozyaystvo Sotsialisticheskikh Stran v 1981 Godu" [The National Economies of the Socialist Countries in 1981]. Statistical administration reports. Finansy i Statistika, Moscow, 1982, 142 pp.
43. "Narodnyy Kontrol' na Sovremennom Etape" [People's Control at the Present Stage]. Compiled by N. A. Zhuravlev, A. M. Korolev, I. P. Burmistrov et al. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 222 pp.
44. "Nauchnoye Upravleniye Obshchestvom" [Scientific Management of Society]. No 15. L. K. Naumenko, S. V. Rogachev and V. D. Puzanov, editors. Mysl', Moscow, 1982, 285 pp.
45. "Otkuda Iskhodit Ugroza Miru" [The Origin of the Threat to Peace]. Second expanded edition. Voenizdat, Moscow, 1982, 95 pp with illustrations.

46. Rodionov, F. N. "Mera Zhizni" [The Measure of Life]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 231 pp (Stories of party actions and people).
47. "Soyuz Nerushimyy" [Unbreakable Union]. Reference compiled by A. A. Grishkevich. M. A. Morozov general editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 304 pp with illustrations.
48. "Sovetskiy Soyuz" [The Soviet Union]. Political and economic reference compiled by V. A. Golikov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 351 pp with illustrations.
49. "Sovetskiy Soyuz-V'yetnam" [The Soviet Union - Vietnam]. Thirty years of relations, 1950-1980. Documents and materials. Editorial collegium. Soviet editors: N. P. Firyubin, Ye. P. Glazunov, M. S. Kapitsa, et al.; Vietnamese editors: Hoang Bit Shon, Vu Tuan, Vu Hoan, et al. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 655 pp.
50. "Sotsializm i Perestroyka Mezhdunarodnykh Ekonomicheskikh Otnosheniy" [Socialism and the Reorganization of International Economic Relations]. Collective monograph edited by O. T. Bogomolov. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1982, 304 pp.
51. Spandaryan, S. S. "Stat'i, Pis'ma, Dokumenty" [Articles, Letters, Documents]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 350 pp.
52. "SSSR" [USSR] Encyclopaedic Dictionary. A. M. Peokhorov editor in chief. Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, Moscow, 1982, 607 pp with illustrations and maps.
53. Honecker, E. "Iz Moyey Zhizni" [From My Life]. Translated from the German. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 367 pp with illustrations.
54. Steigerwald, R. "Vvedeniye v Marksistskuyu Filosofiyu" [Introduction to Marxist Philosophy]. Translated from the German by S. N. Zemlyanyy. Preface by R. I. Kosolapov. Politizdat, Moscow 1982, 144 pp (Small philosophical library for adolescents).
55. Shcherbakov, Yu. N. "Iskry Velikogo Oktyabrya" [Sparks of the Great October]. The contribution of internationalists to the revolutionary workers movement in Central and Southeastern European countries (1917-1921). Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 288 pp.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

END