

178165

JPRS 83323

25 April 1983

# USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 3, February 1983

19971229 129

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 6

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A  
Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

12  
168  
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 83323

25 April 1983

# USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 3, February 1983

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 6

**FBIS**

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

25 April 1983

## USSR REPORT

### TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 3, February 1983

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

### CONTENTS

New Documents by Karl Marx.....	1
Karl Marx's Teachings and Some Questions of Building Socialism in the USSR (Yu. V. Andropov).....	10
Loyalty to Lenin's Foreign Policy Course.....	26
Andropov's Answers to Questions Asked by PRAVDA Correspondent.....	35
Management Presupposes Education (Ye. Sizenko).....	37
Valuable Muscovite Experience.....	50
Guarding the Gains of October (V. Tolubko).....	63
Friendship Stronger Than Armor (M. Shtefanko).....	77
Revolutionary Behest of the Victorious February 1948 (Milos Jakes).....	81
Program of the Austrian Communist Party (Erwin Scharf).....	94
Bourgeois Culture Riding the Crest of Neoconservatism (K. Razlogov).....	107

Guard of the Eternally Young (Aleksandr Il'chenko).....	120
Urban Resource Utilization Standards (T. Sudadze).....	127
Raising Convinced Patriots-Internationalists (B. Arkhipov).....	132
Donbass Workers: History and Contemporaneity (V. Poletayev, A. Samsonov).....	147
Book on Ancient Rus' (A. Gorskiy, Z. Udal'tsova).....	152
Short Book Review (G. Rozanov).....	158
Bookshelf.....	160

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 3  
February 1983

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : February 1983

Signed to press : 15 Feb 83

Copies : 842,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",  
"Kommunist", 1983

NEW DOCUMENTS BY KARL MARX

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 3-8

[Text] Following are three letters by K. Marx written in 1869 and 1871, one of which is published for the first time and all three published for the first time in Russian.

The time during which they were written was an important stage in the development of the international proletarian movement and its revolutionary ideology.

Marx moved to London after the defeat of the 1848-1849 European revolutions. However, the difficult life of this political emigre, full of privations, did not isolate him from active sociopolitical work. These were years of most intensive scientific work. In order to develop a proletarian political economy Marx closely studied actual economic processes and daily political events in the capitalist world. London was a "convenient observation point in the study of bourgeois society" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 13, p 8). He also kept his firm ties with the labor movement. The crowning of Marx's revolutionary activity was the creation of the first mass proletarian organization in 1864--the International Association of Workers (The First International).

The events at the start of the 1870s--the 1870-1871 Franco-Prussian War, which accelerated the ripening of the revolutionary crisis in Europe and led to the proletarian revolution in France and the creation of the Paris Commune --required a definition of the strategy and tactics of the workers movement under the new circumstances and the defense of the principles of proletarian internationalism. These tasks were formulated in the appeals of the General Council of the International Association of Workers on the Franco-Prussian War, which were written by Marx in July and September 1870, and in which the tactics of the proletariat at the different stages of the war were developed (op. cit., vol 17, pp 1-6 and 274-282). Its purpose was to strengthen the international solidarity of the working class, the struggle for the recognition of the French republic and opposition to the annexation of its territory by Bismarck's Germany. Acting in the spirit of these documents, Marx and his supporters mounted a wide campaign in England in defense of the French republic.

By the turn of the 1870s Marx was doing everything possible to hasten the completion of his main lifetime project--"Das Kapital"--the first volume of

which was published in Hamburg in 1867. After its publication, reaching the readership and organizing the publicity of the work in the press became the most important tasks.

Engels greatly helped to popularize Marx's economic theory. He wrote a series of articles for European bourgeois and democratic papers. By 1867 the "conspiracy of silence" surrounding "Das Kapital" had been broken thanks to the efforts of Marx, Engels and their International fellow workers. However, most of the reviews were published in Germany. The note published in the January 1868 issue of SATURDAY REVIEW was the only notice of the work in the British bourgeois press. Despite its openly unsympathetic attitude toward the author, the newspaper acknowledged "the convincing nature of his logic, power of his eloquence and peculiar charm which he could give to even the driest problems of political economy" (op. cit., vol 32, p 445).

The members of the International actively promoted the ideas of "Das Kapital" in labor organizations. The ripe need for an economic theory of the international labor movement dictated the need for a new German edition of the first volume and its translation into other European languages.

In order to acquaint the British readers with "Das Kapital," and eager to ensure the publication of this work in England as soon as possible, Marx tried to expand his personal contacts with members of the local intelligentsia, scientists and publishers.

Marx's two letters published in London's Society of Arts and Crafts, which proved his affiliation with this mass bourgeois educational organization, provide new information so far not included in Marx's biography. Marx's acceptance by this society in 1869 meant that the British scientific circles had acknowledged his reputation as a scientist and publicist.

While clearly assessing the class position of the leadership and the bulk of the membership of the organization, Marx nevertheless gave its proper due to the scientific educational work carried out within the society by noted economists, historians, philosophers and specialists in the natural sciences and the arts. Marx also hoped to use his membership to broaden his contacts with representatives of the middle classes, the progressive intelligentsia and the workers-trade union members, to whom he was already known as the leader of the International.

The photocopies of the letters were sent to the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism by Andrew Rothstein, a veteran member of the Communist Party of Great Britain and chairman of the K. Marx Memorial Library in London. Marx's letter to P. LeNeve Foster, dated 28 May 1869, was published in the original language (English) in the society's March 1981 issue; his 12 November 1869 letter to S. T. Davenport is published for the first time.

Marx's letter to G. Julian Harney, dated 21 January 1871, is the only preserved letter to this noted British labor movement leader. Marx's first meeting with Harney, who had already met Engels, took place in August 1845 in London. It laid the beginning of a personal relationship and contributed to strengthening ties between German and British socialists and democrats.



This document sheds further light on the ideological struggle waged by the British sections of the International on the eve of the Paris Commune. The letter also sheds light on some new aspects of Marx's work on "Das Kapital." The letter was originally published in the original language (English) in "The Harney Papers," a collection of documents, Assen, 1969. The original of the letter is kept in the family archives of Harney's relatives.

The present publication was prepared by V. N. Pospelova and I. N. Shikanyan, senior scientific associates, CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism

K. Marx to Peter LeNeve Foster<sup>1</sup>

Manchester<sup>2</sup> 28 May 1869

Allow me to thank you for the letter in which you submit my candidacy as member of the Society of Arts and Crafts.<sup>3</sup> I would be grateful to you if you would be kind enough to do so at the first opportunity.<sup>4</sup>

Your obedient servant,

Karl Marx<sup>5</sup>

Initially published in the THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF ARTS JOURNAL, Vol 529, No 5,296, March 1981, London, p 259.

Reprinted from a photocopy of the manuscript.

Translated from the English.

First Russian language publication.

K. Marx to Samuel T. Davenport<sup>6</sup>

London, 12 November 1869

1, Modena Villas, Maitland Park,

Haverstock Hill. N. W.

Sir:

I am honored to send you a postal order for 2 guineas as my annual membership fee<sup>7</sup> for the Society of Arts and Crafts.

Most obediently yours,

Karl Marx

First publication

Reprinted from a manuscript photocopy.

Translated from the English.

K. Marx to G. Harney,<sup>8</sup> Boston

General Council of the International Association of Workers

256 High Holborn, London, W. C.

London, 21 January 1871

1 Maitland Road Park Road, Haverstock Hill, N. W.

Dear Harney:

For the second volume of my "Critique of Political Economy" I need documents on the use of state land in the United States since the start of the Civil War.<sup>9</sup> Mr S. Meyer<sup>10</sup>, my friend in New York, suggested that I address myself to Mr Wilson, who is the representative of the Main Land Administration in Washington. I am turning to you, being totally ignorant of how to do so. Could you act as my intermediary?<sup>11</sup>

The second edition of the first volume of my work<sup>12</sup> is scheduled to be published in Germany in the spring. The Moscow police<sup>13</sup> blocked the Russian translation in St. Petersburg while a French edition in Paris was blocked because of the war.<sup>14</sup> An "Homme de Lettres"<sup>\*</sup> in New York has suggested a translation into English for the United States.<sup>15</sup> I have declined it as I believe him to be incompetent for such a project.

We have stirred up the British working class with the activities of our International Council\*\*, and triggered several demonstrations in support of the French republic<sup>16</sup> and against the policy of the unctuous Gladstone,<sup>17</sup> who has become a subservient tool in the hands of the granddaughter of George III<sup>18</sup> and Fritz's mother-in-law.<sup>19</sup> Unfortunately, some labor leaders, such as Mr Mottershead,<sup>20</sup> a former Chartist and member of our council, have been suborned by the Society for Peace.<sup>21</sup> They cannot do any harm in London but would be able to do so in the provinces.

Recently the trade union councils in Manchester and Birmingham have begun actively to support the General Council of the International. Unfortunately, in London most representatives of the workers use their position in our council only as a means for achieving their personal petty objectives. Their ultima thule\*\*\* is to become members of Parliament by hook or by crook, and

---

\* "Man of Letters"

\*\* General Council of the International Association of Workers

\*\*\* Final objective (of their aspiration)

all they want is to hobnob with the lords and members of Parliament who cajole and demoralize them.

You can judge of the state of affairs in Germany by my letter published in the DAILY NEWS,<sup>22</sup> which I enclose.

Greetings and brotherhood.

Yours,

Karl Marx

Originally published in "The Harney Papers," edited by Black, F. G., and Black, R. M. Assen, Van Gorcum and Co. 1969, pp 215-216.

Translated from the English

First Russian language publication.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. This letter was originally published in the article by D. Allan, "'The Red Doctor' Among Art Experts: Karl Marx and the Society," which was carried in the March 1981 issue of THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF ARTS JOURNAL (Society of Arts and Crafts until 1908) and Vol 529, No 5, 296-97, pp 259-261, 309-310. The original is in the archives of the Greater London Library (Greater London Council).

The letter is addressed to Peter LeNeve Foster (1809-1879), secretary of the society's board.

2. Marx's letter was mailed to London from Manchester, where he was visiting Engels with Eleanor, his younger daughter, from 25 May to 14 June 1869.
3. The object of the Society of Arts and Crafts, which was founded in 1754, was the pursuit of bourgeois educational tasks of "encouraging the arts, crafts and trade," and proclaimed its philanthropic intentions of rewarding those who contribute to "giving employment to the poor, expanding trade, enriching the country, and so on." Within the society the bourgeoisie concentrated and directed the creative and scientific forces stimulating British capitalist development. Its social composition was heterogeneous. The aristocratic benefactors of the society were members of its leading organs. The bulk of the membership consisted of the members of the bourgeoisie and bourgeois intelligentsia and trade union representatives. It numbered in excess of 4,000 members in the 1860s.

Marx had become familiar with the activities of the society as early as the 1850s. He had listened to reports and attended scientific discussions and read the papers published in the society's journal.

In 1853-1854, in connection with an upsurge in the mass striking movement, the society tried to act as a mediator between workers and entrepreneurs and to prevent the aggravation of the class struggle. Marx drastically condemned this position when he described it as the "Society of Arts and Swindling" (op. cit., vol 10, p 61).

Marx's affiliation with the society offered him broader opportunities to make use of the scientific publications of the society's library, including an extremely rich collection of the works of 17th-19th century economists. He used many of them as sources in his work on "Das Kapital." Marx was particularly interested in the latest research in the fields of economics and the natural sciences, chemistry, agriculture and others in particular, the results of which were published in the society's journal. Journal materials published in 1859, 1860, 1866 and 1872 were used in the first volume of "Das Kapital" (first and second editions) (op. cit., vol 23, pp 387-403, 743, 428).

4. In May 1869 Peter LeNeve Foster approached a number of individuals, including Marx, with a request that they apply for society membership. Marx's 28 May 1869 letter was in answer to the offer. On 30 June 1869 at its general meeting the society considered 132 applications on which it voted, as a result of which Marx was granted membership. Society membership required recommendations by three members, one of whom was to be personally acquainted with the applicant. In Marx's case this was Peter Simmons-Lund (born 1814), a Dane who had moved to England, a noted publicist and author of a number of works on botany and agriculture.

Marx was invited, together with his daughter Jenny, to a ceremony which was to be held at the Kensington Museum on 1 July 1869, on the occasion of the closing of the society's year (op. cit., vol 32, p 261). Marx was hoping to meet here with the publicist G. M. Ludlow (1821-1911), from whom he expected a review of "Das Kapital" in the British press. Ludlow, however, did not publish the review. "Das Kapital"'s first British edition appeared only in 1887 (translated by S. Moore and Ed. Eveling, edited by F. Engels).

5. The resolution inscribed on Marx's letter reads "form filled." This meant that Marx had signed an obligation to observe the society's bylaws and regulations. Marx's last name and scientific degree-doctor of philosophy (Ph.D.) were written once again clearly on the right bottom corner of the letter, around Marx's signature.
6. The original of this letter is filed in the archives of the Greater London Library (Greater London Council).

Samuel T. Davenport was the treasurer of the Society of Arts and Crafts.

7. According to the society's bylaws, membership dues were either an annual payment of 2.2 pounds sterling (2 guineas) or a lifetime membership of 21 pounds sterling.

8. Harney, George Julian (1817-1897) was a noted personality in the British labor movement. In the 1840s he was one of the leaders of the Chartist left wing; he went into exile in 1855, first on the island of Jersey and, between 1863 and 1888, to the United States, where he held an administrative position in Massachusetts; he was a member of the First International; he returned to England in 1888. He was in touch with Marx and Engels with whom he corresponded.
9. This refers to Marx's work on the third book of the second volume of "Das Kapital." Marx intended primarily to make a thorough study of agrarian relations in the United States (particularly after the 1861-1865 civil war). Marx needed the material in order to study the appearance of land rental "in countries ... in which the land was initially not privately owned and where, officially at least, from the very beginning the bourgeois production method was dominant" (op. cit., vol 26, part II, p 36).
10. Meyer, Siegfried (circa 1840-1872). German and American labor movement leader, socialist, engineer, opposed Lassallianism in the German labor movement, member of the First International; emigrated to the United States in 1866 and was one of the organizers of the International Section in the United States; Marx and Engels supporter.
11. As disclosed in Harney's letters to Marx, dated 10 and 17 February 1871 ("The Harney Papers," pp 267-269), Harney honored Marx's request. At the beginning of February he addressed a written request to the General Land Office in Washington. In his 13 February answer, the official told Harney that "... at the present time I have no copies of the annual office reports for distribution. I will be happy to send to you the official reports for 1869 and 1870 as they come from the Government Printing Office" (ibid., p 268). Preserved Marxian excerpts from the 1870 report prove that Marx had received the requested materials.
12. The second German edition of the first volume of "Das Kapital" was published in 1872-1873, initially in nine separate issues. The first issue appeared in July 1872. The publication of the entire work was completed at the beginning of June 1873. In preparing this edition for printing, Marx made substantial structural changes and partially redrafted the text of the initial 1867 edition.
13. G. A. Lopatin, the noted Russian revolutionary-populist (1845-1918) worked on the translation of "Das Kapital" into Russian starting with the summer of 1870. He profited from his stay in London to consult with Marx. Lopatin was able to translate the second, third and beginning of the fourth chapters. The work was interrupted because of Lopatin's return to Russia in the autumn of 1870 to organize N. G. Chernyshevskiy's escape from Siberia. In a letter to Marx, dated 15 December 1870, mailed in Petersburg, Lopatin informed Marx that the jacket of the second volume of the works of F. Lassalle, published in Russian by N. P. Polyakov's publishing house, carried an announcement on the publication of "Das Kapital" in the next few months, which had displeased government

officials. "The chief censor," Lopatin wrote, "asked the publisher whether 'Das Kapital' was the work of that same Marx who is playing such a noted role in the International, and should this be the case, why had he allowed such an announcement? Nevertheless, my publisher hopes that the matter of 'Das Kapital' can be settled to our overall satisfaction and that my efforts will not be lost" (see the collection "K. Marks, F. Engel's i Revolyutsionnaya Rossiya" [K. Marx and F. Engels and Revolutionary Russia], Moscow, 1967, p 185). The Petersburg censorship committee was unable to ban the publication of this work in Russian (see KRASNYY ARKHIV, vol 1 (56), 1933, pp 6-10). In the summer of 1872 the first volume of "Das Kapital," the translation of which had been completed by N. F. Daniyel'son (1844-1918) and N. N. Lyubavin (1845-1918) saw the light in Petersburg. This was the first translation of "Das Kapital" into a foreign language.

14. Marx was referring to the translation of the first volume of "Das Kapital" into French, which was started in 1869 by Charles Keller (1843-1913), a French socialist and member of the First International. His work was interrupted by the Franco-Prussian War. Wounded at the Paris barricades, Keller emigrated to Switzerland in October 1871, where he became close to the Bakuninists, the ideological opponents of Marx and Engels. Later Keller actually refused to resume his work on the translation (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 33, p 347).

The French edition of the first volume of "Das Kapital" came out in individual sections between 1872 and 1875. The translation was made by G. Rouat. However, Marx considered the work poor and actually translated the entire book himself, changing in the course of the translation the structure compared with the second German edition and also partially redrafting the text.

15. Apparently, this refers to Namehr, a German emigre in New York, who offered to Marx his services as a translator of "Das Kapital" for the United States in a letter to Marx dated 20 September 1867. Harney participated in the search for a translator and publisher of the work: in 1869 he asked Marx for a copy of "Das Kapital" for the purpose. The first edition of the first volume of "Das Kapital" appeared in the United States as late as 1887.
16. Marx referred to a movement of the English workers under the slogan of the struggle for the recognition of the French republic, which had been proclaimed on 4 September 1870, and for giving it diplomatic support. Meetings and demonstrations were held in the big cities, with the participation of the broad toiling masses; the trade unions played an active role in these activities. The General Council of the First International and Marx personally were directly involved in organizing the movement for the recognition of the French republic.
17. Gladstone, William Ewart (1809-1898), was a British statesman and one of the leaders of the Liberal Party; as prime minister he delayed the solution of the problem of the recognition of the French republic and

objectively contributed to the pursuit of an aggressive policy by the Prussian ruling circles toward France.

18. A reference to Victoria (1819-1901), the British queen (1837-1901) and George III (1738-1820), the British king (1760-1820).
19. Refers to Friedrich III (1831-1888), the Prussian crown prince, Prussian king and German emperor (9 March-15 June 1888), who was married to a daughter of the British Queen Victoria.
20. Mottershead, Thomas G. (circa 1825-1884), a British weaver, previously member of the Chartist movement and member of the General Council of the First International (1869-1872); headed the Reformist wing of the British Federal Council after the 1872 congress in The Hague; expelled from the International by General Council decision dated 30 May 1873.
21. The full name of the "Peace Society" was Society for the Contribution to a Permanent and Universal Peace. This was a bourgeois pacifistic organization, founded in 1816 in London by the Quaker religious sect, with the active support of free trade circles.
22. Marx was referring to his article "On the Freedom of Press and Speech in Germany," which exposed Bismarck's police regime (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 17, pp 286-288).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9

KARL MARX'S TEACHINGS AND SOME QUESTIONS OF BUILDING SOCIALISM IN THE USSR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 9-23

[Article by Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary]

[Text] One hundred years have passed since the death of Karl Marx. This has been a century of dramatic upheavals, revolutionary storms and fundamental changes in mankind's destiny; a century which has debunked, leaving no stone unturned, a multitude of philosophical concepts, of social theories and political doctrines; a century of successive victories of Marxism and its growing impact on social development.

With the passing of time, the essence and scale of Karl Marx's exploits are becoming increasingly clear.

For millennia people have been looking for a way towards a just restructuring of society, a way to rid themselves of exploitation, coercion and material and spiritual poverty. Great minds have devoted themselves to that quest. Fighters for the happiness of the people sacrificed their lives, generation after generation, in the name of that goal. But it was precisely the titanic activities of Marx that blended for the first time the work of a great scholar with practical selfless struggle by a leader and organizer of the revolutionary movement of the masses.

Marx is rightfully considered the successor to all the best that was created by classical German philosophy, English political economy and French utopian socialism. But he went much further, by critically reassessing their achievements, above all because he undertook to resolve the problem which he himself formulated with depth and simplicity, as befits a genius: "Philosophers merely explained the world in different ways. The point, however, is to change it" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 3, p 4). Marx devoted all the power of his unique mind and the whole of his life to the cause of the revolutionary transformation of the world.

The integrity of consistently scientific theory with revolutionary practices is a distinctive feature of Marxism. Marx's scientific creativity could unfold only in an inseparable connection with the independent emergence in the political arena of the proletariat, which was then a very young class historically. Marx had the good fortune to see how the prophetic words of his early youth were translated into reality: "Just as philosophy finds its material weapon in the proletariat, the proletariat finds its spiritual weapon in philosophy..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 1, p 428).



The philosophy which Marx gave the working class was a breakthrough in the history of social thought. Humanity did not know about its own self, or even a small part of what it has learned through Marxism. Marx's teaching, presented in the organic integrity of dialectical and historical materialism, political economy and the theory of scientific communism, caused a genuine revolution in world outlook and simultaneously illuminated the road for most profound social revolutions.

Marx discovered the essentially material objective laws for the march of history. He discovered them where previously everything seemed either a trick of merest chance, arbitrariness of individuals, or was presented as a self-expression of a mythical world spirit. He perceived the essence behind the visible, the seeming, behind a phenomenon. He exposed the secret of capitalist production and the exploitation of labor by capital and showed how surplus value is created and by whom it is appropriated.

Friedrich Engels, Marx's greatest companion-in-arms and friend, attached special importance to Marx's two major discoveries--the materialistic interpretation of history and the surplus value theory. It is easy to see why. It is precisely these discoveries which made it possible to turn socialism from utopia into science and provide a scientific interpretation of the class struggle. It is precisely on their basis that what V. I. Lenin described as the main feature in the doctrine of Marx, to bring out "the historical role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society" (op. cit., vol 18, p 582), became possible.

Yes, Karl Marx was a brilliant scholar. But Marx was also a great practical revolutionary. It is astonishing how much he managed to do to attain the goals that he set himself.

Together with Engels, Marx created the League of Communists--the first political organization of class-conscious, revolutionary proletariat. This made him the first communist in the most contemporary meaning of this word, the pioneer of our worldwide movement today.

"Only an international union of the working class can ensure its ultimate victory," he wrote (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 16, p 336). He personally, the founder of the First International, tirelessly worked to forge an international unity of the workers. The political behests of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels to the communists of the world cannot be imagined without the fiery call "Workers of the World, Unite!"

Karl Marx, a convinced internationalist, could like no one else understand the peculiarities of the situation in various countries--from Britain to India, from France to China, and from the U.S. to Ireland. At the same time, by attentively looking into the lives of individual peoples, he always looked for its interconnection with the life of the rest of the world.

At this point he invariably faced the fundamental question: who will start the revolutionary destruction of the capitalist order and who will be the first to take the road to humanity's communist future?

History answered this question. It was the lot of the Russian proletariat to be the revolutionary trailblazers. To this day there are "critics" of the October Revolution, who allege that it took place contrary to all of Marx's expectations. They claim that in his revolutionary forecasts, Marx totally ignored Russia. Actually, he showed enormous interest in Russian affairs. To understand them better, Marx studied the Russian language. As an irreconcilable opponent of czarism, he prophetically assessed the perspective of the social movement swelling in Russia, and realized that a "most grandiose social revolution" was ripening in it (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 32, p 549), which would be of worldwide significance. Indeed, Marx was a better judge of future events than are some of today's "critics" of past events.

Engels said that Marx's death had left a yawning gap in the ranks of the embattled proletariat. It was indeed an immense loss. But Marx's banner remained in reliable hands. It was carried high by Engels himself, who headed the revolutionary working class movement that was gaining in strength. Engels was still alive when V. I. Lenin appeared in the arena of the proletarian class struggle.

Lenin was a loyal follower of Marx and Engels. As he himself said, he could not tolerate even the slightest aspersion cast on his great teachers. This was the only possible line of action for a man who did more than anyone else for the defense and creative development of all the components of Marxism under the new historical conditions, and for its practical implementation. He elevated Marxism to a new, higher stage. Lenin's name is inseparable from Marx's, Leninism is Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the collapse of the colonial system, and mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism. In our time Marxism is simply impossible outside of and without Leninism.

Lenin and the bolshevik party he founded made the first victorious socialist revolution which radically changed the sociopolitical appearance of the world. Thus, a new era was ushered in--that of grandiose accomplishments and history-making gains of the working class and the mass of the people. Thus scientific socialism, which was created by Marx, has blended with the living practice of the millions of working people building a new society.

Today the wealth of meaning of Marx's teaching is perceived as far wider and deeper by us than it was to his contemporaries. For it is one thing to perceive the idea of the historical need for socialism in its theoretical form and quite another to be also a participant and a witness in its implementation.

The specific historical ways in which socialism emerged proved to be different in some respects from what the founders of our revolutionary theory expected. Socialism won first in a single country which also was not economically the most developed. The whole point is that the October Revolution was carried out under new historical conditions which did not exist in Marx's lifetime, in the epoch of imperialism. This was mirrored in Lenin's theory of socialist revolution, which has been fully corroborated by life.

To this day the bourgeois and reformist ideologues are building entire systems of arguments in an effort to prove that the new society which was built in the USSR and in the other fraternal countries has allegedly proved to be not the kind of socialism which Marx visualized. They claim that reality has allegedly clashed with the ideal. Knowingly or unknowingly they overlook the fact that in elaborating his teaching, Marx himself was least of all guided by the requirements of some abstract ideal of neat, sleek "socialism." He deduced his ideas of a future system from an analysis of the objective contradictions of large-scale capitalist production. It is precisely this exclusively scientific approach which enabled him to define accurately the main features of the society which was yet to be born of the cleansing thunderstorms of social revolutions of the 20th century.

The cornerstone of the socioeconomic system which is to replace capitalism is, according to Marx, public ownership of the means of production. The clear-cut words of the "Communist Manifesto" emphasized the significance, which Marxism attaches to this necessary revolution in production relations: "... The theory of the communists may be summed up in a single sentence: abolition of private property" (Marx and Engels, op. cit., vol 1, 1969, p 120).

The historical experience of real socialism shows that the switch from "my own," or private ownership, into "ours," or joint ownership, is no simple matter. The revolution in ownership relations is by no means reduced to a single act, as a result of which the basic means of production become the property of the whole people. It is quite different to acquire the rights of a master and to become a true, wise and thrifty one. It will take a long time for the people, who made a socialist revolution, to assume their new position as supreme and sole owners of the entire public wealth--to shape themselves for it economically, politically and, if you wish, psychologically, developing a collectivist mentality and behavior. For they have a socialist upbringing and cannot remain indifferent not only to their own labor successes, well-being and prestige, but also to the performance of their workmates, the collective, and the interests of the whole country and the working people the world over.

In speaking of turning "my own" into "ours," one must remember that this is a long, versatile process which cannot be simplified. Even after socialist production relations are finally established, some people retain and even reproduce individualistic habits and strive for profit at the expense of others and society. All this, using Marx's terminology, are consequences of the alienation of labor. They do not automatically and suddenly vanish from the mind, although alienation itself has already been eliminated.

We are now well familiar with all this from the practice of building socialism and communism. But we also know something else, i.e., that strictly according to Marx's prevision, wherever proletarian revolutions have won, public ownership of the means of production, which has been firmly established in some form or other, has also become the main factor of the existence of socialism, its foundation and its main source of progress.

It is on the basis of socialist ownership that a powerful economy, developing on a planned basis, has been created in our country. This economy makes it possible to pose and resolve national economic and social, large-scale and complex problems. It goes without saying that this potential of ours is not realized by itself.

Both problems and serious difficulties arise. Their origin may be different but it is never related to the essence of public, collective ownership, which has been firmly established and proved its advantages. On the contrary, a considerable part of the shortcomings, which occasionally upset normal work in one sector of our national economy or another, are caused by deviations from the norms and requirements of economic life, whose keystone is the socialist ownership of the means of production.

Consider, for example, the question of conservation, of the rational use of material, financial and labor resources. The implementation of the current five-year plan and the development of our economy in the future largely depend on the solution of that problem. The point at issue is the observance of the necessary norm of economic management prescribed by socialist ownership, whose essence lies in a thrifty attitude to national property and in showing initiative and vigor in multiplying it. The whole society has to pay for violations of that norm, and has the right to strictly call to account those who squander its wealth because of a half-hearted attitude to duty, want of skill or selfish considerations.

Our concerns are centered now on increasing production and economic efficiency. The importance of that problem is deeply realized by the party and the Soviet people. But things are not moving as successfully as they should as regards the practical implementation of that task. What is the hitch here? Why do we fail to obtain the proper effect now from the huge capital investments? Why are the achievements of science and technology being introduced in production at unsatisfactory rates?

Naturally, the reasons are many. In the first place, we cannot fail to see that our work aimed at improving and reorganizing the economic mechanism and the ways and means of management is falling short of the demands based on the present level of the material, technical, social and spiritual development of Soviet society. That is the most important thing. We also feel, of course, the effects of factors such as the underproduction of considerable quantities of agricultural goods over the last 4 years, the need for channeling ever larger funds and materials into the production of fuel-energy and raw material resources in the Northern and Eastern regions of the country.

One may repeat again and again Marx's basic idea that if the progress of the productive forces can be accelerated it is through corresponding forms of organization of economic life. But nothing will happen before this theoretical truth has been translated into the specific language of practice. The need to consider and consistently take steps capable of giving full freedom to enormous creative forces inherent in our economy is of paramount importance today. These steps should be carefully prepared and realistic. This means that their planning must be strictly based on the laws governing the

development of the socialist economic system. The objective nature of these laws requires rejecting any attempt to guide the economy by methods alien to its nature. It would be pertinent to recall here Lenin's warning on the danger of the naive belief of certain officials that they can solve all problems "by issuing communist decrees" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 33, p 77).

On the other hand, it is impermissible for the work to be left unfinished, once we have agreed on the necessary steps and made corresponding decisions. All decisions must be carried out. This is our party's and the Leninist tradition from which we must not depart.

The interest of society as a whole is a major reference point for the development of an economy resting on socialist property. This does not mean, of course, that for the sake of the common weal, socialism suppresses or ignores individual and local interests and the specific requirements of different social groups. Not at all. As Marx and Engels stressed, "the idea" invariably disgraced itself as soon as it separated from "the interest" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 2, p 89).

One of the most important tasks in improving our national economic mechanism is the need to ensure that these interests are duly considered and combined in the best possible way with the interests of the entire people, and thus used as a motive force for the growth of the Soviet economy, for enhancing its effectiveness, raising labor productivity and comprehensively increasing the economic and defensive might of the Soviet state.

The efficiency of the socialist national economy should be judged, of course, not only by purely economic but also social criteria, taking into consideration the ultimate goal of social production. Under capitalism this means return on capital; under socialism--as Marx proved theoretically--it means the welfare of the working people and the creation of conditions for an all-round development of the individual. Existing socialism makes this provision of Marx's theory a living reality.

Indeed, however multifaceted the tasks now facing the Soviet economy may be, they all merge, in the final count, into one: ensuring the growth of the well-being of the working people, and creating material conditions for the further flourishing of their spiritual and cultural life and social activity. That is what determines the general line of the CPSU's economic policy and what is reflected in the documents of the 26th party congress, the Food Program under way, and the party's decisions on specific economic matters. It is clear that all this also determines many, very many, things in our approach to production efficiency and intensification. In other words, the problems of enhancing economic efficiency are resolved in our country in the interests of the working people and not at their expense. This does not simplify our work but allows us to conduct it while relying on the inexhaustible strength, knowledge and creative energies of the entire Soviet people.

Marx believed that the historical mission of the system that supersedes capitalism is to make work, once an unpleasant and compulsory duty, a primary vital need of the individual. Now we know from our own experience how much

must be done on the long way to realizing this idea in full. However, the decisive line has already been crossed. An end was put to the situation characteristic of capitalism when the work product is pitted against the worker as an alien and even inimical entity, and the greater the physical and mental efforts he exerts, the more powerful his oppressors become. The greatest and indisputable gain of socialism is that it has created conditions that ensure for every person the right to work. This is work, conscious and conscientious work, with a lot of initiative in it, work for the benefit of society, and is recognized in our society as the highest gauge of the merit and public prestige of a personality.

Experience has also proved that the socialization of the means and objects of production is a necessary and effective factor for shaping a social climate characteristic of socialism, a climate in which man has no concern for the future, a climate of collectivistic spirit and comradely assistance, moral health and social optimism. All this combined means a basically new quality of life for the working masses, a quality not reduced to material comfort only but which encompasses the entire range of a rich life.

Understandably, all this cannot be achieved overnight, the very day after the institution of public property. Therefore this cannot be assessed immediately as "ready," accomplished socialism. The change in property relations does not eliminate by itself all the negative features of human relationships which have been acquired over the centuries. The point is that without such change, any "model" of socialism, however attractively clothed, will prove unviable and will remain alive only in the imagination of its architects.

This is an axiom of Marxism which holds as true today as it did a century ago.

Such axioms of Marxism should be approached with care, for life itself severely punishes their misunderstanding or neglect. It was at the cost of great effort and even mistakes that the full significance of Marx's views on distribution was appreciated. He pointed out persistently that in the first phase of communism every working man gets back from society, after all deductions, as much as he himself gives to it, in short, strictly according to the quantity and quality of his work (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 19, p 18). This agrees with the basic principle of socialism: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." As an impeccable democrat and humanist, Marx strongly opposed leveling and categorically rejected demagogic or naive talk, also frequent in his time, on socialism as "general equality" in distribution and consumption.

Today the social and economic significance and tremendous political weight of these judgments by the founder of scientific communism have become clear through practice and the experience of many socialist countries. Indeed, distribution relations directly and immediately affect the interests of one and all. The nature of distribution is essentially one of major indicators of the degree of social equality possible under socialism. Any attempts to exceed this level of possibility, to lunge ahead to communist forms of distribution without assessing accurately the contribution made by everyone with

his work toward creating material and spiritual goods, may and do give rise to undesirable things.

Thus, it has become obvious that any violation of the objective economic demand for a faster growth of labor productivity is most definitely inadmissible.

A wage increase, initially making a favorable impression but undertaken out of contact with this decisive factor, eventually yields a negative effect on the entire economic life. Specifically, it engenders requirements which cannot be fully met at a given level of production and hampers steps to eliminate shortages, with all their ugly consequences, justly resented by the working people.

Proper distribution under socialism presupposes, of course, that the money in possession of the population should be matched by the existence of adequate amounts of various consumer goods and services. The determining factor here is the level of development of productive forces. It is impossible, of course, to satisfy requirements that exceed our possibilities. At the same time it has been and remains our duty to work in two directions: firstly, to ensure a steady growth of social production and, on this basis, a rise in the material and cultural standards of the people, and secondly, to encourage in every way the growth of the material and cultural requirements of the Soviet people.

Complete social equality does not come overnight, and in a finished form. It takes society a great deal of time and effort to grow up to it, to reach it. Society must develop its productive forces to the level of the material and technical basis of communism. It should cultivate in every working person high consciousness and standards, professionalism and the ability to use rationally the benefits of socialism.

Until this has been achieved, relations of distribution and strict control over the measure of work and consumption should be in the center of attention of the party which is leading socialist society. The CPSU always sees to it that the principle of socialist distribution discovered by Marx is applied everywhere unflinchingly and that it is practiced better and more fully. If this principle is violated we face unearned income, shoddy workmanship, so-called rolling stones, shirkers and slackers, who actually sponge on society and live at the expense of the mass of conscientious workers. This must not be tolerated. It is a kind of parasitism on the humanism of our system.

Work and work alone, its actual results and not somebody's subjective desire or good will, should determine the level of material well-being of every citizen. This is entirely consistent with the spirit and content of Marx's views on distribution under socialism.

We have a long-established system of material and moral work incentives. It keeps serving us quite well in the struggle for socialism and communism. But today, this system, like its forms and practical application, evidently needs to be further improved. It is important that not only good work be well

rewarded and get the public recognition it deserves. It is also necessary that material and moral incentives, combined with an efficient organization of labor, should maintain and cultivate in the people an awareness of the usefulness of their efforts and of the goods they produce. This system of material and moral incentives must eventually strengthen in the workers a feeling of involvement in the activities and plans of their collective, and the entire people. This feeling mobilizes and disciplines people better than persuasion and exhortations.

In improving distribution relations it is necessary to take into account the entire set of relationships involved in the labor process. This means, first of all, a consistent consolidation in all spheres of the national economy of what Marx described as "regularity and order," which he considered to be forms of "socially consolidating a given mode of production" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 25, part 2, p 356). Excessive reliance on administrative methods, fuss and talk instead of work are especially harmful in this respect. A leader will not achieve much if he fails to realize this and if he tries to substitute systematic and persistent organizational efforts by showy, ostentatious campaigns. The objective of the party's efforts to improve management, raise the level of organization, efficiency, discipline in matters of planning, state and labor discipline is not only to get rid of certain shortcomings and difficulties--which is extremely important per se--but, in the final account, to strengthen even more the mainstays on which the socialist way of life rests.

It goes without saying that in these matters the party proceeds from the real conditions of labor management existing at the present stage of development of Soviet society. At present these conditions are such that the economic law which Marx considered the first law of collective production--saving working time--is not yet operating here in full. One important reason for this is the presence of a great number of physically hard, unattractive and routine jobs, the slow rate of mechanization and, especially, automation of these jobs.

Meanwhile, suffice it to say that the scarcity of the labor resources and the demographic situation in the country shows clearly that any further preservation of such a high share of manual, nonmechanized labor, which reaches 40 percent in the industry alone, is economically inadmissible. This is why an all-out acceleration of the pace of scientific and technological progress and the intensified use of its achievements, above all in those sectors where labor consumption is particularly high, is so topical now. The basis for accomplishing this exists in the high level of development of the socialist national economy, professional experience and the skill of the Soviet working class.

It is found in the existence of competent specialists and managerial cadres and a large scientific and intellectual potential, whose productive force becomes increasingly significant under present conditions. We must now use better and faster our entire potential and raise production labor and management standards.



We must tackle persistently the tasks of mechanization and automation of production also because of their social and political significance. For, as a rule, a person free from strenuous and hard manual work shows a greater initiative and a more responsible attitude to work assignments. He acquires additional opportunities for studies, rest, participation in social activities and production management. This also enables him to exercise his political, democratic rights, granted to the working people by the socialist revolution, the rights of full masters of their society, of their state, more fully.

Long before the emergence of the society that is to replace capitalism, Marx revealed the essence of its political features. The "Communist Manifesto" itself already noted that "an initial step in the workers' revolution is the proletariat's becoming the dominant class, the establishment of democracy" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 4, p 446). The establishment of socialism is inconceivable without a firm political power, whose class contents Marx summed up through the concept of dictatorship of the proletariat. According to Marx's teaching, it is precisely the dictatorship of the proletariat that opens the road of political development ultimately leading to communist social self-government.

How does the living history of socialism relate to these Marxian predictions?

In our country, and wherever the power has been assumed by the working class, the working people, this meant the triumph of democracy in the most precise and literal sense of the word: the true victory of people's power. The working people finally acquired the rights and freedoms which capitalism has always denied and still denies them, perhaps not nominally but in essence.

Soviet democracy which came up against the particularly fierce resistance on the part of the counterrevolutionary forces, both internal and external, came into being honestly, without concealing its class nature, not stopping at legalizing the privileges of the working people over the exploiting classes who were fighting against the new system. In its essence Soviet democracy has been and will always be a democracy guaranteeing inestimable rights to the working people and protecting their interests, prepared to call to order those who threaten the socialist gains of the people.

In the course of building the new society, the contents of socialist democracy are enriched, historical restrictions disappear, and the forms of the exercise of people's power become more varied. This process develops in an inseparable connection with the development of socialist statehood which itself undergoes qualitative changes. The most important of them is the development of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people. This is a change of immense significance for the socialist political system. It has been reflected in the USSR Constitution which was adopted by the whole people in 1977, and which laid the legislative basis for the further intensification of socialist democracy.

We do not idealize what has been done and is being done in our country in this sphere. Soviet democracy has experienced and, we assume, will still

experience the difficulties of growth conditioned by the material potential of society, the level of consciousness of the masses, their political standards, and the fact that our society is developing not in hot-house conditions, not isolated from a hostile environment, but under the cold winds of the "psychological warfare" unleashed by imperialism. The perfecting of our democracy requires elimination of bureaucratic "overorganization" and formalism, of everything that dampens and undermines the initiative of the masses and shackles its creative thinking and the living cause of the working people. We have always taught these phenomena with even greater energy and persistence.

Allegations are occasionally made that the contemporary appearance of socialist statehood and democracy is different from Marx's projection regarding communist self-government. However, the distance we have covered and our experience reveal the opposite.

Take, for instance, Marx's ideas that to govern the new society is the task of "the people organized in communes," that the essence of the new system is "government of the people by the people" (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 17, pp 344, 350). These ideas were suggested by life, by the heroic impulse of the Parisian Communards. Nevertheless, they contained only a most generalized indication of a remote goal. The real revolutionary creativity of the masses alone could provide the specific approach to this goal. Already on the eve of the October Revolution the creativity of the masses provided the material which enabled Lenin to outline a practical step toward the realization of Marx's formulas under the conditions of our country: "... The people united in the soviets must run the state ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 31, p 188).

People who know of no other power over them but that of their own unity is the idea of Marx, Engels and Lenin implemented in the activity of the soviets, combining legislation, management and control. It is manifested in the work of trade unions and other public organizations, the life of work collectives, and the development of the entire political system of our society. The point is not to seek out its distinctions from the ideal of communist self-government. Many such distinctions can be indicated if only because of the historical distance separating us from the second phase of communism. What is much more important is that this system is functioning and developing, finding ever new forms and methods of democratic development, broadening the economic rights and potentialities of the working man in production and in all sociopolitical practice--from the deputies' commissions and people's control to standing production conferences. This is the real socialist self-government by the people which is developing in the course of communist construction.

The experience of our democratic development in accordance with the new USSR Constitution requires special attention and summation. This applies first of all to the invigoration and ever wider use of local initiative and closer involvement of all work collectives in our common state work. The powers of local soviets with regard to enterprises, institutions and organizations functioning on their territories have been widened substantially in recent

years. The scope of activity of rayon, oblast, kray and republic ASSR soviets will also be increasing as we implement the decisions of the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum on the formation of the agroindustrial associations under their authority. The role of representative organs in the exercise of the primary, managerial and organizing function of the socialist state is thus growing. One cannot fail to note a primary form of production management developed by the masses themselves, such as the cost-effective brigade.

Naturally, an interpretation of self-government as leaning to anarchosyndicalism, to splitting society into rival corporations independent of each other, to democracy without discipline, to the notion of rights dissociated from duties, is deeply alien to us. The proven principle of the organization of the entire life of socialist society is democratic centralism, which makes it possible to combine successfully the free creativity of the masses with the advantages of the single system of scientific management, planning and administration.

The socialist system makes the exercise of collective rights and duties of the working people the mainspring of social progress, in which the interests of the individual are by no means disregarded. Our constitution grants the Soviet citizens broad rights and freedoms, while emphasizing the priority of public interests, service to which is the supreme manifestation of civic duty.

The gap between the interests of the state and the citizen, which exists under capitalism, has been closed in our society. Regrettably, however, there are still people who are trying to pit their selfish interests against society and its other members. In this light we so realize the obvious need for the education or occasionally the reeducation of some persons, for combatting encroachments upon socialist law and order and the norms of our collectivist life. This is no "flouting of human rights," on which bourgeois propaganda hypocritically speculates, but the real humanism and democracy, which stand for administration by the will of the majority, in the interest of all working people.

The CPSU places the interests of the people, the interests of the society as a whole, above everything else. It pays daily attention to providing conditions which stimulate the creative activities of the working people and their social activeness, widening the framework of independence of industrial enterprises, sovkhozes and kolkhozes. This activeness, this initiative is a matter of the feasibility of party plans, growth of its strength, and, in the final analysis, a prerequisite for the implementation of the program for building communism.

As the nucleus of the Soviet political system, the party itself sets an example of democratic organization in all of its activities. It elaborates and develops democratic principles, which become part and parcel of socialist life in all areas. It is one of the most important manifestations of the party's guiding role in social life, and its inspiring influence on the masses.

Lenin wrote, while analyzing the Marxian methodological approach to defining the main features of the new society, that "There is not even a trace of an attempt on Marx's part to fabricate a utopia, to indulge in idle guesswork about what cannot be known ... Instead of scholastically invented, "concocted" definitions and fruitless semantic disputes (What is socialism? What is communism?), Marx analyzes what might be called the stages of the economic maturity of communism" (op. cit., vol 25, pp 459, 471). It is precisely on the basis of such an analysis that Marx developed his theory of two stages in the development of the single communist system used by the CPSU and other fraternal parties. It is precisely on this basis and by generalizing the new historical experience that Lenin comprehensively developed the theory of building socialism and communism. We proceed from these provisions today too in resolving what Marx, Engels and Lenin considered one of the most difficult questions, that of the specific forms of transition to communism.

The most important features of present-day Soviet society are reflected in the concept of developed socialism. This concept convincingly shows both the dialectical unity of real successes in the building of socialism, in accomplishing many economic, social and cultural tasks of the first phase of communism, and the growing sprouts of a communist future and outstanding problems remaining from yesterday. This means that it will take some time to bring up the lagging rear and to forge ahead. We must have a sober idea of where we stand. To anticipate means to formulate unattainable tasks; to be satisfied with past achievements means to fail to use everything at our disposal. What is required now is to see our society in its real dynamics, with all its opportunities and needs.

The elaboration of the concept of developed socialism was placed first by the 26th CPSU Congress among all accomplishments in the field of Marxist-Leninist theory in recent years. Relying on this concept, the party shaped its strategy and tactics for the years ahead and for the more distant future and warned against possible exaggerations in the appreciation of the extent to which our country had approached the higher phase of communism. All this made it possible to concretize the ways and time limits for the implementation of our programs.

Major tasks of great magnitude will be facing the party and the people in the closing decades of the 20th century. Taken together, they could be briefly described as improving developed socialism, in the course of which a gradual transition to communism will take place. Our country is poised at the beginning of this long historical stage which, in turn, will naturally have its growth periods and stages. Only experience and practice will show their duration and specific shape. One of the major qualitative guidelines along this way was clearly indicated by the 26th party congress, which called for the establishment of an essentially classless social structure within the historical framework of developed socialism.

Characteristically, this conclusion, based on practice, echoes Marx's understanding of socialism as a society unaware of class differences (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 9, p 19). This, by the way, is a fresh confirmation of the fact that the validity of Marx's views should not only be judged on

the basis of the experience gained during the last few decades, but should be appreciated also from the positions of a longer perspective.

Those who today ask themselves: "What, after all, is socialism?", then turn for the answer first to Marx, Engels and Lenin, are right. This, however, is no longer sufficient. Today the notion of socialism can be defined only by taking into account the richest practical experience of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries. This experience shows the complexity of many problems arising in the way of socialist construction. But it also proves that only socialism can solve the most difficult questions of social reality.

It is precisely socialism that removes the age-old barriers separating labor and culture and creates a highly durable alliance among workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia, all manual and intellectual workers, in which the working class plays the leading role. It brings the achievements of science, technology, literature and art within the reach of the working masses and ensures an unprecedented public recognition of the creative activities of the intelligentsia. It is socialism that rallies the peoples who were formerly divided by national strife into a close-knit family and ensures a just solution of the nationalities question engendered by the exploiter system. It is socialism that, along with facilitating the flourishing of national ways of life, also molds a new type of international, intergovernmental relations, which exclude any inequality and which are based on fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance.

With the completion of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism and the enhancement of the new socialist way of life, the sharpest social collisions which, in the final account, stem from its division into hostile classes, are surmounted. This conclusion, however, has nothing in common with the simplistic, politically naive idea that socialism eliminates all and any contradictions, differences and troubles in everyday life. Incidentally, our ideological enemies also exploit this idea in their own way when they try to cast aspersions on the new system, pointing out that under it people's lives encounter both difficulties and disappointments, and sometimes a very difficult clash between the new and the old.

Yes, we have both contradictions and difficulties. To think that there may be some other way of development is to leave the reliable, although sometimes rough, ground of reality and break with the elements of Marxist dialectics. Theoretically, this question was elucidated by Lenin as the basis of the Marxist teaching. "Antagonism and contradiction," he wrote, "are not at all one and the same. The former will disappear, the latter will remain under socialism" ("Leninskiy Sbornik" [Leninist Collection], vol 11, p 357). This tenet has now been confirmed by practice. It does not follow from this, however, that one may disregard nonantagonistic contradictions or ignore them in politics. Life teaches that as a result of such disregard, even contradictions which are not antagonistic by their nature may provoke serious collisions. Still another--the most important--aspect of the matter is to use correctly the contradictions of socialism as a source of and incentive for its onward development.

Our experience proves that successes in socialist construction are achieved when the policy of the ruling communist party rests on a sound scientific basis.

Any underestimation of the role of Marxist-Leninist science and its creative development, any narrow pragmatic interpretation of its tasks, disregard for fundamental theoretical problems or the sway of opportunism or scholastic theorizing, are fraught with grave political and ideological consequences. Experience and practice have repeatedly confirmed the accuracy of Lenin's thought that "anybody who tackles partial problems without having previously resolved general problems, will inevitably and at every step face those general problems without realizing it himself. To come up against them blindly in each individual case means to doom one's politics to the worst vacillation and lack of principle." (op. cit., vol 15, p 368).

The CPSU attaches great significance to the development of Marxist-Leninist theory as demands its creative essence. This is vitally important in solving our practical problems. We are increasingly feeling the need for serious research in socialist political economy. And here Marx's "Das Kapital" was and remains for our science a shining example of deep insight into the essence of economic phenomena.

The many-faceted experience of the fraternal socialist countries, which is not coincidental in everything, provides extensive material for theoretical interpretation. One cannot but recall in this connection Lenin's words that "only a series of attempts--each one of which taken separately will be one-sided and suffer from certain inconsistencies--will create complete socialism through the revolutionary cooperation among the proletariat of all countries" (op. cit., vol 36, p 306). This task is being practically tackled nowadays over vast areas of the globe, in the framework of the socialist world system, which has become the decisive factor in mankind's social progress. It is being tackled along the general line predicted by Marx.

Lenin frequently repeated that he was always collating all his activities with Marx. It is with Marx, Engels and Lenin that the CPSU is collating its every step.

To collate current activities with Marx and Marxism-Leninism does not mean in the least to mechanically "compare" ongoing processes in life against formulas. We would be useless followers of our teachers if we limited ourselves to the repetition of the truths they discovered and relied on the magic power of quotations that were once learned by rote.

Marxism is not a dogma but an effective guide to action, to independence, by coping with the difficult tasks which every turn in history sets before us. In order to be able to keep pace with life, the communists should carry forward in all directions and enrich the teaching of Marx, to apply creatively in practice his method of materialistic dialectics rightfully described as the living soul of Marxism. It is only such an attitude toward our invaluable ideological heritage, of which Lenin set an example, and only such continuous self-renovation of revolutionary practice that make Marxism the real

science and art of revolutionary creativity. This is the key to the vitality of Marxism-Leninism and to its unwithering freshness.

It is sometimes claimed that new phenomena in social life "do not fit in" with the concept of Marxism-Leninism, that it is living through a "crisis" and that it should "be brought to life" by being injected with ideas drawn from Western sociology, philosophy or politology. The problem here, however, is not at all one of any alleged "crisis" of Marxism. The problem lies elsewhere--in the inability of some theorists calling themselves Marxists to encompass the true scope of the theoretical thinking of Marx, Engels and Lenin and to use the tremendous intellectual power of their teaching in the specific study of specific questions.

It would be relevant to add to this that many bourgeois philosophers, sociologists and political economists have earned their reputations largely by turning Marxist ideas around.

It is unworthy of communists to be attracted by the trenchant phrases of all sorts of "improvers" of Marxism and cling to the fabrications of bourgeois science. Not to erode the Marxist-Leninist teaching but, on the contrary, to struggle for its purity, to develop it resourcefully, is what leads to the study and solution of upcoming problems. This is the only approach consistent with the traditions and spirit of our teaching and requirements of the communist movement.

We, Soviet communists, are proud of belonging to the most influential ideological current in the entire history of world civilization--Marxism-Leninism. Open to everything best and advanced in modern science and culture, it is today in the center of the world's spiritual life, having conquered the minds of millions upon millions of people. It is the ideological credo of the rising class which is liberating all mankind. It is the philosophy of social optimism, the philosophy of the present and future.

A long distance has now been covered along the path of the social renewal of the world, along the path of achieving the revolutionary goals and implementing the ideals of the working class. The political map of today's world has changed. Great scientific discoveries have been made. Technological advances are breath-taking. At the same time, mankind now has many new concerns, some of them very difficult. Its concern over the aggravating global problems of raw material, energy, food, ecological and others is justified. But the most important thing today is the need to preserve peace, to avert thermonuclear catastrophe. Nothing is more important on the international plane for our party, the Soviet government and the world's nations.

To understand the full complexities of the modern world and to organize and direct the revolutionary sociohistorical creative activities of the working class and all working people is the grandiose task which the theory of Marxism-Leninism and the struggle for the progress of mankind are concerned with today. The task which Karl Marx set for himself and to his ideological and political associates and followers is to explain and change the world.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

## LOYALTY TO LENIN'S FOREIGN POLICY COURSE

Moscow KOMMUNIST No 3, Feb 83 pp 24-31

[Text] The further complication and exacerbation of the international situation and, at the same time, the sharply enhanced activeness of the forces of peace struggling to turn the relations between states into the channel of normal peaceful development corresponding to the expectations of all peoples --such is, in general outline, the situation which marked the beginning of 1983. The situation in the world is characterized by considerable tension caused by the incessant attempts of the aggressive imperialist forces, primarily in the United States, to upset the existing strategic balance and guarantee their military superiority in order to subordinate the course of world events to their will. The Soviet Union, the other countries of the socialist community and all peace-loving forces, pit their consistent policy of peace, security and detente against the militarist course of imperialism. They have come out in favor of normalizing the world's political climate and are putting forward real and practical alternatives to the threat of international relations sliding to the verge of a nuclear catastrophe.

In his "60th Anniversary of the USSR" report, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, characterized our country's course in international affairs in the following way: "We are in favor of cooperation--broad, fruitful and free from diktat and interference in the affairs of others--between all the peoples of the planet to their mutual advantage and for the benefit of all mankind. The Soviet Union will do everything within its power to guarantee a peaceful future for the present and the coming generation. This is the aim of our policy and we will not retreat from it."

As the situation in the international arena demonstrates, a special role has fallen to the lot of the year 1983. The coming period may prove in many respects to be decisive for the further international development. The question is whether the forces conducting the struggle for normalizing the world situation, putting an end to the arms race and preserving and strengthening detente, whether these forces will be able to secure a change of direction in the course of events, or whether the tendencies that are dangerous for the future of mankind, generated by imperialism's aggressive nature and its striving for world domination, whether these tendencies will, if only temporarily, prevail in international relations.

The fact is that this year the United States and NATO have planned to start developing in West European countries new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles



whose appearance would threaten to upset the existing military parity in Europe to the advantage of the West, and thus the approximate equality of the strategic forces of the USSR and the United States. Thus, international stability would be undermined. This would encourage even further the aggressive strivings of the militarist circles of international imperialism who are dreaming of the possibility of scoring a victory in a nuclear war. The text of the recently published report by the Pentagon and the U.S. National Security Council entitled "Directives in the Defense Sphere for the Fiscal Years 1984-1988," for example, bears evidence of precisely such strivings: it directly assigns to the U.S. Armed Forces the goal of delivering the first nuclear strike against objectives on the territory of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact member countries.

However, the transition from 1982 to 1983 is characterized not only by the growth of military threat. The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact member countries have opened the annals of the new year by coming out--on a large scale--in favor of normalizing the political climate on earth, doing it so impressively that it caused, to use the words of Western commentators, "chaos" and "confusion" in the ranks of Washington's ruling clique and forced many politicians in a number of NATO countries to reevaluate some of their views.

Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's report of 21 December 1982 confirmed the invariable loyalty of the Soviet country to Lenin's peace-loving foreign policy and put forward new initiatives of great international significance. It is precisely the consistency and continuity that are the characteristic features of this policy based--at all stages of the USSR's development, during any turn of events, during all the changes in the international arena--on firm Marxist-Leninist principles. It is precisely this that makes this policy basically different from the foreign policy course of the bourgeois states, whose sharp changes often depend on various subjective circumstances, including, for example, the change of political leaders.

Of paramount importance for the cause of struggling to reduce the heat of the international situation was the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states, which took place in Prague on 4-5 January and was held in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely mutual understanding. The Political Declaration unanimously adopted by the meeting and the evaluations and conclusions which it contains are a true fusion of the views and opinions of the brotherly countries. In the form of this document the whole world has received a new telling example of the fact that the countries of real socialism nowadays constitute a world-scale force, aware of its worth and capable and knowledgeable of how to oppose any aggressive plans of imperialism. At the same time this force is thoroughly humanitarian, peace-loving and concerned with the vital interests of the working peoples of their countries and the entire world.

It is precisely nowadays, when the clouds of military peril are gathering on the horizon, that the unity of views and actions in the foreign policies of the countries of the socialist community are letting themselves be felt particularly clearly. Their ideological unity, the unity of aims, brotherly

solidarity and mutual assistance, which are the basis of the principle of socialist internationalism, are also clearly manifested in their joint approach to the main problems of the present which allows us to speak with confidence about the growing strength of such an important factor in international relations as the collective socialist foreign policy.

The following reply of Comrade Yu. V. Andropov to the question of the newspaper RUDE PRAVO, published on 6 January, was regarded everywhere in the world as evidence of the socialist states' indestructible confidence in their strength and of their firm will to overcome the dangerous present tendencies of world development: "We take a sober view of the world situation. We do not conceal our concern about NATO's military preparations. However, in spite of the negative phenomena which are manifesting themselves in the beginning of the eighties, the international position of the socialist community remains stable and reliable. I would like to emphasize this absolutely definitely. We have enough good will and resolution to go step by step toward strengthening European security and normalizing the world political atmosphere. We have enough strength to oppose imperialism's military threat."

A powerful peaceful offensive of the socialist foreign policy is taking place nowadays. The world public highly values the steps undertaken by the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community toward consolidating peace and foiling the dangerous plans of the military circles of imperialism. This political course is determined by the peace program for the eighties adopted by the 26th CPSU Congress, in which the general course of the Soviet foreign policy, mapped out by the immortal Lenin, found new embodiment.

From the first days of the existence of the Soviet republic, its foreign policy--thoroughly scientifically substantiated and based on Marx's teaching of society and the class struggle--immediately revealed itself as a basically new, unprecedented program of how to establish relations between peoples and states. Proceeding from the class nature of the socialist foreign policy, Lenin, even in the pre-October period, thoroughly revealed the indissoluble unity of its two leading goals, namely, the struggle for peace and the struggle for social progress, and elaborated on its main directions and concrete methods.

Under the influence of the foreign policy of the first workers' state in the world and after the victory of the socialist revolutions won in a number of other countries, new and previously unknown forms of interstate relations began to form in the international arena. Proletarian internationalism and the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems serve as the fundamental principles of the new socialist international policy. Expressing the class-revolutionary, peace-loving and humanitarian content of this policy, the principles of proletarian internationalism and peaceful coexistence --being organically interconnected--supplement each other in the most direct manner since they are based on the same laws of the development of society.

The strictly scientific nature and the enormous richness of Marxist-Leninist thought allow the Soviet Union and the brotherly socialist countries to solve successfully the complex problems put forward by life and by the course of international development. Its class character, democratism, love of peace and historic optimism are the specific features of these countries' foreign political activity. Socialist diplomacy is characterized by a deeply responsible approach to the most important problems of world politics concerning peoples' destinies, by firmness in defending its principled positions, readiness for negotiations and agreements and flexibility in solving practical questions.

Not every step along the historical path covered by real socialism has been easy. Periods of peace alternated with periods of cruel military clashes when, as in the years of the Great Fatherland War, the question "who will win?" arose with maximum poignancy. However, even in such times the Soviet people directed their thoughts to a stable peace, paying the road toll toward it with the blood of their sons and, in the postwar decades, they supported by all possible means the titanic efforts of the party and the state in their struggle for a durable and just peace. The fact that the Soviet people have had the possibility for almost 40 years to devote their efforts to creative goals under the conditions of peace is the best practical proof of the absolute effectiveness of Lenin's foreign policy. The principles of peaceful coexistence which now enjoy wide international recognition are laid down in many international documents, among them the final act of the all-European conference in Helsinki.

The Soviet Union came out and continues to come out undeviatingly in favor of maintaining existing international agreements and concluding new ones which will lead to normalizing the situation, preserving and strengthening detente. It is quite clear that such agreements are only possible on a reciprocal and equal basis. The November (1982) CPSU Central Committee Plenum stated: We are in favor of a foundation, sound and acceptable to both sides, for the solution of the most complex problems, primarily of course, the problem of curbing the arms race. However, the same plenum also warned: Let nobody expect of us unilateral disarmament, we are not naive.

The task of curbing the arms race and shifting over to disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, occupies a central place in the intensifying struggle for the prevention of war. In the present situation our country declares firmly and decisively: At present there is no task in international politics more important than the task of averting the growing threat of a nuclear war. The CPSU Central Committee general secretary says: "Our position in this question is clear. Nuclear war must not be allowed, neither small, nor big, nor limited, nor total."

Under the conditions of an unprecedented acceleration of the course of events, the enhanced acuteness of the conflicts between the social and political forces pitted against each other, and the quick, often dramatic, changes in the forms and methods of struggle, the propaganda machine of imperialism, going full speed, spares no effort to distort the people's idea of the true nature of the developing clash. However, millions of people,

regardless of their social status, ideological convictions or membership of political parties, arrive at essentially correct conclusions through the realization--which occurs spontaneously under the influence of undeniable facts and in spite of all artificial obstacles--that processes dangerous for the very life on earth are taking place in the world.

This realization moves them to antiwar demonstrations, makes them join mass organizations which come out in favor of values common to all mankind, primarily in defense of peace. It brings them out on the streets with demands which assume a political character and force the governments to take them more and more into consideration.

In a situation when Washington and some of its allies, ignoring the threatening realities of today's world, continue to sabotage in one form or another the genuinely peace-loving initiatives and proposals coming from the USSR and other socialist countries as well as from many nonaligned states, in this situation the great battle for the minds of the people--who are, in the final account, the real creators of history--is flaring up higher and higher. The November (1982) CPSU Central Committee Plenum emphasized: "The USSR altogether rejects the point of view of those who try to insinuate to the people that force and weapons are deciding and will always decide everything. The peoples are now coming to the proscenium of history as never before. They have found the right to voice their opinion which nobody can silence. With their active and purposeful actions they are capable of eliminating the danger of nuclear war, preserving peace and hence, life on our planet." This principle resulting from the experience of modern sociopolitical life decades later recalls Lenin's thought: "... We must help the peoples to intervene in the questions of war and peace" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 35, p 16).

The absolutely precise, clear and easily understandable peace initiatives formulated in Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's statements and put forward in the Political Declaration of the Prague meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states are gaining wider and more active support from millions and millions of people who see in them a real possibility of reaching agreements, foiling the dangerous plans of continuing the nuclear arms race and strengthening mutual trust and security. Western newspapers note that the negative U.S. reaction to the proposals on reducing armaments recently put forward by the Soviet Union and the brotherly socialist countries results in extremely unfavorable consequence for Washington. The commentator of the American television company CBS (T. Fenton) has said, for example: "The question of U.S. missile deployment is now being solved in equal measure at the negotiation table as well as on the streets of Western Europe."

The tasks of strengthening European security and normalizing the world political atmosphere, as formulated by the USSR and other socialist countries, are in the focal point of attention of world public opinion. In point of fact, at present it is no secret to anyone that Washington formerly agreed to conduct negotiations with the Soviet Union regarding medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe and then on limiting and reducing strategic arms, while

having no intention whatsoever of conducting them in the spirit of good will and of seeking mutually acceptable solutions in the interests of military detente. The White House was forced to enter these negotiations in the hope of guaranteeing a propagandist camouflage for its plans to build up its military might in its striving to upset to its own favor the military-strategic balance with the USSR. At the core of the military-diplomatic intentions of the U.S. ruling circles lie plans for stretching out the negotiations and making clearly unacceptable demands on the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union has from the very beginning approached the Soviet-American negotiations from different, opposing positions. As statements by the Soviet side have often emphasized, to complete the negotiations positively and secure corresponding agreements would open up one of the main paths toward really reducing the threat of a nuclear war, for it would thus be possible to put an end to the uncontrolled build-up of the most destructive weapons and reduce the level of nuclear confrontation. At the negotiations the USSR has sought and continues to seek an honest, mutually acceptable agreement which would lead to the reduction of nuclear arsenals without any damage to mutual security.

It is from such positions that the Soviet side approaches the continuing negotiations on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms.

The proposals of the American side, according to which the USSR would have to dismantle more than 90 percent of its intercontinental ballistic missiles whereas the United States would considerably increase the number of warheads on its missiles, cannot be acceptable to the Soviet side. Parity, equality and equal security--this is, in the opinion of the USSR, the only just foundation on which a Soviet-American agreement on the question of limitation and reduction of strategic arms can be based.

The Soviet Union has put forward bold and constructive initiatives aimed at solving this extremely important problem. While confirming its former proposal--to put an end to the further buildup of strategic arms, that is to freeze them at their present level--the USSR has expressed readiness to reduce the existing arsenals of such weapons by approximately 25 percent on each side, bringing them down to the same level, and in the future to progress toward new reductions. The Soviet proposal, which proceeds from the desire to maintain parity, encompasses all types of strategic weapons without exception and envisages their reduction by many hundreds of units. Thus, all possible channels for the arms race in this sphere would be closed.

At the same time a no less radical solution of the problem of nuclear arms in the European zone was proposed proceeding from the principle of equal security for all. Our side proposes either to have no nuclear weapons at all in the European zone--whether intermediate range, or tactical, whether on the Soviet side, or on the side of NATO states--or for both sides to reduce all their medium-range arms by more than two-thirds. Thus, there would be no Soviet or U.S. medium-range missiles pitted against each other here at all and the Soviet Union would maintain only as many of those missiles as England and France have. Complete equality in nuclear weapon carrier-planes would also be established at a considerably lower level than at present.

Under no circumstances can our country agree to upset the equality in armaments which has been reached on European soil in the course of decades. The implementation of the U.S. plans would force the socialist countries to take corresponding retaliatory measures.

Our country's noble and deeply substantiated initiatives aimed at removing the obstacles--piled up by the other side--on the path of reaching mutually acceptable agreements immediately assumed the significance of an extremely important international action opening the way to agreements, from which all states and peoples as well as the cause of peace in the whole world would benefit. The countries of the socialist community ardently approved and supported the new peace-loving Soviet proposals. In broad circles of the progressive international public they were recognized as evidence of a well-thought out and realistic course on questions of major importance for the world's destiny.

The world press notes that the Soviet position on nuclear arms is meeting with growing understanding and is winning a growing number of supporters in different countries, including the United States, whereas Washington's hard and obstinate line is losing support and becoming subject to every sharpening criticism. As the American newspaper the LOS ANGELES TIMES wrote, Reagan's government has badly miscalculated in supposing that the failure of the Geneva negotiations, a failure it prepared, would "be blamed on the Russians" and create a favorable atmosphere for its actions. Other organs of the Western press note the "erosion of the West Europeans' support for Reagan's initial proposal."

The prospects for a positive development of the international situation to a great extent depend on whether the mistrust, which in many respects overshadows the relations between the states of different social systems and is intensely cultivated in the West by the organs of imperialist propaganda, can be eliminated. As demonstrated by the longstanding practice of international relations a reduction in the level of the hostile confrontation of the sides would be in this connection a very important measure. At present this mainly concerns the two military-political alliances possessing enormous power, the Warsaw Pact organization and NATO.

The Political Declaration adopted at the Prague meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states emphasizes the urgent task of putting up an insuperable dam against war and directing the development of events back into the normal channel of detente and mutually advantageous cooperation. The proposal of the socialist countries to conclude a treaty on mutually renouncing the use of military force and maintaining peaceful relations between the Warsaw Pact member states and the NATO countries assumes particular importance in this connection.

Indeed, when the Soviet Union assumed a unilateral obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, this was met with approval from the entire world, as well as the hope that other nuclear powers would follow the Soviet example. However, evading the question, the NATO countries once again began to refer to the conventional arms superiority which the Warsaw Pact allegedly

enjoys, although neither facts nor figures confirm this is any way. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union declared that we are also prepared to agree that either side should not be the first to use not only nuclear but also conventional weapons. At present, when the USSR together with the other Warsaw Pact member states have officially proposed, as mentioned previously, to conclude a treaty on mutually renouncing the use of military force and maintaining peaceful relations between the Warsaw Pact countries and NATO, one more pretext for hampering the solution of the problems of putting an end to the arms race has lost its validity. At the same time the conclusion of the proposed treaty would give a new impulse to the peaceful coexistence and cooperation between states with different social structures.

The very important peace initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union at the beginning of 1983 and the proposals of the Prague meeting of the Warsaw Pact member states were supplemented by several other actions in the same direction. Worth mentioning, for example, are the visits of the CPSU Central Committee member and Soviet minister for foreign affairs, Comrade A. A. Gromyko, to the capitals of the GDR and FRG and the negotiations which he conducted on the problems of European security and disarmament, as well as the positive response of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community to the proposal of the Swedish government to create a zone free of "tactical [polya boya] nuclear weapons" in Europe.

The peace initiatives of the socialist countries, simple and clear to anyone, give new stimulus to the struggle of the peace-loving forces, clearly demonstrating who is really striving for peace and disarmament, for preventing a nuclear conflict and who is only talking about it, while in reality preventing the agreements from being reached and using the present negotiations as a coverup for their military buildup. Being deeply substantiated and well grounded, justly taking into account the lawful security interests of all interested parties, the proposals of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact member countries exert growing influence on broad social and political circles in many countries of the world.

At present all the peace-loving forces of the planet are faced with a task of extraordinary importance--to stop and turn back the dangerous course of events. The Soviet Union notes that averting the catastrophe threatening the world is a mutual cause and the Western states must carry their share of responsibility for it. It is obvious that progress in normalizing the situation cannot be expected if only one side strives for it, if only one side comes out with initiatives and proposals, while the other side tries to avoid seriously and honestly considering them.

However, the obstructionist position of the Reagan administration at the Geneva negotiations, its unwillingness to renounce the truly unacceptable "zero option" on the question of nuclear weapons in the European zone, hinder the attainment of mutually acceptable solutions at these negotiations. In its striving to break the wave of the antiwar demonstrations by the masses, the American side has resorted to patently unscrupulous steps of an exclusively propagandist character. Thus, in his appeal "to the peoples of Europe," Reagan, continuing to advertise his unrealistic position, demagogically

proposed a Soviet-American summit with the sole aim of signing an agreement on medium-range nuclear missiles based on the notorious "zero option."

Replying to the questions of a PRAVDA correspondent, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov mentioned in particular the serious and responsible approach of the Soviet Union to the question of a meeting between Soviet and U.S. leaders. At the same time, he said that judging by Reagan's appeal, "the United States does not want to seek a mutually acceptable agreement with the Soviet Union and thus intentionally dooms the Geneva negotiations to failure."

This propaganda move on the part of Washington was critically evaluated by the peace-loving circles of the international public. As THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote, in Western Europe Reagan's proposal is referred to as "pure propaganda" aimed at disorienting the public concerning the question of American plans for deploying new missiles.

The Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries proceed from the conviction that however complex the world situation may be, there are possibilities to overcome the dangerous stage in international relations and that developments can be pointed in the direction which responds to the desires of all mankind.

This conviction is a result of the firm determination on the part of the countries of the socialist community to wage an unrelenting struggle against the military threat, for preserving and deepening detente and for expanding international cooperation. This conviction is found in the proposals of the Soviet Union. Doing everything within its power so that reason may triumph in international affairs, the Soviet Union is full of determination to carry out consistently Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence with states with different social systems while maintaining vigilance with regard to the intrigues of the enemies of socialism and peace and undertaking the necessary measures to guarantee its own security.

By uniting their efforts the peace-loving states and peoples are capable of averting the military threat. The appeal of the participants in the Moscow festive session marking the 60th anniversary of the USSR to the parliaments, governments, political parties and peoples of the world says: "Lasting, reliable and stable peace is the first and most urgent need of all people, all peoples and all mankind." And this need cannot be satisfied without exerting all necessary efforts, without utilizing all available means and possibilities. "The vital question, the burning question of the present," as Lenin called the question of peace, can and must be solved in the interests of the peoples' masses, in the interests of their very future.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9



ANDROPOV'S ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ASKED BY PRAVDA CORRESPONDENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 p 32

[Text] [Question] What is your view on the appeal of the U.S. President "To the Peoples of Europe," in which he suggested that the USSR and the United States conclude on the basis of American conditions an agreement on the elimination of surface-based medium-range missiles?

[Answer] First of all, let me say most clearly that President Reagan's proposal suggests nothing new. It is a question--as was immediately noted by all news agencies throughout the world--of the same old "zero option." The fact that it is obviously unacceptable to the Soviet Union is now universally acknowledged. Actually, how could one seriously speak of a proposal according to which the Soviet Union would be asked to destroy unilaterally all its medium-range missiles while the United States and its NATO allies would retain all nuclear weapons of this category at their disposal?

It is precisely this type of unrealistic U.S. position that blocks progress in the Geneva talks, as is well-known. The fact that now the U.S. President has reasserted this position confirms one thing: the United States is unwilling to search for a mutually acceptable agreement with the Soviet Union and thereby deliberately dooms the Geneva talks to failure.

I have already said that the USSR will not undertake a unilateral disarmament. If it is a question of deploying new American missiles in Europe, we shall give this a proper answer. However, this would not be our choice.

The Soviet Union favors a different path. Best of all, as we propose, is not to have in Europe nuclear weapons, either medium-range or tactical. Since this is not acceptable to the United States, we are also willing to agree to a solution according to which the Soviet Union would have no more missiles than NATO has in Europe currently. At the same time, agreement should be reached on reducing the number of airplanes--carriers of medium-range nuclear missiles--to equal numbers. This would provide total equality in terms of missiles and airplanes on an incomparably lower level than the present.

The Soviet Union is ready to conclude such an agreement. Is the U.S. President prepared to sign such an agreement based on the principle of equality and equal security?

[Question] The U.S. President has suggested to meet with you to conclude the agreement he has discussed. What can you say on this subject?

[Answer] We have always believed that summit meetings are particularly important in resolving difficult problems. It is this that determines our serious approach to them.

To us it is not a question of a political or propaganda game. A meeting between the heads of the USSR and the United States, with a view to finding mutually acceptable solutions of topical problems and developing relations between our countries, would be useful to both the Soviet Union and the United States, to Europe and the entire world.

The fact that the President of the United States bases such an encounter on the Soviet Union's acceptance of the clearly unacceptable solution of the problem of nuclear weapons in Europe he offers, does not prove in the least that the American leadership has taken a serious approach to this entire problem. This can only be regretted.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9

## MANAGEMENT PRESUPPOSES EDUCATION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 33-43

[Article by Ye. Sizenko, Bryansk Oblast CPSU Committee first secretary]

[Text] A great deal is being said and written of late about the manager-educator. Why has this question become so topical?

Our party has always considered the personal involvement of managerial cadres in educational work one of the mandatory prerequisites for strengthening ties with the masses and upgrading their activeness. V. I Lenin emphasized that "personal influence and speaking out at meetings is terribly important in politics" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 47, p 54). The manager earns his authority "through his energy and ideological influence (rather than, naturally, his titles and ranks)..." (op. cit., vol 17, pp 363-364). The qualities of the manager--competence, political experience and organizational capabilities--are shaped in the collective, through personal participation in ideological work.

Lenin's requirements concerning the manager as a structural component of all cadre policy at the present stage were developed at the 25th and 26th party congresses. The task was set of taking mandatorily into consideration the sociopolitical and educational aspects of the activities of the manager in all sectors. The urgent need to manage "not on the basis of documents but personal experience and knowledge of the life of the workers, peasants and the intelligentsia in our country, knowledge of their life and problems..." was reemphasized.

Now, after the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum set the task of accelerating the country's turn toward upgrading the efficiency of the entire national economy, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, listed among the main ways to resolve it intensified work with leading cadres and the enhanced activeness of the toiling masses.

It is a question of improving the activities of the leaders themselves and increasing the consistency between their political and practical qualities and the requirements of the current stage of party and people's activities.

### I

The problems which the Bryansk Oblast party organization must resolve this five-year plan are major and responsible. They are based on the resolutions

of the 26th CPSU Congress, the subsequent plenums of its Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures to Accelerate the Economic and Social Development of Bryansk Oblast." Suffice it to say that we must increase the volume of industrial output by 29.5 percent, gross agricultural production by 28 percent and the volume of construction and installation work by 30 percent.

These plans are intensive and we realize that their implementation calls for raising the organizational, educational and economic work of our cadres to the level of the requirements of the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. High-level organization, exigency, conscious discipline and order in everything must be achieved. The work style and methods of those in charge of leading others, their dedication to the party's cause, their competence and their ability to fire up the collectives through their example and to encourage their creative energy largely determine success. The scale and nature of the socioeconomic problems to be resolved demand of the party and economic managers the able combination of the functions of manager, organizer and educator.

The principle of scientific approach to management, by which we are guided, is incompatible with slackness, inaccuracy or approximate estimates. The manager must display purposefulness, efficiency and competence in all matters. The term efficient person is frequently used. This is a valuable quality! Humaneness, goodness and the ability to understand someone else's concerns and worries do not conflict with efficiency. In my view, a great deal depends on the ability of the manager to establish proper relations with the people and to find a common language with them, naturally on a principled basis.

In the final account, these circumstances define the social consequences of our work, particularly in terms of upgrading the activeness of the working people and developing in every one of them the feeling that he is the master of the country. They encourage us to approach the enhancement of the educational role of the manager through increasingly strict measures.

The party gorkoms and raykoms, which maintain close ties with the heads of associations, enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhozes, leading specialists, chiefs of shops, sectors and shifts and brigade leaders, have a great responsibility in work with cadres. The party obkom encourages problems of enhancing the role of managers as educators of collectives always to be the focal point of attention of party committees; the latter must study more profoundly the work style of every manager, contribute to its improvement and eliminate errors promptly.

The Pogarskiy Rayon party committee has acquired instructive experience in work with leading cadres. Here talks are held with every party member recommended for one position or another. An effort is made not only to find out biographic details and determine the level of experience of the worker but most essentially to determine whether or not the future manager would be able to find a common language with the collective and lead it and what he intends to base his work on. I had the occasion to attend one such discussion conducted by M. D. Seriy, rayon party committee first secretary. V. M. Zaytsev,

deputy chairman of a neighboring kolkhoz, was being recommended to take over as chairman of the Kolkhoz imeni Michurin, who was retiring. Let us note in passing that the nomination was not accidental. V. M. Zaytsev was well familiar with the Kolkhoz imeni Michurin. He had visited it frequently and met with its people, as instructed by the rayon party committee. He had extensive practical experience as an engineer and party committee secretary.

The discussion between the first secretary and the future chairman was imbued with the idea that the successful management of the farm meant concern for the working people, educating them and relying on them. I subsequently became interested in the life of the young chairman. Vladimir Mikhaylovich had been able to find a proper approach to the people and enthuse them with his energy.

Weekly meetings with managers of kolkhozes, sovkhozes and enterprises are held at the Pogarskiy Rayon party committee. The practical discussion, prepared by a rayon party committee member, covers not only the production indicators of the collective but problems of the educational aspect of the activities of the manager, his work style, his practical and moral qualities, his strong and weak points, and his relations with people. Such frank comradely talks help the manager critically to assess his own work, take an exacting look at himself and draw proper conclusions.

A thorough study of the management style and methods at the Pogar Cigarettes Factory, the Vernyy Put' and Krasnyy May kolkhozes, and Kisterskiy and imeni Lenin sovkhozes, conducted by the rayon party committee bureau, was made available to all rayon managers. As a result, labor organization and discipline in these collectives improved noticeably. Management services became more effective and new forms of work with people were applied. Individual labor indicators improved.

The state of affairs in labor collectives is studied with the help of public commissions. Of late the party committees have extensively used sociological services.

Thus, a group of sociologists at the Bezhitskiy Rayon party committee, which studied the moral and psychological climate at one of the production sectors of the Bryansk Automotive Vehicles Plant Association, determined that most of the milling machine operators were not satisfied with their work. In the neighboring sector, however, which used older equipment and operated under worse working conditions, all those polled expressed their satisfaction with the work. It was established that it was a matter of relations between workers and management. In the second sector the foreman was concerned with the people, took their views into consideration, and helped them. Here an atmosphere of friendship, good human relations and daily mutual aid had developed unlike the first sector.

The results of the sociological studies were considered by the association's party committee while the Bezhitskiy Rayon party committee used them at a practical science conference on the significance and role of the brigade leader in the education of the brigade's collective and at seminars attended by primary party organization secretaries.

The role of the manager as educator is the focal point of attention of the primary party organizations as well. Managers systematically submit reports on their personal involvement in the upbringing of the members of collectives and in mobilizing them in the implementation of plans and socialist obligations at party committee and bureau sessions and party meetings.

Several years ago the party committee at the Novozybkov Clothing Factory, concerned with the fact that the enterprise was working poorly and producing low-quality goods, took steps to upgrade the personal responsibility of managers and specialists. N. Kh. Khlistunov, the factory director, drew proper conclusions from the party committee requirements and began persistently to improve the organization of the production process and to rally the collective. Together with the social organizations efforts were made to improve the working, living and recreation conditions of the workers. Particular attention was paid to veterans and production frontrankers and young workers. Short ideological meetings and days cleared for business encounters are systematically held at the factory. Heads of shops and sections and factory specialists taught classes and seminars in political and economic training. Visual agitation became lively and efficient.

As the experience of the Novozybkov Clothing Factory proves, this type of approach was bound to affect the work of the collective and the production climate. The enterprise successfully surmounted its difficulties. Compared with the 9th, the volume of sales during the 10th Five-Year Plan increased by over one-half while labor productivity increased by 39 percent. Quality improved significantly. The factory was awarded the title "High Production Standards Enterprise."

## II

In implementing the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Further Improving Ideological and Political-Education Work," the Bryansk obkom, gorkoms and raykoms see to it that managers on all levels regularly meet with workers and employees, explain current and long-term problems and the domestic and international situation to them, head courses and seminars within the party and economic training system and actively enhance their own level of knowledge. Many comrades have realized that concern for the people is reflected in their hearts and has a positive impact on labor and social affairs. However, by far not everyone has the gift to convince, for which reason the obkom tries to promote it in the people. We are steadily organizing business meetings with the working people as well as other measures in order to strengthen the ties between managers and the masses and to become better familiar with local circumstances and the feelings of collectives.

In studying the work style of managers the party committees firmly eliminate unnecessary arguments, paper shuffling and unnecessary meetings. Our criteria in assessing the activities of a manager are his specific contribution to the collective's upbringing. Every year the raykom and gorkom bureaus consider and ratify heads of agitation collectives and members of political information and speaking groups and regularly hear their reports.

Ideological work is made consistent with the instructions of the 26th CPSU Congress. As elsewhere, single political days have proved their usefulness in our area. They are dedicated to topical problems such as "Livestock Breeding Is a Shock Front," "The Economic and Social Role of the Auxiliary Plot," "Work Without Laggards," and "Strengthening Labor and Social Discipline." More than 2,000 managers and more than 150,000 people attend simultaneous meetings of working people held throughout the oblast. As a rule, the party committee secretaries advise the speakers on the eve of such meetings.

Metaphorically speaking, meetings with working people are open classes at which not only do people gain useful information but are tempered ideologically. They help managers to become more familiar with the people's views and to study the circumstances on site.

Thus, one of the business meetings attended by the information group at the Novozybkov Machine Building Plant, headed by plant direct Honored Machine Builder of the RSFSR G. N. Tagiyev, was held at the machine shop. The shop's work was inconsistent. It failed to fulfill its shift assignments, as a result of which the technological process in the assembly shop was disturbed. In the course of an open and exacting discussion with the workers, the suggestion was made to reduce the volume of machining the frame of a machine tool by using precise casting. Engineering work and the implementation of the suggestion "widened" the tight spot in the shop and increased the collective's labor productivity.

Critical remarks and questions are summed up after each political day. The most important of them are discussed at meetings of the party obkom, gorkom and raykom bureaus.

The oblast television and radio and the local press actively participate in the single political days. According to a plan approved by the CPSU obkom, managers of oblast organizations and departments participate in the monthly television production "United Political Day: Questions and Answers."

"Open Letter Days" are gaining the increasing approval of labor collectives. They were initiated by BRYANSKIY RABOCHIY journalists. Such days are sponsored in many oblast enterprises on the basis of letters and suggestions to the editors. The questions they raise are submitted to enterprise and city and oblast service managers. Subsequently, in the course of open meetings with the collectives, the managers report on the steps taken to resolve them. Other meetings deal with eventual accomplishments. Such meetings are covered by the newspaper.

Permanent control "from below" disciplines the managers and enhances their responsibility not only to superior organizations but also to labor collectives.

The manager must always be concerned with improving labor and living conditions and the organization of the healthy recreation of the people. In recent years we have been particularly pleased with changes in the countryside. We see to it that mechanization is applied in each farm, that good

production premises are built as well as housing with all the comforts, cultural clubs, schools, kindergartens, and approach roads. We are successfully resolving the problem of building no fewer than 10 to 12 apartment units per farm. Thanks to these efforts some villages have developed into agroindustrial towns.

We firmly demand of industrial enterprise managers both high production indicators and steady and efficient work with people. Thus the Bryansk, Klinty and Dyatkovo city party committees sponsor "Directors' Days," during which prime attention is focused precisely on this aspect of the matter. The success of large or small collectives is directly related to the way they live, traditions in which they are raised and the extent of their creativity. The directors attending such meetings study the best experience of their colleagues in the socioeconomic development of collectives and the practice of organizing work with people.

In promoting practical criticism, the gorkoms and raykoms teach the cadres how to react to it properly. The oblast holds annual sectorial party group organizer conferences at which occasionally heads of oblast organizations and party obkom departments become the target of sharp remarks. Criticism from below allows the party members to expose shortcomings more daringly and find proper means for their elimination.

Unfortunately, some managers have still failed to draw proper conclusions from such criticism. Such was the case of party member M. K. Kozlov, head of the Rural House-Building Combine. An abnormal psychological situation had developed in his collective. Labor discipline had dropped and exigency toward subordinates had slackened. The combine's manager ignored the opinion of specialists and was rude to his subordinates. His improper management methods were frequently pointed out to him by party members. He was reprimanded by the rayon party committee bureau and the reprimand was recorded in his party file. However, M. K. Kozlov failed to draw proper conclusions and had to be relieved from his position.

Managers' certification is becoming increasingly widespread in the oblast. The Novozybkovskiy Rayon party committee was among the first to apply this method. In recent years more than 6,000 people have been certified. Certification is a major test of the practical qualities and ideological training of the manager. It is not only a test of familiarity with a specific economic area but a determination of the qualities of a person as educator.

Control over administrative activities by the party organizations is an important means for educating cadres and developing an atmosphere of high responsibility and exigency in labor collectives. Problems of administrative activities aimed at improving production and ideological-educational work and social problems are being discussed with increasing frequency at party meetings, party committee and bureau sessions and meetings of primary party organizations. Over the past 5 years about 3,000 economic managers on all levels have reported on their work at party meetings.



The party organization commissions in charge of controlling administrative activities (more than 2,500 in the oblast), guided by the stipulations of the CPSU Central Committee, make a thorough study of the situation at the main production sectors, help the party committees and bureaus to expose shortcomings efficiently and promote their elimination. By strengthening the discipline and developing the initiative of the party members, they enhance their principle-mindedness, develop their self-criticism and raise the standards of criticism and self-criticism.

### III

One of the main tasks facing the manager of any enterprise is primarily the creation of a united and efficient labor collective. Unity between political and economic activities is manifested precisely in the ability properly to apply economic, administrative and educational measures in management. The question of developing such a skill in every manager is always kept in the center of attention of the oblast party committees.

As a rule there is good discipline, and discipline violations are unknown or quite infrequent in collectives with a good microclimate and an atmosphere of creativity, in which concern for the people is combined with exigency and where not only successes but shortcomings are noted promptly. In such collectives managers on all levels can objectively assess the production situation and consider suggestions efficiently.

The Bryansk area has many industrial, transportation and agricultural enterprise and establishment managers whose experience may be considered instructive. They prove the advantages of a skillful combination of economic with educational work and are able to lead the collectives.

Their experience is summed up in the press, television and radio, in leaflets, posters and booklets. In particular, we have summed up the experience of working with people like honored RSFSR construction worker A. K. Il'yenko, director of the Silicate Plant in Bryansk, L. K. Volchek, director of the Klintsey Order of the Honor Badge Krasnyy Gigant Leather Production Association, Hero of Socialist Labor I. P. Dzhem, director of the Krasnyy Oktyabr' Livestock-Breeding Sovkhoz, RSFSR Supreme Soviet Deputy M. S. Baranok, chairman of the Pobeda Kolkhoz, and others.

Another one is Gennadiy Pavlovich Burov, general director of the Orders of Lenin and Labor Red Banner Bryanskiy Mashinostroitel'nyy Zavod imeni V. I. Lenin Production Association.

There was a time when work in this progressive collective had broken down. The production rhythm had been disturbed and work quality has worsened. The fault was largely with heads of individual subunits and services. It was precisely at that time that I attended a meeting held by G. P. Burov. He began by asking why a few freight car builders had been absent the previous day. The question obviously disturbed the production chief. Apparently, he had failed to find out. Equally uneasy was the head of one of the shops, who was asked by the general director why two young workers had failed to attend

a Komsomol meeting. Burov then asked his deputy in charge of services to explain why complaints on cafeteria work had been received. Quite unexpectedly, he also asked the reasons for the poor performance of the plant's Desna hockey team...

Naturally, most of the meeting dealt with production misunderstandings in the collective and a detailed study of the work of production lines and shops. Measures were detailed to correct blunders and careless personnel were strictly reprimanded. However, Gennadiy Pavlovich began, as the saying goes, not by discussing nuts and bolts but problems of responsibility and discipline, and clarification of the needs and requirements of the people and their interests, problems with which the director is always concerned.

Hero of Socialist Labor and RSFSR Supreme Soviet deputy G. P. Burov, party obkom bureau member, is a former turner. His entire labor career has been involved with the plant's collective, with whose interests he is thoroughly familiar. He is an extraordinarily comprehensively educated person. We realize that his originality is the result of independent thinking and a party view on life and problems, something which does not tolerate a stereotype approach.

What is the secret of Burov's success? Above all the fact that he relies on public opinion and works in close contact with the party committee to the membership of which he has been repeatedly elected. Gennadiy Pavlovich heads a course for the party-economic aktiv of the association and is a party committee speaker. After the 26th CPSU Congress, to which he was a delegate, Burov spoke not only at shops and in the microrayon where the association's workers live but in the schools sponsored by the association. The general director holds ideology planning sessions at which problems of education, strengthening labor discipline, struggle against delinquencies, and organization of training, rest, relaxation and sports are discussed. It is no accident that it was here that the "Bryansk Rules," which were approved by V. I. Lenin--"Regulations on Internal Order"--were born. In responding to the decisions of the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the association's collective initiated the oblast movement "For Conscious Discipline and Efficient Labor Organization."

One of the components of success is the steady aspiration of the general director to be in step with the times, and his support of what is new and progressive. This aspiration is a spark which sets the creative fire in others. Association visitors are pleased by high production standards and the atmosphere of steady renovation.

The reconstruction of pig iron production facilities more than doubled casting facilities. The reconstruction of freight car production facilities increased output by almost 2,000 freight cars per year. The diesel locomotive shop is currently being reconstructed and the steel casting shop will be next. Over the past 5 years the association has carried out more than 2,000 measures related to installing new equipment; it has produced six new machine models and 91 percent of its output bears the state Emblem of Quality. Before such results could be achieved, however, the party organization and

G. P. Burov personally had to do a great deal of work with the people, to convince them of the need for a creative approach to the work and to help them to surmount their fear of new developments.

The association has no shortage of cadres. Steady concern is shown for both veterans and novices. No one is ignored. Social problems are in the center of attention. Working conditions have been improved substantially. Twenty-four cafeterias and coffee shops have been opened, an auxiliary farm and a greenhouse have been organized. A polyclinic has been built. The association's workers can send their children to kindergartens and nurseries. The machine builders have at their disposal a sports stadium, field and track facilities, sports facilities at their places of residence, and the best palace of culture in the city. The Yunost' Youth Palace was recently inaugurated. A 300-bed hospital is under construction.

The first duty of the manager is to share the interests of the working people, for otherwise he would be unable to justify the trust of the party and the people. We must invariably act in the spirit of Lenin's instruction of the need to be in the thick of the workers' life and to be thoroughly familiar with it.

The ability of the manager critically to approach matters and to combine exigency and principle-mindedness in assessing the work of the collective with respect for the people is of great importance in the education of the collective. It is precisely thus that Valentina Sergeyevna Babich, head of a large construction organization, works. On the outside she may occasionally seem rigid in her requirements and there are those who believe that she is hard to work with. However, she combines this increased exactingness toward people with strict exigency toward herself. Valentina Sergeyevna is an example of principle-mindedness and strict observance of party and state discipline. She puts the interests of the work and specific concern with the people above everything else.

Here is an example: a brigade leader made an error in laying a sewer line. V. S. Babich saw to it that the culprit corrected everything for free. The entire collective learned of the case. Naturally, such exigency is not liked by unconscientious workers.

The people understand Valentina Sergeyevna's exigency. They tighten up and, taking her as their example, try to work better. They seem to try to reach the level of "high tension" on which Babich herself operates. This construction collective is building more than 100 projects scattered throughout the oblast. However, Babich is always aware of the situation at each separate project, not in general but specifically. The plaque hanging on the door of her office reads: "Open at all times." She carefully listens to anyone who enters the office and tries to find the essence of the request. Unity of words and actions is her main principle. If she gives you a deadline you may be confident that she will keep her word. If she is unable to achieve something alone, she will seek help wherever she can find it but will keep her promise. In the course of current affairs she does not ignore the essential features. She is always thinking of the future and of her development as a specialist.

It was natural for the special projects administration of the Spetstroy Trust to be classified among the best by the USSR Ministry of Industrial Construction and, based on the results of the 10th Five-Year Plan and of 1981, awarded the Red Challenge Banner of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee. Yet only some 6 years ago, until Babich took over, the collective was always among the lagging. Quite recently Valentina Sergeyevna took over the Bryansk Oblast Industrial Construction Trust. We are confident that this trust as well will assume its place among the leaders.

N. Ye. Nakhov, deserving construction worker of the RSFSR, head of the Bryansk House-Building Trust, shows the qualities of high responsibility and exigency toward himself and the collective and daily concern for the working people. This is his third year as head of this collective. Before his arrival, for a number of years the construction workers failed to fulfill their plans. Today this is one of the leading oblast collectives. It was awarded the Red Challenge Banner of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee based on the results of the all-union socialist competition in honor of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR.

These successes are mainly the result of improved mass political work by the party organization and the role of the managers as educators of the collective. Control over the implementation of official obligations by every worker was considerably strengthened. As a result, compared with 1980, unproductive work time losses caused by violations of labor discipline have been reduced by a factor of almost 5, while losses caused by absenteeism have declined by a factor of 4. All of this, combined with organizational and technical measures, made it possible to upgrade labor productivity by 22 percent over a 2-year period. Let us particularly discuss the educational role of managers in the countryside. We are pleased to note that with every passing year an increasing number of managers who are fully aware of the role in the education of the masses may be found here.

The people speak with a great feeling of warmth of P. A. Shinkarenko, chairman of the Rossiya Kolkhoz, Novozybkovskiy Rayon. He lives with the needs of his fellow villagers and is concerned with improving their working and living conditions. Last five-year plan the kolkhoz board allocated 900,000 rubles for sociocultural needs. New asphalted streets and roads appeared. Standard houses are being built. A new kindergarten, trade center, interkolkhoz training-production combine and a swimming pool were completed. It is no accident that every year nearly one-half of the local school graduates go to work in their native farm.

The members of the Kolkhoz imeni Il'ich, Dubrovskiy Rayon, describe A. P. Nesterov, its chairman, as "our chairman." This farm, lagging until recently, is increasing its yields and strengthening its economy year after year. The kolkhoz people are growing. The chairman works in close touch with the party, trade union and Komsomol organizations. Individual talks, kolkhoz meetings and comrade court sessions are all focused on the education of the new man. Today this has resulted in a strong and united collective.

With increasing frequency the board of the Kolkhoz imeni Ul'yanov, Trubchevskiy Rayon, is receiving membership requests. Over the past 2 years 44 people were granted kolkhoz membership at the general kolkhoz meeting. This is the result of the steady concern of V. P. Parachev, its young chairman, for improving housing and living conditions of the people, the work of cultural establishments and the development of a good moral climate.

The practical experience of our best managers proves that they have achieved their outstanding successes in labor and the upbringing of labor collectives mainly thanks to the support of the party, trade union, Komsomol and other public organizations and their steady interaction with them. As a rule, a good manager tries to enhance the role of the collective in resolving all problems of enterprise economic and social development and the implementation of the state plan. He encourages every individual to realize his personal responsibility for the common project. Usually, in such collectives the public institutions in charge of production management work well: standing production conferences, people's control, brigade councils, innovators and tutors, and so on. The feeling of ownership and awareness of personal involvement are powerful factors influencing our socialist progress.

#### IV

Middle-level managers--foremen, brigade leaders and heads of livestock farms --make a great contribution to the education of the people. They are the closest to the people and are well-acquainted with their characters and can see the opportunities of everyone. Consequently, they can touch the most sensitive "strings" in the heart of every man. They play a particularly important role now, when we are testing the strength of a method for upgrading production efficiency such as the brigade organization of labor, which must become the principal way of work this five-year plan. The brigade leader is like a tuning fork which sets the tone of the entire collective.

The brigade headed by S. A. Tarabarin is well-known at Construction and Installation Administration No 4 of the Bryansk City Industrial Construction Trust. The brigade built a circus, pedagogical institute, airport and other projects. Currently it is building a multiple-story hotel. All of its work is well-rated and completed ahead of schedule. The brigade leader makes skillful use of the power of the brigade council. Before making one decision or another, Sergey Andreyevich extensively discusses all details with the council members. The same method is followed in grading the best workers, allocating bonuses or punishing delinquents. As we know, construction workers face many difficulties. The target of the brigade leader, however, is to find new opportunities with the help of the council. His rationalization suggestions have saved the collective more than 6,000 rubles.

We have many such middle-level production leaders. They include N. S. Yermakova, head of the Merkul'yevskaya Dairy Farm, Bryanskiy Rayon, V. I. Zarudko head of a complex brigade at the Bolshevik Kolkhoz, Klimovskiy Rayon, and delegate to the 26th CPSU Congress, and I. F. Golovko, head of a complex brigade at the BMZ Production Association. The personal examples they set have a great impact on others.

The party committees are improving the ways and means of work with the heads of this subdivision. "Foremen Days," practical science conferences, young brigade leader meetings and competitions for the title of best foreman are used. Finally, economic training is provided, which helps them to understand production problems even better.

Klimovskiy Rayon, which is one of the first to undertake extensively agricultural production specialization and concentration, has developed an efficient system for training middle-level managers. Most brigades and livestock farms here were headed by practitioners. Some of them were capable and initiative-minded organizers who, however, were short of knowledge. The CPSU raykom suggested to the primary party organizations to study the situation at production sectors in the light of the new assignments and to submit suggestions on cadre training. Young production frontrankers and innovators and the best-trained school graduates were considered in the formulation of the rayon-wide plan. Many of them were assigned by the farms to attend VUZs and technical schools. The work of theory seminars, party and Komsomol training circles, courses for the economic training of the party-economic aktiv and the agricultural study university improved. Currently all farm managers in the rayon are graduates of higher schools. Each farm averages 17 specialists, many of whom are heads of brigades and livestock farms.

Unquestionably, however, not all managers have become educators of their collectives. Not all of them are suitably placed in their work. Some of them avoid educational work or, worse, violate the norms of socialist morality themselves. Thus, V. I. Karpikov and chief engineer N. P. Konovalov at the Pochepskiy Rayon Sel'khozkhimiya Department essentially spoiled production work. The department systematically failed to fulfill its plan and some managers used state transportation facilities for trips "on the left." The decision was made to dismiss such pseudomanagers. Unfortunately, cases such as this still exist.

Some comrades find themselves unable to get rid of obsolete concepts on the role of the manager and his work methods. We still have collectives in which violations of labor rules are tolerated and absenteeism and drunkenness are not opposed. This leads to work time losses, lower labor productivity and worsened production quality. Some collectives work without the necessary stress and do not make full use of reserves.

With increasing firmness the party members speak out against poor managers who fail to cope with responsible assignments. As the party teaches us, a considerate and respectful attitude toward cadres has nothing in common with liberalism and irresponsibility. We try to eliminate such cases.

The party obkom ascribes tremendous importance to ensuring that young people work side by side with reputable and experience comrades whom they will replace in the future. Before appointing someone we take into consideration the opinion of his fellow workers.

The role of seminars sponsored at leading farms and enterprises has been substantially enhanced of late. Such seminars are thoroughly prepared by the

oblast party committee personnel. They do everything possible to make the experience of such farms and enterprises a practical example of how to work and to increase the number of their followers. In this case, it is very important to supervise execution closely. We support the desire of managers to visit leading farms even outside the oblast, to compare their experience with that of their neighbors and even perhaps to adopt theirs.

The most important task of the oblast party organization is to upgrade the educational role of managers. The Leninist style of management is a comprehensive concept. The tasks formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress and the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum call for improving management style further. Consequently, in 1982 the obkom discussed at a plenum the question of upgrading the educational role of managers. The discussion was frank and meaningful. The party members expressed a number of interesting thoughts and made specific suggestions. We must persistently and profoundly master our party's historical example, improve the ways and means for managing collectives and reorganize them in accordance with the new requirements. We must polish and aim them at our targets. The practical implementation of the measures formulated at the plenum will energize the work of our managers even further, upgrade the initiative of the masses and contribute to the ahead-of-schedule implementation of the 11th Five-Year Plan.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9

## VALUABLE MUSCOVITE EXPERIENCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 44-54

[Three interviews on discipline]

[Text] The decisions of the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the national economic and social tasks formulated in Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's plenum speech met with the broadest possible response of the working people. Particularly important among the assignments are the need for a firm struggle against all violations of planning, technological, labor and state discipline. The confidence expressed at the plenum to the effect that this demand will meet with the full support of party and trade union organizations and all Soviet people was clearly confirmed by the numerous speeches by working people at meetings, and in the flood of letters to party, soviet and economic organs, public organizations, newspapers, journals, the radio and the television.

The working people of Moscow were among the first to respond to the Central Committee's appeal. The leading Moscow collectives started a movement for the further strengthening of production discipline. A meeting held by representatives of the capital's working people appealed to the Muscovites comprehensively to ensure high-level discipline and efficient labor organization and to adopt the slogan "Honor and Glory Based on Work!" The obligations which were taken are aimed at uprooting all violations of discipline, self-seeking, parasitism, and theft of state property. An extensive development of brigade forms of labor organization, strict observance of contractual obligations with related enterprises, and the thrifty use of raw and other materials and energy resources are planned. The Muscovites see in this real opportunities for enhancing national economic efficiency.

The patriotic initiative to strengthen production conscious discipline and organization is supported by important initiatives launched by the collectives of leading



enterprises, housing organizations and city militia sections which are implementing specific measures aimed at the further strengthening of law and order and intensifying the struggle against antisocial actions.

Many enterprises, establishments and residential districts in the capital have acquired valuable experience in really strengthening discipline and organization and public order at work and outside work. Following are three interviews prepared by the editors describing this experience.

### The Great Power of the Collective

For the past several years the Khromatron Plant, which is part of the MELZ [Moscow Electric Bulb Plant] Association, has held the title of model Moscow enterprise. Its collective is famous for its efficient and rhythmical work, strict implementation of annual and five-year plans and high level of labor organization. The plant's party organization is considered among the best in Moscow's Kuybyshevskiy Rayon. It is distinguished by the high activeness of the party members and the ability to resolve problems with drive and efficiency.

Strengthening labor and production discipline and ensuring an efficient labor organization are among the most topical tasks," says Renat Vasil'yevich Skalkin, Khromatron party committee secretary. Measures to resolve this problem are discussed at party committee and general party meetings, at party education and economic training courses, people's universities, theory conferences, lectures and debates on motion pictures and theater performances on production topics and moral aspects of labor activities.

In the course of such work we see to it that all the members of our collective become profoundly aware of the significance of discipline in the life of society and in ensuring the efficient functioning of the national economic mechanism and the planned development of the entire economy with its individual sectors and enterprises. We tried to indicate through specific figures and examples the losses which breakdowns or delays in contractual deliveries, unrhythmical production work, nonimplementation of individual obligations or parts of the plan, violations of technological stipulations and working time losses could cause.

The development of worker honor and a feeling of duty to fellow workers, the enterprise and the entire country plays an important role in strengthening conscious discipline. Here again the involvement of the worker, the young production worker above all, in the revolutionary, combat and labor traditions of the Soviet people, is of inestimable importance. The young workers willingly meet with production veterans and frontrankers, attend labor dynasty celebrations, ceremonies of presentation of labor cards and the dedication of people as members of the working class, "first wage days," and profession evenings. They attend hobby clubs. Such measures contribute to the shaping of their class self-awareness and enhance their feeling of responsibility to the collective.

The trade union, Komsomol and other public organizations participate in the efforts to strengthen discipline alongside the party organization. Their joint efforts played a decisive role in the application of brigade forms of labor organization and wages, including work based on a single order with the use of individual labor participation coefficients, which make it possible to determine the contribution of the individual worker and clearly see one type of deviation or another from approved production order. Currently nearly 90 percent of all Khromatron workers work as brigade members.

We consider the level of production discipline one of the main indicators in the socialist competition. It is considered in summing up competition results along with basic economic indicators. Absentees and those who are late for work are discussed at brigade, sector and shift meetings.

A council on strengthening labor discipline and legal violations was set up in 1977. This public authority enjoys a high reputation in the collective. It is headed by L. P. Beketov, head of the cadre department, and includes members of the public organizations, the radio broadcasting editor, the physician and the legal counsel. Eight of its 11 members are party members. Violators of labor discipline and public order are summoned to its weekly sessions. As a rule, following such discussions, the photographs of the culprits and an explanation of the violation and related measures taken are published as well. The materials of the proceedings are broadcast.

Successful struggle is being waged against drunkenness, which is an antisocial phenomenon. We began by identifying all those who misuse alcohol. It turned out, however, that this was no simple matter, for people were reluctant to disclose this aspect of their nature. A brief conversation takes place with people who show up at work drunk. The clear fact of intoxication is established. However, it is far more difficult to prove that faulty work has been the result of intoxication.

The foremen, who are closely acquainted with the personnel in the production sectors, helped to identify alcohol abusers. A list of their names were drawn up and given to drug addiction specialist L. G. Karelina, who works at the plant's medical center (she is also a member of the public council on strengthening labor discipline and delinquency prevention). She talked to all the individuals included in the list, after which measures were defined on how to influence the various people. In some cases the immoderate use of alcohol is caused by basic slackness or irresponsibility. In such cases the influence of society suffices. Should they become necessary, administrative measures are taken to set the person "on the true path." Matters become more complicated in cases of alcoholism which has become a disease, at which point medical help is needed.

L. G. Karelina gives a weekly talk on the plant radio on the harm caused by alcohol and on the destructive social consequences of drunkenness and its influence on health. She discusses the same topic individually with each one of her "wards." Should medical treatment be necessary, it is provided in a special office at the medical center. In the case of more difficult or neglected cases the people are urged to seek hospital treatment.

Fellow workers exert a positive influence on alcoholics. Members of the public organizations are in close contact with the families of the addicts. This helps to promote more efficient control and the formulation of a behavioral frame.

Such comprehensive work yielded very real results. Alcohol abuses on the part of those who had not reached the stage of chronic alcoholism came to a virtual end. However, even most of those for whom alcoholism had become a disease were able to cure themselves after a course of treatment.

The attitude of the person toward his collective is also important in strengthening discipline. If a worker values the collective truly and cares for the honor of the enterprise, as a rule he does not let his plant down. Our feedback between the worker and the collective is exceptionally strong in our plant. The Khromatron workers are proud of their enterprise, its achievements and labor glory. They also care for the daily concern shown by the collective for the individual working person.

How could one not value, for example, the steady efforts of the administration and the public organizations to improve labor conditions in all sectors? Lighting, ventilation and temperature in the premises, the colors in which the equipment and the walls are painted, the convenience of work places and nice work clothing are all on the level of contemporary requirements of industrial aesthetics. A project was recently completed on a contractual basis at Khromatron by the Scientific Research Institute of Normal Physiology imeni P. K. Anokhin, USSR Academy of Medical Sciences. On their recommendation, an efficient change in assembly operations, a shifting conveyor belt rhythm and functional music were applied with a view to making the work easier and more varied and to eliminate monotony.

A great deal has been done to improve amenities, recreation and housing conditions. Plant visitors are impressed, in particular, by the convenient lockers, Dutch tile and gleaming showers. Yet our workers consider this an ordinary matter. They have become accustomed to beautifully appointed areas for recreation and their comfortable wood furniture, placed in the vicinity of the conveyor belt.

The plant's cafeteria, properly appointed (wide wood-paneled walls, proper illumination and modern furniture), and the latest kitchen equipment provide hot food on a round-the-clock basis, free for those who work on the basis of a three-shift sliding schedule. Without leaving the plant one can purchase semi-finished meat and vegetable goods and confectionary items. Food orders may be placed twice weekly.

The plant's entrance hall has been converted into a center for daily living requirements. The personnel of the industrial aesthetics bureau have turned this area into beautiful stands and reception centers. Here the people can purchase books, periodicals, medicinal drugs, railroad tickets. They can deal with insurance matters, have their shoes repaired or have their hair done and have a manicure. Company goods are sold in a stand maintained by the Mytishthi Knitted Goods Factory. The "Elegant Store" has opened a branch

here for fashionable ready-made clothing. Fabrics for those who like to sew at home are cut here. The building of a winter garden with a swimming pool and a fountain was completed during the day of the December communist subbotnik. Everything in the hall is the result of the work of the Khromatron personnel who followed the relatively inexpensive design of the plant's industrial aesthetics bureau.

Ninety-eight percent of the personnel have their own comfortable living premises and one of every three receives paid leave benefits. Any worker can participate in creative music collectives or sports games. The need for children's preschool institutions has been met in its entirety. Recently the construction of a model residential complex with all necessary customer services was undertaken not far from Khromatron. Let us note that its layout includes many of the suggestions formulated by the workers who participated in a collective discussion of construction plants.

Concern for the personnel strengthens the feeling of pride in one's own plant, strengthens individual ties with it and has a beneficial influence on all realms of collective life and activities.

We are fully justified in saying that the increased struggle against anti-social actions is yielding tangible results. In 1975 the sum total of infractions per 100 employees averaged 7.3. Seven years later it had been reduced to 1.3. Whereas cadre turnover was 10 percent in 1975 it was 6 percent in 1980. This is the lowest sectorial indicator in enterprises whose personnel work on the basis of a sliding schedule.

The decisions of the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum gave a powerful impetus to further improvements in party work at the plant and encouraged the focusing of attention on the most topical economic and social problems. On the suggestion of the party committee the plenum's materials were discussed at cluster party meetings in basic and auxiliary production facilities and engineering and technical services. In addressing the meetings, the party members described their work self-critically and their shortcomings which have become apparent of late. Concern was expressed over the fact that the share of superior quality goods has declined and that the requirements of technological discipline are not always met because of unrhythmical and incomplete deliveries of complementing parts. The fact that loafers and absentees are still found in the collective was mentioned as well.

The party members earmarked specific measures for the elimination of these and other shortcomings and for upgrading the level of organizational-party and ideological-educational work. The MELZ Association, of which the Khromatron Plant is a part, was one of the initiators in the movement for further enhancing labor and production discipline.

Although our collective has acquired a certain experience in this respect, we never forget that at our enterprise, as is the case with other enterprises in Moscow, shortcomings and unused reserves exist. The new socialist pledges assumed by Khromatron workers stipulate the following:

"Decisively upgrading discipline and order in production is one of the main reserves for the growth of output. Daily labor discipline is the law. The violation of labor discipline means the violation of the law. This is the demand of the times. This precisely must be our attitude toward labor discipline, for under contemporary conditions, when labor collectives have at their disposal significant production capacities and expensive equipment, any violation of the labor rhythm results in major material and economic losses. A weakening of discipline corrupts the collective. It triggers formalism and indifference toward the common project and, in the final account, causes severe moral harm. Quite frequently, slipshod, sloppy workers, absentees and drunkards hide behind overall favorable output indicators and growth of labor productivity, behind the backs of leaders in the socialist competition."

At a general Khromatron meeting the workers suggested that a system be developed in which any case of lateness, absenteeism or leaving before the end of the shift be considered an extraordinary case. Loafing must be considered a collective shame and a single case of absenteeism, a spot cast on the entire collective.

Naturally, persuasion should be applied above all to those who violate labor and social discipline. However, such delinquents reject the good words and advice of their fellow workers, and the entire power of the law should be applied and specific steps taken as stipulated in the labor legislation. The collective unanimously resolved that all violators of labor and social discipline--absentees, drunks, parasites and hooligans--should be watched strictly. No "rolling stone" who seriously damages the production process should be offered any kind of benefits. The submission of a resignation must be mandatorily considered at a worker meeting. Discipline violators must be penalized both morally and materially.

We also believe that in order to maintain model labor and social discipline, managers on all levels must provide favorable working and resting conditions. Amenities must be improved and those who work conscientiously and fulfill their civic duties must be given moral and material incentives.

We shall continue to see to it that our collective observes the principle of "Honor and Glory Are Based on Labor!"

#### Components for Success

The Moscow-Krasnopresnenskiy Department Store is not a huge one. Its sales are lower than that of the GUM by a factor of 7-8 and the number of its employees is proportionally small. It could not really be described as small, however, for it employs some 800 people. In recent years its collective has invariably been in the rank of the leaders and held a good position in the competition among Moscow trade enterprises. Its economic indicators are good. A convincing one among them is its steady growth of sales.

This is a stable collective. Cadre turnover is declining steadily. Over the past 5 years, in particular, the number of people who have resigned on their own free will declined from 9 to 5.5 percent. There are virtually no cases of absenteeism, lateness or other labor discipline violations.

Viktor Ivanovich Arkhipov, department store director, comments on these facts as follows:

There are many components of the success achieved by our collective, but let me single out the most important ones. I place first the power of the collective itself, which is united and cohesive, feeling a common responsibility for assignments. Here a feeling of closeness and mutual aid and informal interest in the affairs of everyone are manifested daily. In a word, a good psychological microclimate has developed which encourages the people to work conscientiously, to care for the honor of the collective and to live with its interests.

Naturally, this did not develop by itself. It is a result of many years of joint efforts on the part of the party, trade union and Komsomol organizations and the economic management, and daily educational work. Such work is conducted along a number of directions and is concentrated mainly on newly hired personnel. This means not only the development of professional skills but making the nobility of the profession clear, educating the person in a spirit of love for the work and professional conscientiousness. From his very first step at work the novice becomes aware that the salesclerk is not a robot. He must act as a good adviser and consultant to the customer.

One of our rules is that in the course of the training process we study the character of the novice, his mentality and range of interests attentively. We proceed from the fact that not everyone can be a trade worker and that it is better immediately to explain this to the young person before he reaches the same conclusion himself through his own trials and disappointments.

Women account for most of our personnel. After a course given by the production training foremen, the beginner salesclerk is sent to a section or branch of the general store in which she is assigned a sponsor. We have 68 sponsors who are acknowledged masters of their work and enjoy a good reputation. Naturally, however, from the very beginning the person begins to work on her own. In the final account, however, the collective exerts a decisive influence on her.

People become united not only at work but in their leisure time as well, which is spent together. We have developed the tradition of collective outings to theaters, museums and exhibits, hiking trips, excursions and trips to hero cities.

I think that the members of our collective are well aware of the level of their responsibility and the importance of labor discipline. It may also happen, however, that a person who seems to be properly familiar with the need to observe the established order accurately may violate the discipline. In our study of cases of late appearance to work we reach a somewhat paradoxical conclusion: quite frequently such lateness is virtually inevitable. Some people live far from their work (and we know how the city transportation system could let one down); others must take their children to kindergartens on their way to work (quite frequently going out of their way). This sharply increases the likelihood of being late for work.

We found a solution to this situation by establishing a sliding schedule which was developed after a detailed study of the "transportation problem" faced by the individual salespersons. We also considered the individual views and only then established the working hours of the personnel. Some begin their work day at 8 am while others begin 1 or 2 hours later. Some salespersons were converted to half-day work or partial work weeks at their own request. Naturally, this meant more work for the administration which, however, was more than compensated by a drastic decline and subsequently the total elimination of late appearances.

For quite some time we have had virtually no cases of absenteeism. Incidentally, we make full use of the rule according to which showing up for work intoxicated is the equivalent of being absent. In our collective the "stronger sex" is in the clear minority, but it is precisely men who account for most established cases of alcohol abuse. Although the number of such cases was small, every one of them was considered by the collective as an exceptional occurrence.

The social organizations, which operate smoothly in our enterprise, on the basis of a unified plan, play an invaluable role in strengthening production discipline. The party organization, with its 118 members, directs the common efforts. The party members set the example at work. They strictly observe the requirements of discipline and trade regulations. Problems of efficient implementation of the principles of the moral code of the builder of communism and the struggle against negative phenomena are always discussed at party meetings. Party member-managers regularly submit reports to the party bureau on educational work in the various branches, departments and sections of the department store.

The trade union and Komsomol organizations pay great attention to enhancing the level of conscious discipline, with the help of their specific methods. Extensive work is being done by the public legal consultation service, which includes the department store director, the chief bookkeeper and the heads of the main departments. This social organ sponsors seminars, lectures and dissemination of legal knowledge. However, the most efficient line of work in the area of social consultations is individual talks with every discipline violator.

The group of people's controllers, which numbers 80 members, exerts a major influence on the life of the collective. It made more than 100 investigations in 1982, the materials of which became the basis for orders issued by the department store's administration.

In the view of our collective, problems of production discipline involve not only the regimen of the work day but the strict observance of the rules of Soviet trade and proper service standards. The trade union organization takes strictly into consideration the observance of stipulated norms in summing up the results of the socialist competition and sponsors competitions for high service standards. The Komsomol committee organizes unannounced "beacon" investigations and sets up Komsomol quality posts. They control the standard of work with customers, the availability of goods in warehouses and on store shelves, and the hygiene standards in official and trade premises.

Violations of the daily schedule or sale rules are clearly noted. They are discussed at production conferences and, in many cases, submitted for consideration by the comrade court. In addition to public reprimands (which, as we have realized, can be quite effective!) we use other kinds of penalties such as, for example, an administrative reprimand, demotion, or the lowering or total loss of bonuses. By decision of the trade union committee a discipline violator may lose his seniority in obtaining housing or may be allowed to take his paid leave during the winter season only.

Naturally, we influence the people mainly through positive example. Our best workers, who skillfully serve the customers and set examples of strict observance of discipline requirements and sale regulations, are well-known to the entire collective. Their work is described at meetings and monthly "salesclerk days." As a rule, frontrankers are awarded bigger bonuses.

Such efforts yield very real results: the substantial improvement in production discipline has been paralleled by improved customer service standards and protection of socialist property. The official stipulation of "loss of trust" may be applied even in cases of minor violations of trade rules. Whereas in 1977 five people were the subjects of "loss of trust," there were only two in 1980 and no cases have been recorded over the past 2 years. For the past several years no complaints have been received from customers. Conversely, last year 807 letters of thanks were received.

The appeal adopted at the meeting of representatives of Moscow working people on strengthening discipline and order was discussed here with the participation of the personnel of the branches, departments and sections. The pledges taken by the pioneers in the movement for strengthening discipline in party and Komsomol training classes were studied. Our collective tries to enhance the responsibility of every worker and customer service standards.

As to the wishes of the working people carried by the press that the work hours in trade enterprises be changed, I can say the following: the main building of our department store remains open from 8 am to 9 pm. A number of branches, however, stay open from 10 am to 7 pm. We are currently converting the "Porcelain-Glassware," "Carpets" and General Store No 5 to new working hours more convenient to the customers.

In the Progressive Microrayon

The Veshnyaki-Vladychino Microrayon was the first in Moscow to be awarded the title of model microrayon in November 1982. The construction, transportation, trade, service, scientific, medical and other enterprises and institutions here reach high labor indicators year after year and their collectives are distinguished by their high production and labor discipline standards. Here housing, engineering systems, roads, sidewalks and sports playgrounds are kept in excellent or good condition. Efficient struggle is being waged against antisocial actions and extensive work is being done to upgrade the social activeness of all residents.



Here is what Galina Fedorovna Shilova, Perovskiy Rayon party secretary said:

For the past 5 years--from 1978 to 1982--Perovskiy Rayon was awarded the Red Challenge Banner of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee, based on the results of the all-union socialist competition. Eleven enterprises were awarded the high title of "Moscow City Model Enterprise."

This became possible thanks to the joint efforts of party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations sponsoring enterprises and establishments. Speaking of the contribution of the rayon soviet of people's deputies, let us note the daily attention which all of its administrations, departments, deputy commissions and groups pay to the daily needs of the working people, and to their wishes and requests. This applies not only to the Veshnyaki-Vladychino Microrayon but to the other microrayons in Perovskiy Rayon as well.

However, in terms of meeting the needs of the population, the Veshnyaki-Vladychino Microrayon has reached a higher level compared to the others. The network of kindergartens, nurseries, polyclinics, stores, and service enterprises develop here and the availability of transportation and telephone facilities meet virtually all population requirements. There is an abundance of plants and flowers along the streets and in courtyards.

Nine territorial deputy groups are actively operating in the microrayon. They regularly meet with the voters and promote socialist competition for the title "model apartment, access road and house," for the proper maintenance of housing facilities and for landscaping. Every deputy has been assigned a group of houses with whose residents he works regularly.

A great deal has been done in the microrayon by the Komsomol aktiv and the personnel of the Komsomol raykom, who regularly meet with the young people, organize lectures and talks, set up international friendship clubs, promote educational work in hostels for young workers and initiate the construction of sporting facilities. A Komsomol-youth center, visited by more than 2,000 adolescents, was opened at the Entuziast Movie Theater on the raykom's suggestion. The workers of the prosecutor's office, the courts, the militia and the public health and education personnel, the Knowledge society and DOSAAF have made a substantial contribution to making the microrayon exemplary.

The Perovskiy Rayon party committee guides and coordinates all such comprehensive activities. In this respect we rely on the party organizations which sponsor microrayon enterprises and microrayon party members. Nonstatutory party organizations have been set up at two house-building management offices. Twice a year we hold cluster party meetings in the microrayon.

With the help of the public the raykom thoroughly studies living conditions in the microrayon, the population structure and its requirements and needs. Teachers and students attending the Komsomol Central Committee Higher Komsomol School have become involved in sociological studies in Veshnyaki-Vladychino. Interviews based on survey cards were held in 1,578 apartments

housing almost 7,000 people. The resulting data enabled us to draw a social portrait of the microrayon population, reflecting its sociodemographic features and the level of social and creative activeness of the people. Their suggestions and wishes were summed up.

The investigation materials enabled the party raykom to work with a more precise consideration of professional and age-group population characteristics and to influence even more purposefully the public associations which currently play an important role in microrayon life. Each of the nine house management offices has public councils, house committees, people's control groups, councils of Great Patriotic War and Labor Veterans, women's councils, and others. All in all, more than 3,000 people participate in the work of the social organizations.

All housing management offices have developed into permanent centers for educational, mass cultural and sports work. By decision of the rayon party committee, each one of them is sponsored by a Perovski Rayon enterprise. Thus, the collective of the Sel'energoprojekt Institute organized sports and chess clubs and a puppet theater and center for medical knowledge for the adult at House Administration No 15. Here physicians living in the microrayon examine patients on a voluntary basis and have organized several groups for general physical training.

The collective of the Komsomol Central Committee Higher Komsomol School is the sponsor of House Management No 25. It has set up a political information center on problems of international life in which meetings, talks and lectures and consultations for political informants and agitators are organized. After capital repairs, the premises of a former barbershop were converted into a club for children's creativity, with an art and photography studios, airplane model building, knitting and soft-toy circles. Many adolescents attend the international friendship club and participate in sports. The building of a sports complex will be completed shortly.

The party raykom tries to find new forms of ideological and education work, to broaden its framework and intensify its content. The comprehensive plan of the Perovski Rayon party organization for the communist education of the working people has become the guideline followed by all party members. It calls for the efficient coordination of all means for education and close interaction among labor collectives, schools and families. The microrayon has permanently active 280 propagandists and agitators, 31 Knowledge Society members and 160 political informants. The party organizations regularly sponsor information-propaganda conferences with the participation of senior party raykom and rayon soviet executive committee personnel.

Particular attention is being paid to the development of voluntary activities, in the broadest possible meaning of the term, and the involvement of the entire population in microrayon improvements. Joint participation in landscaping, yard cleaning, building children's playgrounds and refurbishing premises for club work unites the people and strengthens their involvement with common projects. The attitude of the people toward their surroundings changes for the better, for something accomplished with one's own hands is valued more and protected better.

The role of common, properly realized responsibility for its protection is invaluable in developing an attitude of ownership of public property. By competing for the "Model Maintenance and High Living Standard Home," the residents collectively watch over the building and thus raise the attitude toward public property higher.

Repair brigades staffed by microrayon residents are becoming increasingly popular. Currently there are 28 such brigades totaling more than 450 members. In 1982 they completed projects worth in excess of 35,000 rubles through their own efforts.

One of the main directions in our work is the steady strengthening of law and order and increasing the struggle against antisocial actions. This involves essentially preventive work and an efficient system for the dissemination of legal knowledge.

The facilities of the patrol-post service, nondepartmental guards, state automotive inspectorates and public units have been efficiently deployed. With every passing year the voluntary law and order protection centers are playing an increasing role in the struggle against delinquencies. Their councils are headed by senior personnel of leading sponsoring enterprises, with senior sectorial inspectors acting as their deputies.

House-building committees and comrade courts have been set up by the microrayon housing management offices. The people's units number 236 party and Komsomol members who are steadily patrolling the streets of the Veshnyaki-Vladychino district.

All rayon social organizations have subunits or officials in charge of education and preventive work with adolescents, operating in close touch with secondary and vocational-technical schools. All house management offices have public commissions in charge of juvenile matters.

Legal training in the schools is being improved. The framework of lectures has been broadened, a consultation center for parents has been opened and school detachments of young friends of the militia have been organized. The Veshnyaki-Vladychino Microrayon has identified all students requiring greater educational care. Work is being done with them on a one-to-one basis. A thorough study is made of the interests, capabilities and inclinations of the adolescents, who are then encouraged to participate in the work of youth clubs, circles and sports sections and in literary-music performances. In summertime many children attend Pioneer, sports-labor and health recovery camps.

The results of all of these efforts are tangible. The number of juvenile delinquencies in the microrayon has declined by one-third over the past 2 years.

The results achieved in strengthening discipline and enhancing responsibility and law and order in Veshnyaki-Vladychino proved the effectiveness of purposeful and clearly coordinated work of party, soviet, Komsomol and law and order organs and public organizations.

The appeal of the representatives of Moscow working people to enhance the level of production and labor discipline and secure proper law and order in the capital was warmly supported by the working people in Perovskiy Rayon. We see to it that the rayon as a whole, as is the case with Veshnyaki-Vladychino, assume a leading position and for every one of its residents make a worthy contribution to converting Moscow into a model communist city.

The Muscovite initiative was taken up by many labor collectives throughout the country. The struggle against time wasters, waste makers and loafers, who are causing substantial damage to the entire society, has been energized everywhere. In his speech to the workers of the Moscow Machine Tool-Building Plant imeni Sergo Ordzhonikidze, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov pointed out that "we must give a deeper meaning to the struggle for discipline and relate it directly to the implementation of production assignments. This would eliminate exhausts, so to say." It is precisely in this key that the party organizations in labor collectives must do their work. This is a prerequisite for the successful implementation of the decisions of the November 1982 party Central Committee plenum.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9

## GUARDING THE GAINS OF OCTOBER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 55-66

[Article by General of the Army V. Tolubko, commander-in-chief of the Strategic Rocket Forces, USSR deputy minister of defense]

[Text] The Soviet people, the working people of the brotherly socialist countries and all progressive mankind are festively celebrating a significant event in the life of our state--the 65th anniversary of the Armed Forces of the USSR.

The Soviet soldiers are celebrating this glorious anniversary in an atmosphere of enormous political and labor upsurge, called forth by the decisions of the November (1982) CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the celebrations marking the 60th anniversary of the USSR. Together with all the people they are exerting every possible effort to fulfill successfully the historic plans set forth by the 26th CPSU Congress, ardently approving the scientifically substantiated internal policy of the party, whose supreme aim is the well-being of the people and its principled, consistent and well-weighed out foreign policy course aimed at guaranteeing lasting peace, defense of the October gains and the peoples' rights of independence and social progress.

Shoulder to shoulder with the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact member states, the Soviet army and navy are guarding peace and socialism. The communists of the armed forces of the USSR and all Soviet military men are filled with determination to defend reliably the results of their people's labor, to do everything possible to defend peace on earth. They see a guarantee of this in strengthening further the might of our fatherland and the socialist community as a whole and in constantly enhancing the combat readiness of the army and navy.

### I

The history of the emergence, development and constant perfection of the new type of army is inseparably linked with the revolutionary accomplishments of our people, the activity of the communist party and all the stages of the socialist state's life.

The Great October Socialist Revolution--a very great event of the 20th century--was mankind's first step toward a society without social injustice, violence or wars. For this reason the fact that Lenin's decree of peace was

the first legal act of the Soviet state appears to be not just a symbolic coincidence but a deeply law-governed phenomenon.

Peace was the primary requirement of the workers' and peasants' state for reconstructing social life on new foundations. However, the deposed exploiting classes, not willing to acquiesce to the victory of the people, put up armed resistance. The forces of international capital came to their aid. The imperialists counted on direct foreign intervention, on creating White Guard armies.

Under these conditions the bolshevik party and V. I. Lenin, realistically evaluating the military threat which hung over the revolutionary gains, saw the only correct way in guaranteeing the country's security in organizing its armed defense. Lenin emphasized: "Every revolution is worth something only if it can defend itself..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 37, p 122). In the shortest possible time and relying on the traditions of the proletariat's armed struggle, a new type of army had to be created. Such an army was indeed created.

Lenin, the great leader of the proletarian revolution, stood at the cradle of the Soviet armed forces. On 28 January 1918 he signed the decree of the Council of People's Commissars on organizing the workers and peasants Red Army, and, on 11 February, the decree on organizing the workers and peasants Red Navy. Even in these first documents the main principles of building the armed forces of a socialist state--the class, proletarian nature of the new type of army, its very close unity with the people and the leading role of the communist party in the cause of military building--were easy to trace.

In February 1918, when the kaiser's troops, having broken the cease-fire conditions, began an offensive against revolutionary Petrograd, mortal danger hung over the socialist fatherland. Throughout the country the organization of military units and formations developed on a large scale.

To mark this mass mobilization of the forces of the workers class and the kolkhoz peasantry for the defense of the October gains as well as the courageous resistance put up by the Red Army detachments against the German invaders, 23 February is celebrated by the Soviet people as the Red Army's birthday. The issue of when to celebrate this event was solved on 17 February 1919 at the meeting of the Defense Council with Lenin as chairman.

The communist party and Lenin elaborated the basic principles of building the Red Army, demonstrated its historic purpose and the sources of its strength and invincibility. Lenin's ideas, which were further developed in the party's programmatic documents, are now the foundation of our policy in the sphere of military building.

The backbone of the newly formed Red Army consisted of the most aware representatives of the working people, primarily communists. In spite of the fact that unblazed paths had to be taken and a severe shortage of experienced military cadres had to be faced, disciplined, combat-efficient armed forces were still successfully formed in the shortest possible time in order to

defend the revolutionary gains, the peoples' power and the new, genuinely democratic system. Their might was not directed against the people but was used to defend them, it was not used to seize foreign territories, but to defend the Soviet republic. So it was, is and always will be, a fact that is born out by the entire history of our state.

The young Soviet republic was caught up in the flames of the civil war. The White Guard hordes--armed to the teeth--of Kolchak, Denikin, Vranghel, the troops of bourgeois Poland, and America, England, Germany, Japan and other invaders pressed hard on our country from different sides. In the hard and severe years of cruel battles the newly born Red Army succeeded in defeating the enemy, defending peace on its own soil and emerging strengthened and tempered by the flames of the battle. All of this was possible--in spite of the predictions and evaluations of the bourgeois politicians and military specialists--due to the fact that our armed forces were waging a just war of liberation relying on the strong union of the workers and peasants, the friendship of the peoples of our country and the international solidarity of the working people of other states. This became possible because the leadership of the country and the army was in the hands of the bolshevik party--the recognized vanguard of the working people. Lenin said: "Only because of this, in spite of the onslaughts of the imperialists of the entente and the whole world--onslaughts that were repeated two, three, four times--were we able to achieve victory" (op. cit., vol 40, p 240).

The civil war ended. Emerging from the ruins and destruction, the country embarked on the path of peaceful construction. At the price of enormous efforts the Soviet people, led by the party, transformed their fatherland in a historically short time into a mighty socialist power. All this made it possible to reorganize the Red Army and arm it with the most up-to-date weapons and equipment of that time.

The party and government, loyal to Lenin's behests, did very much to strengthen further the defense potential of our country; however, history gave us too little peaceful time necessary to increase considerably the combat might of the armed forces. The imperialists could not reconcile themselves to the fact that from this time on a socialist state existed on the planet. Having hardly had time to celebrate their 23rd anniversary, the Soviet army and navy rose to defend the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

On 22 June 1941 Hitler's Germany and its allies threw against the USSR 5.5 million fascist cutthroats, about 4,300 tanks, almost 5,000 combat planes and over 47,000 guns and mortars. Thus began a war, unprecedented in scale, bitterness and extreme tension, which for our people became a genuine fatherland and just war for the freedom and independence of the homeland and for the future of all mankind.

As in the years of the civil war, the battle against the insolent aggressor was headed by the communist party. It united the Army and the people into one under the slogan "Everything for the Front, Everything for Victory!" appealing to them to defeat the fascist hordes as quickly as possible.

In 1,418 nights and days of struggle against Hitler's aggressors our fighting men accomplished quite a few heroic deeds at the fronts. More than 7 million people were awarded orders and medals, over 11,600 were honored with the title of Hero of the Soviet Union, almost 11,000 combat orders decorated the banners of groups of units, units and ships. Owing to the courage and mass heroism of all the Soviet people and fighting men of the armed forces, we not only defended the freedom and independence of our fatherland and the great gains of October, but we also helped many peoples of Europe, and later of Asia, to liberate themselves from the fascist enslavement. The victory of the USSR over the most aggressive detachment of international imperialism--Hitler's Germany and its allies--created favorable conditions for socialist revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries. Thus the world socialist system emerged and the mighty community of socialist countries was formed.

The victory of the Soviet people and their armed forces in the Great Patriotic War was an important historic landmark in the destiny of all mankind, and has assumed a truly worldwide historic significance. The authority of the USSR has been enhanced, its international positions have become stronger and new possibilities have opened for strengthening peace on earth, for the flourishing of democracies and for socialist transformations. At the same time our victory has once again convincingly demonstrated what comes out of infringing on the independence of socialist states; it has taught those who like to play with fire another serious lesson.

Soon after the end of World War II, imperialism, and primarily American imperialism, revealing its aggressive nature, unleashed a "cold war" against the Soviet Union, started an arms race, created a number of military blocs and subordinated their activity to the plans of waging a new, this time nuclear, war against the USSR and the countries of the socialist community.

All the actions of the imperialist militarists were directed toward gaining superiority in the sphere of armaments and other military advantages which would allow the ruling circles of imperialism to pursue their policy "from a position of strength."

It is known that the most destructive weapons of our century--nuclear weapons--first appeared in the United States. The United States was also the first to use nuclear bombs, without any military necessity, against the peaceful populations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The creation of nuclear weapons was followed by the feverish production of its carrier systems--strategic bombers--and then intercontinental ballistic missiles. At the beginning of the sixties the United States started building nuclear submarines carrying ballistic missiles.

Under these conditions the Soviet Union was forced to take retaliatory measures to strengthen its security. In a short time, owing to the concern of the communist party, the Soviet workers, designers and scientists built a powerful missile-nuclear shield, and our fighting men mastered the new weapons. With regard to the state of their technical equipment and organizational



structure, the system of control and logistics, our armed forces have become a secure guarantee of the peace and security of our state and the socialist community as a whole.

It must be emphasized that all the measures aimed at enhancing the defense potential of the armed forces were of a retaliatory nature and were called forth by sheer need under conditions in which the imperialist states were banking on nuclear blackmail and elaborating plans of attacking the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The details of these truly cannibalistic plans, which have now become publicly known, eloquently attest to the timeliness of the steps taken by the USSR after World War II to strengthen its defense potential.

In showing concern for strengthening the army and navy, the communist party and the Soviet government and the leadership of the USSR Armed Forces have thus supported the cause of peace, never striving for military superiority or the possibility to dictate its will on other peoples. It is not out of place to recall that taking these forced measures, the Soviet government has constantly come out with proposals to reduce the armaments on a mutual basis and to renounce every type of mass destruction weapons.

Owing to the heroic labor of all Soviet people and to the intense military efforts of the fighting men of the USSR Armed Forces, the Soviet Union has reached approximate equality with the United States in the sphere of strategic arms and, in spite of the desperate attempts of U.S. imperialism to forge ahead, has managed to maintain this equality. The military might of the USSR, the struggle of the masses for peace and disarmament, which is growing in the whole world, and the change of mind of a number of sober-minded Western politicians to recognize these new realities, all these factors have led to a situation where, toward the beginning of the seventies, there was a certain improvement in the relations between states with different social systems.

Under the influence of incipient detente in international relations, avenues were opened for establishing cooperation between these states on a very broad range of questions. Realistic prerequisites for detente in the military sphere also took shape.

The first step on this road was the Soviet-American strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT I), which was based on the principles of equality and equal security of the parties.

## II

However, the aggressive imperialist circles of the United States and a number of other NATO states did not like either the positive changes in the world or the strengthening of the positions of the peace-loving forces. The Washington administration elaborated a fairly large program for the seventies for a further buildup of strategic arms by increasing the quantity of nuclear arms and substantially improving their accuracy. The program envisaged the perfection of all the types of the "strategic triad," namely intercontinental

ballistic missiles, nuclear missile-carrying submarines and strategic bombers. In this period the United States put into service 550 "Minuteman III" missiles, each having three warheads. A total of 496 "Poseidon C-III" missiles, each equipped with 10 to 14 warheads, were deployed in 31 nuclear missile submarines.

The improved accuracy of the modernized systems (more than twofold compared to their predecessors) in fact leads to their destructive capabilities being enhanced more than fivefold. At the same time work was done to increase the power of warheads, strengthen the defense of the launching installations in silos and equip the "Minuteman-III" missiles with a remote control system for retargeting missiles to unplanned targets. Some 268 "B-52 strategic bombers were reequipped for the deployment of 20 guided missiles each, whereas 65 "FB-11A" medium bombers were also equipped with the same missiles. This allowed the United States to double its capacity for delivering nuclear weapons to the target without increasing the number of carrier systems.

This was all done under the cover of the noise made by the so-called "Committee on the Present Danger," mass information media and, later on, by official figures on the account of the "vulnerability gaps" in the U.S. defense, which had allegedly appeared. Acting on instructions from the ruling circles, the mass information media tried, in defiance of facts, to persuade the Americans and the world public opinion in every possible way that the United States had not reinforced its strategic arms and therefore the existing parity was, allegedly, upset.

With the aim of preventing the emerging new spiral in the arms race, the Soviet Union came out with a number of proposals on further limiting strategic arms. The strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT II) signed in 1979 concluded the negotiations and established the parties' equality regarding arms of this kind. Unfortunately, through the fault of the United States this treaty was not ratified. What is more, a sharp turn toward confrontation took place in U.S. policy.

Once again, as before, the U.S. ruling circles began to orient themselves toward using crude force in international relations. The official representatives of the White House have repeatedly made open declarations on the acceptability of unleashing both a global and a "limited" nuclear war. Without paying heed to other countries' opinion the United States declared vast regions of the world, being thousands of kilometers away from its own territory, spheres of its own "vital interests." The formation of the U.S. Central Command, whose zone of action comprises 19 states of East Africa and the Near and Middle East, is a striking example of the imperialist trend in U.S. policy.

The present U.S. administration together with its most aggressive NATO partners are banking on upsetting the existing military-strategic balance between the USSR and the United States, between the Warsaw Pact Organization and the North Atlantic bloc. At a meeting with editors of provincial papers on 17 October 1981, President Reagan himself openly admitted that the United States is setting the fashion for the arms race, saying: "The Russians cannot catch

up with us." Instead of obtaining an agreement on the basis of equality and equal security, the United States is directing all its efforts toward insuring military superiority for itself and its NATO allies. For the sake of this goal it is trying by every possible means to place all Western resources at the service of its interests, striving to expand NATO's zone of responsibility and increase the military spending of this bloc.

Washington is concentrating its efforts on breaking previously reached agreements and hampering the strategic arms limitation and reduction talks (START) which are now under way. Pleading the need to elaborate a new approach to the question of limiting and reducing strategic arms, Washington is intentionally dragging out the negotiations. It took advantage of the pause in the negotiations to urgently elaborate programs for a massive buildup of U.S. strategic arms and prepare negotiating proposals unacceptable to the USSR.

The calculations of the American side are quite simple--to succeed in upsetting the existing parity in favor of the U.S. by proposing a reduction in only one of the strategic arms' spheres. A proposal, attractive at first sight, has been put forward to reduce the level of ballistic missiles to 850 units on either side. However, such a substantial reduction of ballistic missiles puts the Soviet Union in a situation of unequal conditions and this is why: Due to historical factors and its geographical location the USSR has developed land-based ballistic missiles (LBMs) which carry 70 percent of the warheads, whereas the United States has concentrated on submarine-based ballistic missiles (SBMs) and heavy bombers which carry more than 80 percent of the warheads.

It is natural that such a difference in the distribution of strategic arms, a difference resulting from their different type of basing, presupposes the need to consider all arms when preparing mutual agreements. Should the U.S. proposal be implemented, the United States would gain a 50 percent superiority over the Soviet Union regarding the number of strategic carriers and a threefold superiority regarding the number of nuclear charges. Should the U.S. proposals be accepted, the USSR would be obliged to dismantle more than 90 percent of its LBMs which, as we noted before, constitute the foundation of its military strength. Thus, the proposals put forward by the United States are incompatible with the principles of equality and equal security.

All these facts as well as the stand of the Soviet government are well-known to the American side. Putting forward proposals which obviously pursue the aim of upsetting the existing balance casts doubt on the seriousness of Washington's intentions to attain a real agreement on the limitation and reduction of missile-nuclear arsenals. The influential circles of the U.S. military-industrial complex are coming out against such an agreement while regarding the negotiations as just a coverup for creating a new spiral in the senseless and dangerous arms race.

Proceeding from the conditions of guaranteeing equality and equal security, the Soviet Union proposed to reduce in stages by 1990 the total number of strategic carriers (intercontinental ballistic missile launching pads,

ballistic missile launching installations based on submarines and heavy bombers) up to 1,800 on each side, that is to lower by 25 percent the ceiling for the total number of carriers set by SALT II. It is important to note that in this case both the USSR and the United States would remain--at all stages of reduction--in the same position from the point of view of guaranteeing their strategic security. In putting forward this proposal, the Soviet Union is taking into consideration that the United States possesses forward-based nuclear means deployed in the immediate proximity of the borders of the USSR and its allies. The Soviet Union does not possess any such means in the vicinity of U.S. territory.

However, this equal and comprehensive proposal again fails to satisfy the United States. By rejecting it the White House pursues quite different aim --to exacerbate world tension even further by whipping up the arms race.

This turn of affairs has a particularly adverse effect on the situation to Europe. It is precisely this continent that the strategists from beyond the ocean have in mind when they expand on the acceptability of a "limited" nuclear war. The situation in this region of the world will substantially deteriorate with the deployment--planned by the United States and its NATO allies--of the new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles, the ballistic "Pershing II" missiles and cruise missiles in a number of European countries.

The performance of these weapons (their short flight time to the target, particularly high accuracy--up to plus-minus 40 meters--and relatively high warhead power) shows that U.S. military-potential circles regard them as means of a sudden first strike against strategically important and well-protected objectives in the depth of our country's territory including the command posts of the political and military leadership case of war, do not constitute any immediate danger for the countries whose governments--under Washington's pressure--have agreed to the deployment of U.S. missiles on their territory. Of course, the sudden use of "Persings" would not be able to prevent a retaliatory strike. However, the possible death of millions of Europeans, the destruction of all that has been achieved by the centuries-long labor of the peoples of this continent, is of no concern to the "hawks" from beyond the ocean. They bank on reducing--at the expense of their partners--the power of the punitive retaliatory strike at U.S. territory in case of nuclear catastrophe.

It must also be mentioned here that the deployment of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe would considerably confuse and complicate the negotiations on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms.

Taking all this into account, the Soviet Union has come out with a new initiative and proposed--on condition that our negotiation partners renounce the deployment of U.S. missiles in Western Europe--to reduce a considerable number of launching installations for the missiles which in the NATO countries are referred to as SS-20, SS-4 and SS-5, located in the European part of our country, thus bringing their number down to 162. It is exactly the same as the number of intermediate-range missiles possessed by England and France.

The world immediately responded to the new peace-loving proposal of the Soviet Union. In speeches and published statements by political leaders of different countries, the idea of support for the Soviet efforts--which are genuinely directed at reducing the nuclear potential in Europe and creating the necessary conditions to guarantee security on the continent--is clearly to be seen. It is typical that nowadays, according to the data quoted by the bourgeois mass information media, 65 percent of the English people and 61 percent of the FRG citizens are against the deployment of U.S. missiles on their territory.

Under these conditions the supporters of deploying new types of nuclear weapons are forced to maneuver. Some of them try to placate public opinion in Western Europe by promising to give the Soviet proposals thorough consideration and by referring to the negotiations conducted by the USSR and the United States (which have, in fact, reached a deadlock over the so-called "zero option" on which the United States still continues to insist). Others specialize in distorting the essence of the Soviet proposals and juggling the facts which attest to the real correlation of forces in Europe. Typical in this context is the statement of one of the influential West European political figures who claimed that "the Soviet Union is holding two guns aimed at NATO, which has none." The crudity of such a comparison as well as its plainly biased nature, calculated to intimidate millions of Europeans, are obvious. In reality the correlation of nuclear means in Europe is as follows: As regards the number of means of delivery, there is approximate equality: The NATO bloc countries have 986 units, whereas the USSR has 975; however, in nuclear warheads (and it is precisely these rather than the means of their delivery that kill people and destroy cities) NATO even holds a 50-percent superiority.

If we agreed to the American "zero option," we would fall behind NATO two-fold as regards the number of carriers and three-fold as regards the number of nuclear charges. And there are still people who under these conditions seriously propose unilateral disarmament to the USSR.

The U.S. militarists put great hopes in the modernization of their intercontinental ballistic missiles. Here the stake is on the deployment of the most up-to-date MX missiles. Striving to set a new spiral of the arms race in motion, certain U.S. circles apparently expect that new types of weapons, whose production technology is very complicated, will allow the United States to gain a decisive superiority over the Soviet Union. Particularly eloquent in this context is the U.S. refusal to second the Soviet obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The hopes to upset the balance which exists in the world are dangerous and short-sighted. Three decades ago the United States failed to succeed in maintaining its monopoly on nuclear arms. Nowadays it has even less of a chance to gain decisive superiority over the USSR. In response to the U.S. commissioning of nuclear submarines of the Ohio type with Trident missiles on board, the USSR built a similar Typhoon system. In response to the deployment in the United States of the long-range cruise missile, we have also developed a cruise missile which is presently being tested. In case the

new U.S. MX missiles are deployed, we shall deploy our new intercontinental ballistic missile which will not be inferior to the U.S. one. Our country will make sure of its defense capability even if NATO decides to "close up the armament gap" in Western Europe by means of new medium-range missiles. Replying to the questions of a PRAVDA correspondent, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov stated this quite unambiguously: "...If it comes to the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Europe, we will respond to this in an appropriate manner." Of course, the Soviet Union was and continues to be of the opinion that buildup armaments on both sides to a new level in this way is undesirable and that it will exert every effort to halt this expensive, senseless and extremely dangerous race.

The Political Declaration recently adopted by the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states was a new initiative directed against the military threat for maintaining and extending detente and developing international cooperation. The propositions contained in this document open a practical possibility for stopping the dangerous development of events at present. In particular, the socialist countries propose to conclude a treaty on mutually renouncing the use of military force and maintaining peaceful relations between the Warsaw Pact states and NATO. The Soviet Union repeatedly appealed and continues to appeal to everyone to aim for a clear and just agreement. Now it is up to our negotiating partners.

### III

The communist party has arrived at the substantiated conclusion that there is a possibility of averting a world war under the present conditions. To convert this possibility into reality, the CPSU and the Soviet government are pursuing a policy in which the active struggle for peace and readiness to give a decisive rebuff to the fanciers of military adventures and the war-mongers are merged into one. In the face of the growing military threat on the part of imperialism, the Soviet Union is obliged to take the necessary measures to strengthen its defense potential.

Owing to the constant concern of the communist party and the Soviet government, our armed forces have at their disposal the most up-to-date weapons which embody the latest scientific discoveries as well as the outstanding achievements of industrial production and the heroic labor of the Soviet designers, engineers and workers.

The Ground Troops--the numerically strongest type of armed forces and the most diversified as regards their combat strength--have undergone radical changes. Their fire and striking power have greatly increased in the postwar period. Operational-tactical and tactical missiles became their main destructive force.

The Air Defense Forces also have been further developed. They are now equipped with powerful air defense missile systems of various types, all-weather ultrasonic interceptor fighters, up-to-date radar stations and other equipment.

The combat capabilities and the striking power of the air forces have also increased. They are armed with supersonic jet planes, missiles and guns and up-to-date radio-electronic equipment.

The Navy as well has become a formidable force to combat the enemy. It has at its disposal nuclear missile-carrying submarines and up-to-date ships of various types armed with missiles and self-homing torpedoes and equipped with the most up-to-date navigation, control and communications equipment. The naval missile-carrying air force is an important means of destroying the enemy. The Soviet country's navy has come out onto the world's oceans, which is an important factor for stabilizing the situation in the various regions of the planet and for keeping in check the aggressive intrigues of the imperialist states.

The youngest of all the Soviet armed forces--the Strategic Missile Troops--constitute an important component part. In the 22 years of their existence these troops have become a reliable shield of our homeland. Nowadays they are armed with the most perfect systems of intercontinental and medium-range missiles capable of delivery to the target nuclear charges of enormous destructive capacity with great reliability and accuracy, dealing the aggressor --wherever he may be--unpreventable blows.

The strategic missile forces are forces of constant combat readiness. For their subunits, units and groups of units, combat readiness is determined by their ability to deal the enemy a crushing retaliatory missile-nuclear blow at any moment and in any situation.

In peacetime the most responsible task of the soldiers of the strategic missile forces is maintaining a state of operational readiness [neseniye boevogo dezhurstva]. This essentially means that the personnel of the subunits constantly remain at the combat tasks assigned to them. Only people boundlessly devoted to their socialist fatherland, ideologically strong and morally and physically fit, are capable of remaining in a state of constantly high mobilization and alertness. Our soldiers, sergeants and officers, the vast majority of whom are communists and Komsomol members, are precisely of this type. The combat readiness of the subunits and units of the strategic forces is measured not in hours, but rather in minutes and seconds.

All this demands of the missile troops high moral-combat qualities, as well as an acute feeling of responsibility for maintaining the most formidable weapons in a state of constant combat readiness, courage, excellent engineering-technical training, quick reaction, crystal-clear honesty, flawless accuracy of actions at the combat station, moral and physical endurance, and irreproachable diligence at any moment and in any situation.

Our fighting men have repeatedly displayed these qualities in the course of preparing and carrying out combat-exercise launches of strategic missiles. It is precisely under these conditions that everything a member of the missile troops is expected to do, all he is worth as a defender of his fatherland, is put to a real test.

We can say with satisfaction that the vast majority of training exercises are carried out with excellent and good results. Intensive training and military exercises as well as the purposeful work of our commanders, headquarters and political organs aimed at educating the personnel greatly contributes to this.

The Soviet army and navy cannot be separated from the people. They share the same thoughts and concerns. All Soviet military men regard as their own vital cause the tasks assigned to the party and the country by the 26th CPSU Congress, the November 1982 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's report "60th Anniversary of the USSR."

Speaking at the plenum on the draft state plan for the economic and social development of the USSR in 1983, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized: "As always, the needs of defense have been considered in sufficient measure. The Politburo considered and continues to consider it obligatory to give the army and navy everything necessary, particularly in the present international situation."

The fighting men of the Soviet armed forces respond to the party's concern for strengthening our country's defense potential by achieving new successes in combat and political training and by their hard military work.

The Soviet people clearly understand that as the country's economy is successfully moved onto the path of intensive development, as the envisaged plans are successfully fulfilled by industry, building organizations and agriculture, as the situation in the sphere of transportation improves, not only will the prosperity of the people increase, but the might of our homeland will also be enhanced--which is extremely important considering the exacerbation of the world situation--and the defense potential of the USSR will be strengthened. At his meeting with Moscow machine builders, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said: "It is not difficult to understand that the greater our successes, the stronger our economy, the better the state of affairs in our people's economy, the stronger our international positions will be, the more stable peace on earth will be."

The Soviet armed forces are a complex organism connected by thousands of strong threads to various branches of the country's economy. This is why the tasks set by the November CPSU Central Committee Plenum are at the center of attention of our military collectives. The task of maintaining a more demanding attitude toward saving material resources, for example, is most directly concerned with fighting men of the Soviet Army.

Our fighting men clearly realize that the weapons and equipment entrusted to them have absorbed a great amount of the Soviet people's labor. The communists and Komsomol members of the armed forces regard the careful handling of material equipment and the skill in using it effectively and attentively not only as a statutory responsibility, but also as their moral duty.

Under present conditions the strengthening of military discipline and the creation of a feeling of responsibility among personnel for fulfilling assigned tasks have assumed great importance.



Tomorrow, having completed their service in the ranks of the armed forces, the young people will return home to their peaceful constructive labor. It is important that for them service in the army or navy proves a good school of ideological and physical tempering, developing discipline and a high state of organization and concern for state property, and deep respect for the results of their own and other people's labor.

Under conditions in which imperialism's aggressiveness is growing and its military preparations are stepped up, the Soviet fighting men consider it their primary task to strengthen constantly the defense potential of our country and enhance in every possible way the army's and navy's combat readiness. The constant enhancement of the combat readiness of the armed forces directly depends on the degree to which the personnel have mastered the weapons and military equipment and on their skill in modern warfare. All fighting men must persistently master the science of defeating a strong enemy, study the enemy thoroughly and pit against him more effective combat weapons and methods. Each soldier, whatever post he may occupy, must always be concerned with the question of whether he is ready to carry out a combat order at any time. The primary responsibilities of a defender of our homeland are a high state of vigilance, strenuous labor and steady progress in the case of enhancing the readiness of the army and navy.

The further strengthening of the armed forces' combat readiness depends to a decisive degree on the moral-political and combat qualities of the personnel. Developing a high state of political awareness in the personnel, perfecting their morality, enhancing their cultural awareness, enriching their intellectual world, intensifying their patriotic and internationalist education, strengthening their military discipline--all these questions are at the center of attention of the political organs, as well as the party and Komsomol organizations.

Today service in the Soviet army and navy makes higher demands on the new recruits of our armed forces. The combat equipment, which must be mastered in an extremely short time, is becoming increasingly complicated. It must be admitted that our young people are successfully solving this task. The higher level of their education and ideological-political and physical training contributes to this. Even before joining the armed forces many young soldiers learn military-technical professions in the DOSAAF organizations. Under the conditions of exacerbated world tension the concern for the good pre-enrollment training of our young people, for the perfection of their military-patriotic education, assumes even greater significance.

On the eve of nationwide celebrations of the 65th anniversary of the Soviet army and navy our fighting men are achieving new significant results in combat and political training.

In the course of intensive training on the ground, in the air, on and under the water, and under conditions approaching combat conditions as closely as possible, representatives of all the services of the armed forces and all troop branches are mastering with seriousness the wisdom of military science and perfecting their combat skill. A great contribution to this is the

socialist competition under the slogan "To Enhance Vigilance and Reliably Guarantee the Security of Our Homeland!" which has been broadly developed in the army and navy.

The following initiators of socialist competitions in the services of the armed forces have celebrated the armed forces anniversary with good marks: a missile unit (commander Lt Col A. Pavlov); the Proskurovsk-Berlin guard armored regiment named after G. I. Kotovsky and decorated with the Orders of Lenin, the Red Banner and Kutuzov (guards commander Lt Col B. Dyukov); the Smolensk Red Banner guard air defense anti-aircraft missile regiment decorated with the Orders of Suvorov, Kutuzov and Bogdan Khmelnitskiy (guards commander Lt Col V. Tatarchenko); and a nuclear missile submarine (commander Captain First Rank A. Samokhvalov). At the head of the socialist competition winners list are communists and Komsomol members.

In their day-to-day military exercises the young fighting men piously revere and multiply the great revolutionary and combat traditions of the older generation. Quite recently the Soviet people and all progressive mankind celebrated the 40th anniversary of the Stalingrad victory, which brought about the turning point in the course of the Great Patriotic War and World War II as a whole. The soldiers of missile forces are proud of the fact that the anniversary of their troops--the day of missile forces and artillery--is celebrated every year on the first day of our offensive in Stalingrad. Young fighting men with great enthusiasm took part in the defense of Stalingrad and in our historic offensive on the Volga. In honor of the 40th anniversary of the Stalingrad battle a supermarathon race from Moscow to Mamayev Kurgan in Volgograd was organized for the soldiers of missile forces. Among those who arrived at the finish was a war veteran and retired Captain B. Osokin and officers V. Parakhnevich and V. Laptev, sons of fighting men who had fought the Battle of Stalingrad.

For 65 years the Soviet armed forces have been reliably defending the borders of their socialist homeland. They have traveled a heroic and legendary path, covering their combat banners with eternal glory in the battles for their Soviet homeland.

The Soviet people can rely today as well on their armed forces who--in united combat formation with the fraternal armies of the countries of the socialist community--are vigilantly guarding the peaceful labor and are always prepared to fulfill their patriotic and international duty in defending socialism's gains.

The present generation of homeland defenders has something to defend and the means to defend it with. Their responsible and humanitarian aim is to guard the peaceful labor of the Soviet people; their reliable compass is the victorious banner of Marxism-Leninism; and their tested and tempered leader is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9

## FRIENDSHIP STRONGER THAN ARMOR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 67-69

[Article by Guards Sgt M. Shtefanko, commander of excellent tank crew]

[Text] Ivan Ivanovich Shtefanko, my grandfather, covered in combat the distance from his native Moldavian soil to the lair of the fascist beast. He frequently described to us children his front-line duty, military life and the greatness of military service. Years went by and my turn to serve in the army came. Grandfather did not live to see this solemn day, for he died as a result of combat wounds....

According to an old tradition, the solemn send-off of young draftees is organized by my countrymen at the common grave of soldiers who fell at the liberation of our village from the Hitlerites. I shall never forget the speech by Ivan Moruz, one of the founders of our sovkhos.... He took off his straw hat. The warm May wind ruffled his grey hair. It was the first time that I saw how many medals my neighbor had, whose strong hands had frequently lifted me, as a child, high up. Uncle Ivan spoke quietly but quite audibly:

"My children, be worthy of those who sacrificed their lives for the freedom and happiness of the land of the soviets and our great nation. Serve well wherever you are ordered by the homeland. Our homeland is huge. You were born on Moldavian soil but our fatherland is the entire Soviet Union. It is right to have such a fatherland earned with blood. Always remember and watch over this!...

The draftees then lay wreaths on the common grave on which stands the metal-cast statue of a soldier wearing a helmet, gun in hand, always ready for battle, forever standing on his granite pedestal. There are always flowers at the common grave, brought by fellow villagers as a token of infinite gratitude to the heroes.

The names of those who went into mortal battle so that today gardens may blossom in my native village and happy songs may be heard on its fields, who allow me and all those around me to be alive, stand engraved on smooth stone plates. The names of heroes stand out in bronze: Alekseyev, Gaynullin, Abdurakhmanov, Ostapchuk, Azizov, Kruminysh, Eyno.... Dozens of names of the sons of many peoples of our country.

Bowing at the common grave to lay a bouquet of red carnations on the sacred soil, I experienced a feeling of deep gratitude for these unknown yet infinitely precious people to me who, fulfilling their international duty, gave their lives for the salvation of the fatherland and the happiness of the Moldavian people. I swore to be worthy of the exploits of the front-line veterans.

... This is my second year of army service. I command a crew which can be proudly described as international. I come from Moldavia. The driver is Guards Pvt Sergey Nikolayevich Polyakov, from Moscow. The gunner is Guards Pvt Aleksandr Ivanovich Ocherednik, from the Ukraine.

Close ties link the members of our company, commanded by party member Guards Sr Lt Vladimir Kinesovich Abuov, a Kazakh, with all corners of the endless land of the soviets. Warm letters from parents, friends and sweethearts reach the Soviet soldier--patriot and internationalist--from everywhere, making all of us happy.

Guards Jr Sgt Revkat Usmanovich Zalyayev receives letters from the Volga, from Kazan. Guards Pvt Akhmar Karamovich Yulmukhametov gets mail from Bashkiriya, Guards Pvt Aleksey Petrovich Barsukov from Belorussia, Guards Sgt Aleksey Georgiyevich Prokop'yev from Chuvashiya, Guards Pvt Viktor Stepanovich Kudelya from the Ukraine, etc.

When I read aloud letters from my father and mother, Andrey Ivanovich and Yekaterina Nikolayevna Shtefanko, on my native Koshkodeny Sovkhoz, Lazovski Rayon, my parents' words strike at the hearts of my fellow servicemen as though they were address to them, too. Unity of political views, spiritual interest, all intellectual life and joint soldiering make our friendship invulnerable.

This is a convincing argument confirmed by a number of examples. I recall, for example, a morning in which the weather warmed up and the frozen soil began to thaw. The order came to stop the headlong offensive and work on the topic of "The Tank Squad in Defense." Squad commander Guards Sr Lt Yacheslav Mikhaylovich Grachev quickly gave clear instructions for the engineering systems to be installed at the squad strong point.

Our crew worked with the coordination of a sports team. We barely communicated with each other.

Our competition rivals--the crew commanded by Guards Jr Sgt Zalyayev, worked by our side. It worked zealously and stubbornly, fully resolved to outstrip us in terms of skill and combat norms. They were succeeding. Suddenly, however, one of their mechanical appliances for digging a trench broke down. Our rivals lost heart. It was clear that they would be unable to carry out the assignment within the stipulated time.

We tripled our efforts in order to complete our work as rapidly as possible. Then, silently, we grabbed our shovels and went to the aid of our rival

friends. Not one of us was tempted by the opportunity to use their misfortune in order to come out the winner. We were resolving a common problem. This was the main thing.

By the time the commanding officer came, both crews had already completed the necessary work well. Both crews were given an excellent rating. In answering jointly to the commander's thanks with our proud quote "We Serve the Soviet Union," we shook hands firmly, like brothers--like comrades-in-arms and sons of the single great Soviet people.

We are proud of the fact that our unit was raised during the difficult years of the Great Patriotic War and that it includes forever in its ranks Heroes of the Soviet Union Guards Col Vasiliy Ivanovich Shibankov, Guards Jr Lt Vasiliy Antonovich Yermolayev and Guards Jr Lt Ivan Platonovich Golub'. We try to be worthy of their glory and combat traditions.

Every soldier today is familiar with the name of Guards Jr Sgt Vasiliy Ivanovich Peshekhonov, who is forever member of our guards tank unit. On the approaches of the Polish city of Krakow, on the morning of 20 January 1945, he blocked with his body the opening of an enemy pillbox, thus silencing a machine gun whose fire was keeping the troops down. The soldier died saving the lives of his friends who, inspired by his exploit, threw themselves into the attack and captured the settlement....

This was during the distant days of the war. Can today's soldier commit such an exploit? We, Soviet soldiers, who have been assigned vigilantly to protect the historical gains of socialism, closely guard in our hearts the names of the brave defenders of the socialist fatherland. They are not dead but are always with us. They help us firmly to surmount the hardships of army life and teach us warm love for the homeland and dedication to the sacred cause of defending its freedom with our entire being.

Let me describe an event in our unit. Planned training was under way. The young recruits were practicing throwing hand grenades. Suddenly one of them, pulling out the safety pin, excessively excited, dropped the grenade by his side. His comrades, also threatened by this mortal danger, were not far from him.

In a matter of seconds Guards Pvt Tashpulat Yuldashev made his decision. He threw himself on the grenade, covering it with his body. The steel fragments did not hit his fellow soldiers. He died heroically in carrying out his military duty, the duty of great friendship inherited from front-line veterans.

No one had ordered the fearless soldier to go to certain death. However, this warmly beating young heart, ideological convictions developed by the party, the Komsomol and the commanders, and our entire Soviet way of life indicated the only choice he had, the choice of front-line veterans who say that "you must die to save your comrade."

Military service in the Soviet armed forces is a true school for political maturity, military skill, patriotism and internationalism. The fascist hopes

that the friendship among the peoples of our country would break down under the pressure of war failed. Equally vain are the imperialist efforts to reduce the power of our friendship today. This friendship is stronger than ever before.

The friendship among troops representing all nations and nationalities in our country, welded in the unbreakable alloy of the communist party, has been tested and tempered in the fire of battles for the triumph of the cause of the Great October Revolution. This friendship is stronger than any armor, for which reason our heroic armed forces, vigilantly guarding the beloved fatherland, are always victorious and invincible.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9

## REVOLUTIONARY BEHEST OF THE VICTORIOUS FEBRUARY 1948

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 70-81

[Article by Milos Jakes, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee Presidium member, CPCZ Central Committee secretary; article published in the theoretical and political journal of the CPCZ Central Committee NOVA MYSL, No 2, 1983]

[Text] The long years of struggle waged by the Czechoslovak working class and working people for the overthrow of bourgeois rule and creation of prerequisites for building a society of social and national justice reached its culminating point 35 years ago, during the Great February days. The victory of the working people over the reaction irrevocably resolved the main problem of any revolution--that of power. Headed by the CPCZ, the people gave a simple answer to the question of who would rule the Czechoslovak republic. Whereas in 1920 the clash between the working people and the bourgeoisie ended with the defeat of the working people, in 1948 the bourgeoisie and its allies were facing an organized working class headed by a strong communist party and skillfully guided by it; they faced the power of the absolute majority of the toiling people fully resolved to prevent a repetition of 1920. February 1948 clearly indicated that People's Democratic Czechoslovakia will never return to the old order and the foreign policy course of the period when the bourgeoisie, which had brought about the tragic consequences experienced by the country, was in power. The February events proved that Czechoslovakia would take the socialist way of unbreakable friendship and alliance with the Soviet Union, which was the only one loyally to take the side of our peoples, to give us comprehensive aid in the national liberation struggle and whose victory in World War II gave birth to our freedom.

The February victory was preceded by the purposefully headed and persistent struggle waged by the communist party for the systematic implementation of the Kosice government program, which was the first program of the government of the National Front of Czechs and Slovaks. Its implementation ensured the growth of the national and democratic revolution into a socialist revolution and created conditions for its victory through peaceful means. The national committees, in which communists and socialist-leaning citizens defended the will of the people played a considerable role in the revolutionary reorganizations in the local areas and the implementation of the Klement Gottwald government.

The reaction, which had entrenched itself in several political parties, tried to break up the National Front and to hold back and subsequently wreck the implementation of the Kosice government program and to use for the sake of its class objectives the postwar difficulties and the catastrophic drought of 1947. It was guided by the slogan "The Worse for the People the Better for Us." By 1946 and particularly 1947 it had already become clear that despite the tireless efforts of the CPCZ, cooperation within the National Front was becoming increasingly weak. The right-wing leadership and the right wings of the remaining political parties, relying on reactionary foreign forces, were promoting the creation of a single anticommunist front and hindered the revolutionary process in the hope of attempting a counterrevolutionary putsch at the proper time.

The fact that the class and political polarization of society was intensifying throughout society and that, thanks to its principle-minded policy, the CPCZ was gaining the increasing support of the masses with every passing day, acted as a catalytic agent in the enemy camp.

Under those circumstances, naturally, the reaction feared that the communist party would win the May 1948 elections and that a new constitution would be adopted, which would consolidate the gains of the people's democratic system. For this reason, even before the elections it tried to change the domestic political situation in the country and its international orientation with the help of a counterrevolutionary putsch. However, the reaction met with a firm rebuff. It was defeated and the power switched into the hands of the working people headed by the CPCZ. The party, headed by Klement Gottwald, was able to formulate proper strategy and tactics, consistent with our conditions, creatively to resolve the main problems of the period and lead the toiling people to victory. The systematic course of a peaceful transition to a socialist revolution, however, did not mean that the communist party underestimated the real possibility of armed conflict. That is why, in the course of the February events, it set up a people's militia staffed by working people, a militia which to this day plays an important role in the protection and building of socialism.

To the people of Czechoslovakia, February 1948 became a historic milestone. It opened the way to socialism. It confirmed the truth that a prerequisite in the victory of the working class is the leadership provided by the Marxist-Leninist party which can accurately express the interests of the people and rally them around its program. The victory of the socialist revolution in Czechoslovakia proved the applicability of Marxism-Leninism in an industrially developed country as well. This victory was of great international importance. It was a structural component of the process of the establishment of the global socialist system.

The victory also proved that the bourgeoisie, however it may try to hide behind pseudopatriotic and pseudorevolutionary phraseology, will never accept the loss of its class rule. Its subversive activities, in the course of the national and democratic revolution, had already confirmed most clearly that the joint rule by the bourgeoisie and the working class allied with the remaining working people could be only temporary and that such a situation



leads, sooner or later, to a great class confrontation and to the solution of the "who-whom?" problem.

In terms of foreign policy, the greatest revolutionary result of the February events was the definitive orientation of our country toward a single line of alliance, friendship and mutual cooperation with the USSR, which was based on the experience of the peoples of Czechoslovakia during the period of the bourgeois republic, Munich, World War II and the period of building a people's democratic system. Klement Gottwald's statement to the effect that it is possible to lean on friendship with the Soviet Union as on a rock was fully justified. The existence of the Soviet Union and the support it gave to our revolutionary struggle were the main external prerequisites for the failure of the counterrevolutionary putsch, the victory of the socialist revolution and the building of a socialist society. The power and international prestige of the Soviet Union protected Czechoslovakia from imperialist aggression, ensured our freedom and governmental independence and weakened the impact of economic discrimination and the cold war on our economy. The power and international prestige of the Soviet Union enabled our people to resolve by themselves, in accordance with their own will, the question of the nature of postwar Czechoslovakia.

The establishment of socialist production relations was initiated immediately after the February victory. The second stage of nationalization was carried out and the socialist sector in industry expanded rapidly. Construction, wholesale trade, foreign trade and international haulage were nationalized. Foreign trade, oriented toward the fraternal countries, the USSR in particular, became an important instrument in socialist construction. It weakened the consequences of the policy of embargo and economic blockade and enabled our national economy to surmount the consequences of the crisis, and the elemental fluctuations and speculations in the capitalist world. The agrarian reform was completed. The land was given to those who farmed it. This strengthened the alliance between workers and peasants considerably.

The National Front and the political, social and state organs and organizations experienced a renaissance. In the hands of the working class, the political power became the main tool in the socialist reorganization of society. A new constitution was adopted on 9 May, which codified the elimination of the exploitation of man by man. The right to work, education, full medical aid and old-age pensions was ensured.

The basic prerequisites for building a socialist society, which the party proclaimed as its general political line at its Ninth Congress in 1949, were created in all fields of life. The CPCZ relied on the experience of building socialism in the Soviet Union and Lenin's doctrine on the general laws of socialism, creatively applied under Czechoslovak conditions. The party encouraged the dialectical unity between socialist change in the economy and changes in the ideological area and the cultural life of society. The familiar Ten Points of Klement Gottwald's report submitted at the congress included the most important strategic and tactical tasks in building socialism.

It was a question, above all, of completing the industrialization, an important component of which was to develop Slovak industry. This was a prerequisite for building a single Czechoslovak economy and a material foundation for a Leninist solution to the national problem and reaching true equality between our peoples.

The establishment of socialist production relations in the entire national economy and the considerable improvement of the population's living standard, ensuring the abundance of food in particular, required the victory of socialist production relations in the countryside as well. Under the party's guidance and with the active participation of the working class, one of the most important and most difficult problems was resolved gradually--the conversion from a splintered, petty agricultural production to large-scale cooperated socialist output. The CPSU experience in the implementation of the Leninist cooperative plan in the USSR was the basis on which this problem was resolved. The CPCZ closely saw to it that the principle of voluntary participation was observed in rural cooperation and the steady strengthening of the alliance between the working class and the toiling peasantry, between town and country.

The cultural revolution, extensive growth of education and establishment of a socialist way of life and a conscientious attitude toward society, developing in the labor collectives in the struggle for achieving best results in construction, training and participation of the people in the management and administration of society became an inseparable component of socialist construction. Education and culture became accessible to the broad popular strata. Tens of thousands of working people upgraded their political and professional training. Thousands of them completed higher educational institutions. A new intelligentsia developed and the role of the working class affected with increasing clarity cultural and spiritual life.

Many problems of economic and cultural development were resolved along with the strengthening of the power of the state and the enhancement of the organizational and educational role of the socialist state and the strengthening of the National Front as a political form of the class, social and national alliance among working people in town and country, the nucleus and rallying force of which was the CPCZ. Comprehensive cooperation with the USSR and the other countries which had taken the path of socialism was developing successfully.

In the course of two five-year plans the basic tasks included in the general line of the Ninth Congress were implemented. The CPCZ which, on the eve of the February events, had honorably fulfilled its role as the revolutionary vanguard in the process of developing the national and democratic revolution into a socialist revolution, was able to implement its mission in the course of building the new society in precisely the same fashion. Historical socioeconomic changes were made under its guidance, which radically changed the life of the working person. A strong material and production base was laid under the socialist economy and a major step was taken to eliminate major economic and even social differences in the development of the individual areas. A new class social structure consistent with socialism was formed. The working class displayed high political and labor activeness. It became

the bearer of the most progressive labor and organization methods. The toiling people historically proved that they can manage society better than the bourgeoisie and that socialism is resolving all basic problems of human life which no preceding society was able to do.

The path was not easy. The creation of the new social system and a new life demanded of millions of people true heroism, conscious and dedicated labor, zealous patriotism and class solidarity. It demanded self-denial for the sake of the common good but also brought a great deal of joy thanks to the successes which were achieved. It strengthened a type of collectivism intolerant of philistine egotism. Klement Gottwald's perspicacious words to the effect that socialism is not reached by following a straight asphalted road were confirmed repeatedly.

In addition to the aggravating international situation and internal enemy subversion, our difficulties were caused by vestiges of the past in the minds of the people and the new problems which the headlong development itself, economic development above all, created on the administrative level. By the end of the 1960s subjectivistic errors, paralleled by a revived right-wing opportunistic view on the management of the socialist economy and society, increased. At the same time the party's ideological work weakened. The party did not systematically oppose the penetration of non-Marxist views. Petit bourgeois mores, careerism and adaptation to circumstances revived. The class view on problems was dulled and revolutionary vigilance and ideological principle-mindedness weakened. Subjectivism in decision-making, violations of ideological and party work unity, shortcomings in the ideological upbringing of party members and other negative phenomena brought about an internal party crisis which resulted in a crisis of the entire society. Klement Gottwald's warning that "the class enemy is never asleep and we must always remember that it will try, again and again, to penetrate our party, influence its policy and lead it astray" was forgotten.

The revisionist current in the party and the antisocialist forces in society tried to abolish the leading role of the CPCZ, particularly in economics. This would have been a bridgehead for the elimination of our entire political system and socialism as such. The revisionists tried to separate economic from political management and disseminated petit bourgeois and bourgeois ideas on the effect of commodity-monetary relations, erroneous views on the role of the marketplace, and so on. Distortions of reality, half-truths and beautiful promises were all used to conceal their true intentions and to mislead above all the naive youth. They adopted as a subject of political speculation criticisms of shortcomings in the national economy and management. The revisionists rejected the continuous growth of the economy and abandoned the principles of planned development. They proposed a new "model" of economic management and operation. They tried to undermine state foreign trade monopoly and cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other CEMA member countries. The purpose of the offensive mounted by the antisocialist forces was to turn the socialist development of our country back. It was aimed against the gains of the victorious February events and the revolutionary gains of the working people.

In the circumstances in which the party's political, cadre, organizational and ideological work became paralyzed, while right-wing opportunistic and antisocialist forces had virtual monopoly over the mass information media, the Marxist-Leninist forces lost the opportunity to change the course of events in favor of socialism. This required the international aid of the Soviet Union and our other loyal allies who wrecked the plans of domestic and foreign reaction. This opened the way to waging a victorious political and ideological struggle by the Marxist-Leninist forces within the party against right-wing opportunistic and antisocialist forces and involving the majority of the people in surmounting the crisis in society.

The April 1969 CPCZ Central Committee Plenum laid the prerequisites for this turn in the development of the party and the state. The new party leadership was headed by Comrade Gustav Husak. This marked the beginning of a process of political and economic consolidation, which consisted of restoring all principles of socialist construction. It was a question of restoring the party and its leading role in society on Marxist-Leninist principles, the restoration of the role of the socialist state as the organ of power of the working class and the entire working people, the healing and energizing of the National Front, the development of socialist democracy, above all through the expanded participation of the working people in management and administration, the restoration of centralized planned economic management and the development and strengthening of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union, which was expressed in the new 1970 treaty, and with the other socialist countries on the basis of the principles of proletarian and socialist internationalism.

As in February 1948, our party proved its ability not only to lead the society out of the crisis but to offer to the people at its 14th Congress a program for the even faster and more comprehensive development of the socialist society. A long-term strategic line for building a developed socialist society was formulated and comprehensive enhancement of efficiency, based on the full utilization of intensive growth factors, became the main feature of economic policy. This policy met with the full support of the people, which was expressed in the increased number of labor initiatives and a conscientious attitude toward labor and brought about great successes in the national economy, in enhancing the living standards of the people and strengthening social guarantees.

In the period after February 1948, under CPCZ leadership the Czechoslovak working people have been able to create a powerful economic potential. The resources accumulated in 35 years of social labor made the implementation of an extensive investment program possible. The national economy in the production and nonproduction areas has productive capital worth 2.8 trillion kronas. Equipment, machines and installations made available to the workers increased by a factor of 7; they increased by a factor of 20 in agriculture. Hundreds of new industrial enterprises were built. Old enterprises were radically reconstructed and expanded. Modern large-scale agricultural production was developed. The transportation network was expanded and hundreds of thousands of apartment units, new hospitals, schools, sports grounds and cultural institutions were built. Industry, which employs 38 percent of the

working people, accounts today for nearly two-thirds of the goods produced in the country. In 35 years industrial production increased by a factor of 12. Its structure changed radically. Compared with 1948 machine-building output increased by a factor of more than 31; as a key sector, today it accounts for 32 percent of the overall volume of industrial output. The volume of output in the chemical industry increased by a factor of 33; it increased by a factor of 15 in the construction materials industry, 12 in the power industry, 5 in the fuel sectors and 9 in ferrous metallurgy; the production of consumer goods increased by a factor of 7 and the output of the food industry more than quintupled.

The scattered construction organizations were replaced by modern specialized construction capacities which can build even the most complex projects such as, for example, nuclear power plants, metallurgical plants, hydroelectric power plants, highways, and so on. Compared with 1948, the volume of construction work in 1982 was higher by a factor of 12.5.

The implementation of Lenin's cooperative plan under Czechoslovak conditions brought about the development of a contemporary large-scale socialist agricultural production. Today the socialist sector covers almost 96 percent of the arable land. Compared with 1948 by 1982 agricultural production had doubled, although today the number of people employed in agriculture is no more than 40 percent of the people employed in 1948 and the size of the farmed area has declined by 10 percent. Grain crop yields rose from 15.8 quintals per hectare in 1948 to over 40 in 1982. During the same period animal husbandry production nearly tripled.

Czechoslovakia is maintaining its high economic level by expanding its scientific research base and scientific and technical cooperation with the socialist countries, the USSR above all. The development of automation and mechanization is continuing; the most advanced technical facilities are used in industrial production, construction and agriculture. Science and technology are insuring major successes in health care and other areas of social life. Whereas some 10,000 people were engaged in science and technology in 1948, today the scientific research base numbers nearly 180,000. Every year about 4 percent of the national income goes into science and research.

The international division of labor is of essential importance to the Czechoslovak economy. Trade within CEMA, the Soviet Union above all, is the basic prerequisite and guarantee for stable national economic development. This enables us to obtain the necessary raw materials and equipment in exchange for our industrial goods. As a whole, between 1948 and 1982 our foreign trade in current prices increased by a factor of approximately 17; it increased by a factor of 31 with the socialist countries and a factor of 8 with the nonsocialist countries. The share of the socialist countries in our exports and imports has reached nearly 70 percent, one-half of it with the USSR. A characteristic feature of the foreign trade policy in the 1970s was economic and scientific and technical cooperation, including joint measures for the development of specialization and cooperation, based on the Comprehensive Program for Socialist Economic Integration among CEMA-Member Countries. More than 300 agreements are in operation, more than one-third of

which are multilateral. The most important to us is the implementation of a bilateral program for cooperation and specialization with the Soviet Union in machine building, in which specialized commodities account for 40 percent of overall machine and equipment deliveries. Such cooperation with the Soviet Union enables us to develop new technically complex sectors such as, for example, a nuclear power industry. Major projects such as the Prague subway, the Friendship Gas Pipeline, our participation in the space program and other measures are examples of successful Czechoslovak-Soviet cooperation.

Unlike capitalism with its millions of unemployed people, the socialist system has enabled us to involve the entire active population in the labor process. In Czechoslovakia, with its 15.4 million population, there were 7.4 million employed in 1982. Whereas in 1953 we had 74 specialists, graduates of secondary and higher schools per 1,000 workers, their number reached almost 250 by 1982. During the 1981-1982 school year more than half a million students were enrolled in secondary schools; there were 386,000 students enrolled in vocational-technical training and nearly 200,000 university students.

The rapid development of production forces following the February events brought about a growth in the national income which increased by a factor of 6 between 1948 and 1982. This enabled us to more than quadruple personal consumption and increase social consumption funds tenfold. Compared with 1953, according to statistical figures, the population's income has increased by a factor of more than 4.7. Average wages rose from 823 kronas in 1948 to 2,735 kronas in 1982. At the beginning of the 1970s the average wage in the unified agricultural cooperatives had reached that in industry. The major disparities between town and country were eliminated and those between mental and physical labor are being abolished gradually.

In terms of per capita comestible products Czechoslovakia is among the most economically developed countries; few other countries in the world are as well shod and clothed as we. Population demand has noticeably shifted in the direction of durable consumer goods: in 1981 97 percent of all families had refrigerators and 44 percent had private cars. Today a family averages more than one washing machine, more than one television set and one radio receiver. Household electrical power consumption has risen from 19.5 kilowatt hours per capita in 1937 to 574 kilowatt hours in 1981; natural gas consumption has increased respectively from 4.8 to 135 cubic meters.

The solution of the housing problem is one of the greatest achievements of the party's social policy. A total of 2.9 million apartment units have been built in 35 years, or about 60 percent of the entire available housing, in which 8.5 million citizens have moved.

One of the most significant manifestations of the true humanism in our society is medical services, care for mothers and children and social insurance. We belong to the countries with the highest development of medical-prevention services. We have virtually eliminated the most severe infectious diseases. The number of people serviced by a physician has declined from 1,158 in 1948 to 295 today. The number of openings in nurseries has

increased by a factor of more than 15, and so on. Social insurance covers the entire population. For example, the number of pensions has tripled and pension insurance funds have increased by a factor of 13.

Many other facts could be cited confirming the development of school training, science and culture, the drastically increased general literacy of our people and the significant improvement in the material well-being of the families. Tangible advantages are enjoyed by the working people who rest in the country's health institutions and abroad, organized above all by the trade unions, as well as other gains made by our working people.

Working time has been reduced to 42.5 hours per week, on the basis of a 5-day work week. Paid leave has been increased to the point that leisure time accounts for one-third of every year.

The past 12 years have been particularly important in the development of our national economy and in upgrading the living standards of the people over the past 35 years. Despite the great worsening of external and internal circumstances, this period was marked by a further upsurge in public production, as confirmed by the fact that compared with 1970, the 1980 national income was 58 percent higher and social labor productivity had increased by 42.5 percent. This enabled us to improve the living standard even further and to strengthen the population's social guarantees. Compared with 1970, individual consumption was 37 percent higher while social consumption funds had increased by 77 percent by 1980.

The CPCZ has paid steady attention to the location of production forces in both our republics. As we planned, the economic potential increased faster in the Slovak socialist republic whose share in overall output and resource utilization increased. Compared with 1970, by 1980 the national income increased by 48 percent in the Czech socialist republic and 66 percent in the Slovak socialist republic. Essentially we succeeded during the 1970s to equalize the levels of economic development and living conditions of the populations in the Czech and Slovak socialist republics and in the individual parts of the country. Here again we are implementing the behest of the victorious February events. This confirms the implementation of the Leninist national policy by the CPCZ under the conditions of the coexistence between two equal nations, as expressed in the federal structure of our state.

The party's Marxist-Leninist policy, aimed at promoting the welfare of the people and relying on their extensive support and on the initiative of the people and their participation in administration and management, and comprehensive cooperation with the USSR and the other members of the socialist comity are the sources of all our successes. The achieved results entirely confirm the accuracy of the conclusions we drew based on the lessons of the crisis and which, as confirmed by our development, remain equally relevant today; in the future as well they will remain an organic component of the party's policy.

We are summing up results and assessing the accomplishments achieved over 35 years of building socialism not merely for the sake of drawing attention to

the past. Relying on the work we have done and experience acquired, it becomes a question of struggling even more decisively and achieving further successful progress in order honorably to fulfill the decisions of the 16th CPCZ Congress.

Reality has fully confirmed the accuracy of the strategic line adopted at the 14th party congress. This line was further developed at the 15th and 16th CPCZ congresses and was concretized on the basis of changed circumstances which, particularly if we bear in mind international relations and the tasks we face, have become more difficult and complex. With this in mind, the 16th Congress formulated as the main task today that of ensuring the further development of the national economy in order to maintain the living standard already reached and to continue to improve its quality. At the same time, we must ensure the balancing of external economic relations and reduce the foreign debt. The congress also defined the ways and means for the implementation of these objectives.

It is a question mainly of the strategic requirement of ensuring the fastest possible intensification of the national economy, upgrading the efficiency and quality of all work, comprehensive conservation, implementation of structural changes, utilization of the high skills of the working people and raising the level of their incentive and initiative.

As Comrade Gustav Husak noted at the 16th CPCZ Congress, "scientific and technical progress is the decisive factor in economic intensification and the most powerful source for the growth of social labor productivity." The powerful strength of social development lies in combining the achievements of science with the advantages of the socialist system. Therefore, the prime task is firmly to apply the achievements of scientific and technical progress in production practice and to expand economic and scientific and technical cooperation with the socialist countries, the USSR in particular.

The results of our country's development are inseparably related to the systematic application of the principles of socialist internationalism and the unity and joint consolidation of the power of the socialist comity, the share of which in global industrial output is rising steadily. Steadily expanding cooperation and specialization and utilization of the achievements of science and technology multiply the economic power and opportunities of the individual socialist countries and lower our dependence on the capitalist states. That is why we fully support further steps aimed at intensifying and strengthening cooperation and integration, including cooperation in the field of economic policy, which will be discussed at the summit meeting which CEMA members will hold on economic problems, which is currently being prepared.

At the present stage ensuring a higher level of decision-making, steadily and significantly lowering material, fuel and energy outlays per unit of output and rationally utilizing newly created capital assets and available manpower represent a key problem in the intensification process and in upgrading the efficiency and growth of the national income. This is objectively necessary from the viewpoint of the international economic situation as well.



The stipulation of the congress regarding further intensification of socialist democracy and enhancing the participation of the working people in the management and the administration of the state was also aimed at the implementation of the party's economic and social program. As we reach the higher stages of socialist development, Lenin's thought to the effect that socialism can be built only through the active creative work of millions of people becomes increasingly relevant. Here again the national committees, our National Front and its organizations, which represent the broadest possible social platform and which comprehensively express the interests of the people, play an exceptionally important social role. The rights of the national committees as organs of people's power are being expanded. They are assigned greater tasks in enhancing the level and quality of population services. Loyal to the February behest, formulated by Klement Gottwald at the Ninth Party Congress, and wisened by the experience of the period of crisis, we are seeing to it that the National Front organizations actively participate in building a developed socialist society and ensure through their daily activities the increasingly broadening participation of the people in the management of the country, in resolving governmental and public matters and in the life of their enterprises, cities and villages.

Such tasks require a more active participation on our part in the development of all positive trends and a firm struggle against shortcomings. Despite the problems and errors committed in the implementation of the strategic line formulated at the 16th Congress, the results of the past 2 years of the 7th Five-Year Plan confirm the accuracy of our path. The 1983 state plan as well is aimed at the implementation of this course. Its aim is to restore the dynamics of the growth of production and national income without any substantial increase in the use of resources.

At the same time, we must counter the measures adopted by the capitalist countries, above all under U.S. pressure, aimed against the socialist countries and, above all, the steadily increasing discrimination in the fields of credits and finances on the part of Western banks, the raised customs and export barriers, technology embargoes, and others.

We are concentrating our attention on mobilizing internal economic reserves, which are substantial, and accelerating the development of cooperation with the socialist countries, the USSR in particular, which is something of decisive importance to our country. At the same time, we are limiting new capital construction and promoting the fuller utilization of installed assets. We have undertaken their reconstruction and updating in order to reduce the increased volume of unfinished construction. We are focusing our efforts on resolving our problems such as increasing the export possibilities of industry, lowering import needs and ensuring the more efficient use of resources, energy, fuel, metal and feeds, lowering material production outlays and reducing the stress in the fuel-energy balance through coal mining and accelerating the building of nuclear electric power plants. Our efforts are also directed on increasing agricultural production through the more efficient utilization of the land, reducing all possible losses and utilizing further growth possibilities which are related to the remaining considerable disparities in the results of economic activities of agricultural enterprises, raising the level of food self-sufficiency and increasing the variety of

goods reaching the domestic market. We are also systematically making the necessary changes in the shaping and utilization of material resources and in the production structure.

The implementation of these main tasks calls for the steady application of the socialist principles of wages based on the quantity, quality and social value of labor. We must also apply more consistently and extensively in the work of enterprises, labor collectives, individual production facilities, shops and brigades the principles contained in the set of measures aimed at improving economic management planning and management and cost-effectiveness, and see to it that the interests of production collectives and individual workers coincide with those of the rest of society. In turn, this means that we must wage a more decisive struggle against the attempts on the part of individuals to live a parasitical life at the expense of socialism, to live at the expense of the toil of honest people and to benefit from the advantages of socialism while avoiding their duties to society.

The further extensive development of the working people's initiative is also of exceptional importance. In this case the revolutionary trade union movement and the Socialist Youth League, as well as the powerful upsurge of the socialist competition, which is manifested in the pledges taken in honor of the 35th anniversary of the February events, in energizing the activities of socialist labor brigades and comprehensive rationalization brigades, and the movement of rationalizers and inventors, have been called upon to play an important role. All of this is a confirmation of the conscientious attitude on the part of the working people toward the party's policy and socialism.

The new and substantially more complex problems which must be resolved demand changes in management style and methods. The unquestionable need for this has still not been sufficiently realized everywhere. This task applies to all administrative levels without exception. Improving work in this area is also a prerequisite for advancement and utilization of the achievements of scientific and technical progress in production. This is the main way, the key to our success.

The increased role of the party as the unifying factor and the decisive prerequisite for the unity and cooperation among all classes and social groups for the sake of the common objective is inseparably related to building a developed socialist society. As early as the 14th CPCZ Congress Comrade Gustav Husak said that "the higher the level of development of our society, and the more complex, political, economic and ideological problems become, the more urgent becomes the need for the party's leading role in society and the more comprehensive its implementation must become."

Aware of its historical role and on the basis of its own costly experience acquired during the crisis by the communist party, we stated at the 15th Congress that the party would be able to carry out its historical mission only if all its activities are based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, if it is closely linked with the people and if it is headed by a firm, united and decisive leadership. This calls for the systematic implementation of the principles of democratic centralism, intraparty democracy, criticism and self-criticism.

Our working people know perfectly that an all-round upsurge in society and living standards are possible only under the conditions of peace. Therefore, we have been forced to spend substantial funds to ensure the defense of socialism during the cold war period and in recent years, when the ruling U.S. circles are trying to put an end to the policy of peaceful coexistence, increase the production and development of new types of mass destruction weapons, aggravate the international situation, try to achieve military superiority, undermine international cooperation and engage in political, economic and ideological warfare against socialism. As was the case in February 1948, the imperialist circles are unwilling to accept the weakening of their influence and the growth and successes of the socialist countries.

We proceed from the fact that the implementation of the 16th Party Congress as well is possible only with peace. That is why we are combining our constructive efforts with a daily struggle for peace the world over. We fully support the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and its proposals on strengthening peace, eliminating the threat of nuclear war, reducing armaments and detente.

To this effect, as Yuri Vladimirovich Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, emphasized at the joint ceremonial meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet and RSFSR Supreme Soviet, dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR, this calls for strengthening the unity and economic and defense power of the socialist countries. We fully support the conclusions of the conferences held by the Political Consultative Committee, which met in Prague, the capital of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic at the beginning of the year, and the political declaration it adopted, which expresses the viewpoint and approval of the suggestions formulated by the Warsaw Pact members on basic global contemporary problems.

The distance we have covered over the 35 years after the victorious February was not free from shortcomings and blunders. Subjective errors were made and all opportunities at the disposal of the socialist social system were not always utilized in full. Difficult objective obstacles had to be surmounted and the subversive activities of domestic and foreign enemies counteract it.

In the future as well the implementation of our economic plans will be no easy matter. We expect many difficulties and obstacles. Their elimination will demand of our people greater efforts and dedication, for economic intensification can be compared with the implementation of major and complex historical problems such as the industrialization of the country and agricultural collectivization.

The behest of the victorious February will be implemented through our daily toil and tireless efforts for the implementation of the resolutions of the 16th CPCZ Congress and for the sake of further successes in building a developed socialist society and achieving peace and progress on earth.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9

## PROGRAM OF THE AUSTRIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 1983 pp 82-93

[Article by Erwin Scharf, Austrian Communist Party Politburo member and Central Committee secretary]

[Text] One hundred years have passed since Karl Marx's death, but his ideas live and are embodied in the realities of today's socialism. Marx's theory of the laws governing the dynamics of human society is in the center of the ideological-political struggle in the contemporary world; furthermore, it is the theoretical foundation for building socialism or for a transition from socialism to communism over one-third of the globe. Vladimir Il'ich Lenin deserves the credit for the further theoretical development of Marxism as applicable to the epoch of the practical implementation of the ideas of socialism. In relying on the historical experiences summed up in Marxist-Leninist theory, the communist parties not only proceed from it in the course of their political activities but engage in a variety of creative and pioneering efforts, applying Marxist-Leninist theory to the specific political tasks of their countries. The specific circumstances in which the communist parties must operate dictate the need for a thorough consideration of new approaches which are assuming their organic position in overall Marxist-Leninist strategy.

The program of the Austrian Communist Party, which was adopted at the end of February 1982 at its extraordinary congress, was drafted in precisely this Marxist-Leninist spirit.

### The Political Situation and Internationalism

When the International Association of Workers was founded in September 1864, Karl Marx wrote the following in its Constituent Manifesto:

"The gain of political power has become ... the great obligation of the working class.... One of the elements of success--numerical strength--is already available to the workers; however, size can decide a matter only when the mass is organized and guided by knowledge. Past experience proves that a scornful attitude toward the fraternal alliance which must exist among workers in different countries and motivate them to support each other firmly in their struggle for liberation, penalizes with a general defeat their uncoordinated efforts" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 16, p 10).

What Marx prophetically said about the first steps of the international organization of the labor movement has assumed today an incomparably greater and truly decisive significance. Since Marx the world seems to have shrunk, not only as a result of the tempestuous development of transportation and communications and the scope and depth of economic relations among countries, but also as a result of the steadily growing flow of information and the ideological influence to which the people are subjected. At the same time, a horrifying development of military technology has taken place. Today there is no point on earth unreachable by a missile. The impact of the class struggle waged on a global scale is felt today in all parts of the world and all areas of social life and the link between the battles waged by the working class in the individual countries and the class battles in the international arena is becoming increasingly tight.

That is the reason for which, compared with the times of Marx and Engels, the importance of the internationalist stipulations of each communist party is increasing. Our party program tries to take this circumstance fully into consideration. Based on the nature of our epoch as the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism, the program considers the global aspect of the general crisis of capitalism: "The process of weakening of imperialism as a result of the successes of socialism, the struggle waged by the labor movement in the highly developed countries, and the movements for national and social liberation in Asia, Africa and Latin America is becoming increasingly obvious." Based on the fact that imperialism and the anti-imperialist forces the world over are pitted against each other, the ACP program formulates the task of securing peace the world over as the most important problem of our time.

It is precisely in this connection that the program also assesses the role of real socialism. Here it is a question of the historical merits of the October Revolution and its influence and significance in the development of the revolutionary labor movement, the historical victories of the Soviet Union and in World War II and its decisive contribution to the defeat of fascism and the consequent change of ratio of forces on an international scale, bearing in mind above all the appearance of the global socialist system.

This new universal-political situation proves, above all, that the peoples can prevent a third world war. "Thanks to the power of socialism, for the first time the possibility of preventing a world war has become apparent," our document states.

Internationalist concepts run throughout the entire ACP program. Naturally, we take into consideration that today new forces and organizations have appeared in the international arena, have found their place in the anti-imperialist struggle and are playing a considerable role in it. However, we have rejected superficial views according to which the time has come to cast overboard proletarian internationalism and adopt some kind of vaguely interpreted "new internationalism." Whether or not these conclusions were the result of a retreat under the pressure of anticommunist propaganda which, during the cold war and after it, interpreted proletarian internationalism as dependent on the "diktat of Moscow," or whether or not there were other reasons for it,

we were unable to find in the course of all debates on this problem which took place on an international scale a single convincing argument which could prove scientifically that proletarian internationalism has outlived its usefulness. Therefore, we found no reasons whatever to abandon this concept and its meaning. However, this is not to say that we have shut our eyes to anything new which has assumed its position in the international class struggle for a period of time. In this sense, our program reads as follows: "The positive feature of internationalization is expressed also in the fact that internationalist positions are typical today not only of the labor movement but of the supporters of peace and the antifascist and anti-imperialist forces. That is precisely why the international reaction is trying with increasing stubbornness to weaken this unity and make use of any trend toward narrow-minded nationalism, exclusivity and complacency.

"The broader the alliances in a country the more important the autonomy of the working class and the revolutionary party become. The broader the international alliances directed against the reaction, the more important proletarian internationalism becomes."

Therefore, the ACP sees no contradiction between something tentatively described as the "new internationalism" (i.e., orientation toward cooperation with anti-imperialist forces outside communist parties) and proletarian internationalism (i.e., the need for unity among the national detachments of the working class and the communist parties themselves). Conversely, it considers this as an addition consistent with the requirements of the present. It is precisely by virtue of the extent of international contacts and alliances that exchanges of views and ideological discussions among communist parties become particularly important, while the joint initiatives involving communists can ascribe a real anti-imperialist power to a variety of occasionally quite contradictory trends and political concepts which frequently arise spontaneously within progressive movements. Without rejecting possible contacts with the social democrats or weakening our solidarity with the anti-imperialist liberation struggle, we believe that it is precisely our strong relations with the fraternal communist parties which offer new opportunities for the more effective support of these anti-imperialist battles. We have adopted a broader view on world events and our solidarity with other parties and currents has become broader and stronger.

Personal experience has convinced us that the effort to undermine our proletarian internationalism are focused mainly on discrediting our relations with the CPSU and the communist parties of other members of the socialist comity and to depict them as a kind of burden, whereas in reality they are the source of our strength and major support in our struggle. Our program stipulates this with unequivocal clarity: "The internationalist policy of the Soviet Union and its power are the most important factors in the preservation of world peace and ensuring the progress of the global revolutionary process. The unrestrained anti-Sovietism of the reaction is considerably more focused on undermining the solidarity among progressive forces the world over and isolating them than at the Soviet Union itself.... The ACP tries to strengthen its friendly relations with the fraternal parties in the socialist comity. It is broadening fraternal relations with the communist and workers parties. It is displaying active solidarity with all anti-imperialist movements."

The ACP is a party of socialism.

The main feature which our party most emphatically stresses and which is its distinguishing characteristic compared with the other parties in our country is the unequivocal clarity with which it supports the socialist reorganization of the class capitalist society. This is not an incidental phraseological formulation or a high-sounding incidental remark included in its program. The seriousness of our struggle for socialism, clearly manifested in daily struggle for the demands of the working class and democratic progress, is manifested in the thoroughness with which the program considers the specific conditions of the struggle for socialism and the nature of socialism as it should be in Austria. This thorough study of economic, social and political conditions is the base for the specific revolutionary strategy and tactics of Austrian communists.

Therefore, the ACP remains loyal to the objective which it set itself from the very beginning when, inspired by the victory of the October Revolution, in 1918 it drew the necessary conclusions based on the fact that the social democrats had abandoned the ideas of socialism. Since then, the leadership of the Austrian Socialist Party has become increasingly integrated in the Austrian system of state-monopoly capitalism. This has been clearly manifested by the attempt to embellish this exploiting system, fraught with crises, with the term "prosperity state." Equally indicative in this respect is the statement made by ASP Chairman Kreisky in an interview granted to the newspaper KURIER, in the summer of 1982: "Since we are convinced that we have no alternative to the mixed economy system which exists in the country, we are trying to make certain corrections which could humanize the system. Such is the social democratic idea. It is clearly not inspirational to the young people who have always aspired to make a revolution."

However, this embellishing formula of "mixed economy" does not make in the least the cruel system of state-monopoly capitalism any more human; this is confirmed by increased unemployment, intensified pressure on the social gains of the working class and attempts to rescue major capitalist enterprises by raising the taxes paid by the working people and at the expense of their wages, the real level of which has been steadily declining over a number of years as a result of inflation. The ASP, the largest party in Parliament, which has been the Austrian ruling party for more than 10 years, has surrendered to this system. Although deprived of representation in Parliament as the result of undemocratic electoral rules, the Austrian Communist Party, loyal to its belief in the effect of historical laws, by which it is guided, is indicating a socialist solution.

In February 1934, as a result of the defeat inflicted on democracy and the labor movement and the establishment of an Austrian fascist dictatorship, the Austrian working class was given a bitter lesson which proved that the bourgeois-democratic state as well represents the power machinery of the ruling class which is mercilessly using coercion, should it consider that the results of popular elections threaten its domination. However, these lessons have been somewhat eroded in the minds of the broad toiling strata by the policy of class cooperation which has been followed in Austria as of 1945,

under ASP leadership. The 1978 ASP program no longer includes the "class struggle" concept itself. Furthermore, it indicates a future based on the development of the "prosperity state," i.e., actually a system of state-monopoly capitalist rule following a social democratic direction. The actual line of this development, however, remains the profound secret of the authors of the ASP program.

Conversely, the communists consider as their purpose arming the working class with an awareness of its historical mission of builder of socialism and knowledge of scientific socialism as a tool in the struggle for its interests. Consequently, our program stipulates that "even a large party cannot lead the working class to victory and self-liberation if it seeks "conciliation" and compromise where decisions must be made and masses called upon to engage in dedicated and selfless action.... The labor movement needs a revolutionary party, regardless of size: in the daily battles it must act as its motive force and in the sharp turns of social development as a force indicating the direction of the struggle."

The socialist future which our program outlines to the Austrian working people would be hardly convincing had we been unable to present the epoch-making gains of real socialism and its significance in the universal struggle for peace and social progress. Naturally, it is precisely at this point that anticommunist propaganda gets to work. It does everything possible to belittle and reduce to naught achievements in building socialism, without shying at open lies or a variety of misrepresentations. Supporters of socialism, who isolate themselves along with their utopian concepts in the vacuum of some kind of abstract socialism, which they intend to build, may be found even among the ranks of so-called leftists.

Karl Marx traced precisely similar phenomena through the experience of the Paris Commune. In analyzing the 1870-1871 events, he wrote that "ever since the working class movement became reality, imaginary utopias disappeared, not because the working class had abandoned the objective of the utopians but because it had found the real means for its implementation. However, fictional utopias were replaced by a true understanding of the historical conditions of the movement and the combat organization of the working class began to gather strength increasingly" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 17, p 562).

Naturally, this does not free us, the contemporaries in the gigantic struggle for the further progress of socialism, from the obligation to consider and assess the difficulties and problems which exist in the countries of real socialism. To build socialism means to bring down mountains, as a noted Western European communist once said. Without being tricked by the distorted picture painted by anti-communist propaganda in interpreting the difficulties and weaknesses of socialism, our program discusses this matter in a positive and optimistic spirit: "Even under socialist conditions progress is possible only through the appearance and resolution of conflicts. Each success creates new problems and each step along the way to growth carries with it the danger of the appearance of disproportion. Unlike capitalism, the irreconcilable contradictions within which can be surmounted only as a result



of its elimination, the solution of contradictions under socialism is not only possible but is a specific form of development and a most important motive force. Under socialism progress is expressed not in the lack of contradictions but in its ever-growing ability to advance further in the direction of its objectives."

#### Socialism Under Austrian Colors

A separate chapter in the ACP program deals with the conditions which, in our view, will give Austrian socialism its own specific imprint. In this case we firmly rely above all on the experience acquired by the socialist countries. However, we also take into consideration the fact that socialism in Austria, if it is to be consistent with the specific conditions prevailing in our country and our time, will have its own specific coloring.

The propaganda game involving the so-called "Soviet model," as well as efforts to tag on communist parties the notorious label of dependency on Moscow are continuously promoted in the international labor movement and, particularly, in anticommunist publications, because of the orientation of the communist parties toward socialism. This entire set of arguments, if we may describe it as such, is totally meaningless, for, as the ACP program stipulates, the laws on which socialism is built are inevitably modified by specifically historical and national characteristics. Inasmuch as the debate on so-called "models" goes on, the ACP invariably presents the viewpoint according to which there are as many "models" of socialism as there are socialist countries. In deciding to take the path of socialist development, each country has consciously and invariably proceeded on the basis of its own circumstances. "Nothing can replace the need for the creative application of scientific socialism, its general stipulations and international experience to specific national conditions," our party program stipulates. It is our conviction, therefore, that socialism in Austria as well will have specific Austrian characteristics.

Compared with what was characteristic of most countries which took the path of socialism, Austria is distinguished by the fact that it has a strongly developed industry, a large sector of nationalized enterprises and skilled manpower and intelligentsia which have developed over several centuries. A high level of organization is also typical of Austrian agriculture, whereas the majority of countries in which the socialist revolution has won in our time were forced to lay the material foundations for socialist reorganization only after a revolution and at the cost of tremendous sacrifices. They fulfilled this task, in the course of which they proved their unparalleled power and achieved truly impressive successes despite the fact that in the course of resolving the problem they were forced to surmount the fierce opposition of domestic reaction and imperialist encirclement. Some of these countries, Austria's neighbors, are already reaching the stage of developed socialism. Thanks to their economic power and political prestige, along with other factors governing the global revolutionary process--the international worker and national liberation movements--they are creating the favorable external conditions in which our own struggle is developing.

Therefore, the high standard of social and economic development, the international ratio of forces and the practical experience of the countries of real socialism, frequently gained at the cost of tremendous sacrifices, are the main factors which, it seems to us, will give Austrian socialism its specific emphases and coloring. We hope that we may face an easier situation. Nevertheless, we too shall have to work for socialist change. No one will present it to us ready-made. The elimination of capitalist ownership and bourgeois power will create prerequisites for "gradual improvements in social and individual living conditions." The transfer of large factories and monopoly enterprises to the hands of the working class and its allies will create a new form of equality and democratic participation in social affairs by all members of society. It is only as of that point that "freedom" can be achieved not through the principle of "equality;" it is only as of that point that freedom, understood in its true meaning, in the Marxist meaning of the term, will become freedom for all, i.e., it will represent the material rights and freedoms which the new state will provide to all members of society. Here is what our program stipulates on this account: "A degree of freedom reached at any given moment can never exceed the possibilities of objective and subjective conditions: level of development of production forces, culture, consciousness of the masses, social structure, and national and international conditions governing the class struggle."

Our program firmly relates the qualitatively new socialist democracy, which develops in the course of the socialist reorganization of society and the assertion of the power of the working class, with proletarian dictatorship. Although a tendency to avoid the very concept of proletarian dictatorship has become apparent in international debates on this question, we consider a reference to it accurate. "Marx and Lenin," the program stipulates, "described this state of a new type with the help of the scientific concept of dictatorship of the proletariat."

Based on the experience of the 1960s and the struggle against revisionist groups within our party, we know that concessions on this matter lead to all sorts of distortions. Another trend which appeared in the course of the debates which took place within our party, was to abandon the concept of proletarian dictatorship, in reference to the historically based characteristics and differences in the attitude of the working class toward state power. Distortions were not late in coming: immediate attempts were made to pit nonhistorically and arrogantly our democratic concepts against apparent concepts regarding socialism in the real socialist countries, thereby indirectly encouraging a simile of anticommunist propaganda which claims the existence of despotism in the socialist states. Naturally, quite often utopian views were expressed on the subject of abstract democracy independent of class conditions. Our program does not make even the slightest concession to such vacillations which we have surmounted.

Naturally, the democratic nature of an Austrian socialist political system will be determined by the general laws and international experience as well. However, it will also have features which should be specifically consistent with our national conditions. Let us take as an example the current electoral system in the Soviet Union and a number of other socialist countries,

in which representatives elected by the people are the supreme organs of state power, in which the stipulations of equal and secret balloting exist, in which the deputies must report to the voters and the right to recall an elected deputy is granted. We are aware of this but are also guided by the fact that parties and organizations of different persuasions will begin to free themselves from the influence of big capital in the course of the transitional period, for which reason the building of socialism will obviously take the shape of a multiparty system (historical experience offers many proofs to this effect). Different views and religious currents will also have their place in a socialist republic. The trade unions will be facing an exceptionally important task: while representing the interests of the working people, they must energetically help to surmount conflicts between "long-term and short-term and overall and private interests," as the program stipulates.

The organized working class and its revolutionary party will be able to rely on their alliances with other classes and social strata, with people of varying consciousness. Briefly stated, the leading role of the working class must be exercised "in equal cooperation with others, on the basis of unity on basic problems and consideration of existing differences in interests and views." It is self-evident that many features of our socialism will bear the mark of the course of the class struggle and the very process of establishment of the new system.

#### State-Monopoly Capitalism and Social Partnership

The economic, social and political structure of our country bears the mark of the system of state-monopoly capitalism. The importance of this final stage in capitalist development in terms of a transition to socialism was made clear by Lenin, who described the contradictions characteristic of a given historical stage between the elements of planning and control, on the one hand, and the preservation of capitalist competition, on the other. However, it is we alone who must answer the specific questions which arise in this connection in terms of our socialist orientation.

A separate chapter in the ACP program studies the state-monopoly system which exists in Austria and which plays the role of a "cardiopulmonary" role in terms of big capital. "Using all possible means, this state sees to it that the problems of the social labor of millions of people are converted into the private wealth of multimillionaires." Austria has a large sector of nationalized enterprises which, naturally, have been fully integrated within the state-monopoly system. They operate in the interest of private capital and serve the maximizing of the profits of large capitalist private enterprises. Nevertheless, as the program emphasizes, the nationalized enterprises deserve the particular attention of the working class from the viewpoint of the possible use of such enterprises in abolishing the power of private monopolies.

The possible use of nationalized enterprises in the interest of regulating some economic sectors for purposes of creating new jobs and putting an end to the process of the seizure of the Austrian economy by foreign capital depend mainly on the militancy of the labor movement even under state-monopoly capitalist conditions. The ACP is mobilizing the working people to counteract

the efforts of the government to avoid its responsibility in the implementation of such functions and the tasks of the nationalized enterprises. In this connection we openly say that we consider the nationalized sector in the Austrian economy a key position in the ability of the population to influence the country's economic life. We have no illusion that the exercise of such an influence depends in fact on the extent to which monopoly capital administrators and politicians can be removed from administrative positions in the nationalized sector and from other state positions. In considering the various opportunities in this connection, the program stipulates that "the struggle against the state as the 'central capitalist' can easily develop into a political struggle and substantially contributes to the development of antimonopoly consciousness."

Other characteristics of our country and its social structure are the parties and alliances related to the state-monopoly system, which act as "major links in the chain linking monopoly to state power." On this level the leadership of the Austrian Socialist Party and the Austrian trade unions play a specific role because of their cooperation with big capital for the sake of "social peace." It is precisely thus that, starting with 1945, a specific form of domination on the part of state-monopoly capitalism took shape and developed in Austria--the so-called social partnership. Its main purpose is to tie the "socialist" partners to the state-monopoly system and to force them, as our program notes, to participate in "the dissemination of the lie that some kind of binding 'common economic interests' exist and the possibility of 'conciliation to the advantage of everyone' exists between cartels and consumers, multimillionaires and apartment tenants, land magnates and petty farmers, and entrepreneurs and hired workers."

Cooperation within such social partnership is based, on the one hand, on already existing organizations and establishments, from associations of industrialists to trade union federations; on the other hand, however, it has not been codified in the Austrian constitution. To the extent to which, operating behind the screen of social partnership, i.e., in a small circle of "partners," representatives of big capital and the trade unions reach unity on problems of wage policy, taxation of the working people and social policy, it is achieved under the conditions of the total isolation of the working class which, for decades, has been trained through the practice of social partnership to remain passive and refuse to participate in the solution of all such problems. "The basic principle of 'partnership' with capital," the ACP program stipulates, "is to suppress any activity on the part of the masses, thus guaranteeing the possibility of a conspiracy at the top."

The decisions made within the framework of social partnership also represent a rejection of the principle of majority rule, for the so-called consensus, which is achieved in the course of class cooperation, is also a guiding principle in the activities of elective organs. "The Parliament and the legislation are reduced to the position of an agency obeying instructions from outsiders."

Clearly, the current political atmosphere, which emphasizes the ideology of social partnership, contradicts the real social conditions existing in our

countries; this ideology is not strong enough to retain its influence in the face of aggravating class contradictions in the long run. Crisis phenomena, the declining pace of economic growth and increasing unemployment have frequently triggered in the past a variety of forms of active opposition on the part of the workers. We are directing our efforts on increasing and strengthening the understanding of antagonistic class contradictions and the antipeople's nature of monopoly capital and surmounting the paralyzing effect of social partnership on Austrian political life. We are seeing to it that the policy affecting the interests of the workers acquire new democratic development opportunities.

#### Through Antimonopoly Democracy to Socialism

The course to socialism presumes the need for a specific and responsible consideration of the interests and forces which are objectively gravitating toward socialism. In this connection, the Austrian Socialist Party program is satisfied with formulating general loose statements such as "the contradictions in the contemporary world and the inability of the present social system to resolve the problems facing the people demand profound changes in society and the consideration of social democracy a permanent target." Elsewhere, the ASP program states even more simply that "the implementation of social democracy, based on freedom, justice and solidarity is a continuing process."

Nevertheless, even under the rule of the Socialist Party--starting with 1970 and to this day--it would be difficult to find anything related to this process. In fact, despite its entire social and political injustice, even during that period the state-monopoly system enjoyed the full support of the government. The income gap continued to widen, the burden of the crisis was shouldered by the working people and the mechanism of class cooperation with the monopolies continued to improve with the factual isolation of those who man the enterprises.

Socialism in Austria is possible only if the people, the broad masses, whose objective interests coincide with the socialist objectives, join the struggle for socialism. In his time, explaining the three sources and three components of Marxism, Lenin wrote the following on the interconnection among historical development, class interests and class struggle: "The supporters of reform and improvements will always continue to be stupefied by the defenders of the old until they realize that however wild and rotten it may seem, an old institution is supported by the forces of one ruling class or another. The only way to crush the opposition of these classes is to find within the society around us and to enlighten and organize for struggle the type of forces which can and, by virtue of their social position must, constitute a force which can replace the old and create the new" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 23, p 47).

The ACP is systematically analyzing the most important forces of social development in our country, particularly from the viewpoint of their interests which conflict with the state-monopoly system. In the course of such an analysis we have reached the conclusion that four-fifths of all

Austrians are hired workers and that most of them could be classified as members of the working class. This also applies to the majority of white-collar workers even though some of them may not be engaged in the production process but work in services and in the distribution and management areas. In the spirit of the Heinfeld 1889 Austrian social democratic program, which laid the foundations for party unity, the communists deem it their most important duty "to arm the working class with an awareness of their status and historical tasks and to make it combat-capable in the struggle for socialism and, in the final account, for a classless society and communism."

Our program immediately follows this by a special consideration of the question of the intelligentsia although, as the program clarifies, it is neither an autonomous class nor an autonomous political force. However, the basic interests of the tremendous majority of the intelligentsia coincide with those of the working class. An insignificant percentage of the intelligentsia "is a member of the bourgeoisie or blends with the higher bureaucracy of the state-monopoly system and the senior management of big capital;" however, by far the greater percentage of the scientific and technical intelligentsia is objectively closer to the working class.

Whereas with the development of production forces the numerical strength and role of the intelligentsia increase, that same development yields the directly opposite consequences to the peasant population. "The number of people fully and professionally engaged in agriculture has been reduced by half over a period of 2 decades," the program notes. The rural population is finding itself increasingly chained to the agroindustrial complex of the monopolies and the large landed estates through the mechanism of procurements, credits, marketing, and others. Therefore, to the peasantry as well socialism means freedom from the oppression of agrarian and financial capital. We see in the peasantry a potential ally in the struggle for antimonopoly democracy.

In addition to all of this, other social contradictions within the exploiting capitalist system are becoming aggravated in the conditions of the state-monopoly system. The ACP program looks at the situation of women under capitalist conditions and calls for counteracting the efforts to separate the women's liberation movement from the revolutionary labor movement and even more so to pit one against the other. The line of struggle runs not between men and women but between antagonistic classes. The ACP program calls for granting the young people development possibilities consistent with human dignity. It criticizes the faulty practice of using science and technology in the interest of maximizing profits and considers the problems of a moral decline and cultural crisis in the bourgeois society. The communists proceed from the belief that the greatest unity with the labor movement can be achieved thanks to a common interest in social progress, a broadening of democracy and a struggle for specific related requirements. This could become the foundation for the creation of the broadest possible antimonopoly alliances regardless of the ideological differences dividing their participants.

Everything leads us to believe that the way to socialism in Austria will go through the antimonopoly interests-antimonopoly alliances-antimonopoly democracy stages. To us, communists, this calls for paying the greatest

possible attention to the specific interests and requirements of the various population categories and to set the example of cooperation and the mobilization of the various social strata which have their specific interests.

The second part of our program, the so-called "program of demands and actions," considers a number of specific problems the solution to which is sought by the various toiling strata in our country. Real results can be achieved even under the circumstances of a state-monopoly regime by promoting unity of action among these different strata. However, the significance of these joint battles is particularly great as an element in the development of antimonopoly alliances. "Wherever the exercise and ensuring of these rights meets the line of the capitalist relations of power and ownership we must be clearly aware of the need for their decisive removal. Activities aimed at the implementation of these requirements determine the content of the immediate next stage in social development. They are needed also in order to prepare the transition to antimonopoly democracy."

Bearing in mind these possibilities of progress toward socialism through the stage of antimonopoly democratism, we are hoping to achieve our objective without an armed struggle which could take the aspect of civil war. This is neither social democratic opportunism or an attempt to avoid the specific tasks of the struggle for socialism facing all revolutionary parties. Our course has nothing in common with the foggy concept of a so-called "third way." On the contrary, the ACP proceeds from the fact that the transition to socialism in each country, as Lenin taught, will be based on its specific conditions, the changed ratio of forces and the course of the class struggle. Suffice it to recall that only a few weeks before the October uprising, Lenin saw the possibility of assuming power peacefully. It was not the revolution but the counterrevolution which blocked and made this method impossible.

A hard struggle requiring mass nonparliamentary activities is inevitable along the way to socialism, even without civil war. Naturally, we do not reject the use of the opportunities provided by the Parliament. The ACP clearly realizes, however, that in themselves parliamentary decisions cannot secure profound social change. However, we take into consideration the fact that already under the conditions of an antimonopoly democracy favorable prerequisites develop for the nationalized economic sector to be a base for the working class and, furthermore, for the nationalization of all monopoly enterprises, ranging from agrarian monopolies to banks and insurance companies. Antimonopoly democracy could be a power factor which would support "the class struggle of the masses waged from below through state means," and would create "through political, economic and social measures and progressive legislation passed in the interests of the people, favorable conditions for the struggle for socialism and the victory of the socialist revolution."

Our entire previous experience proves that the course of events will obviously not be as harmonious as we would like it. Naturally, the ruling class in our country will do everything possible within its forces to protect its privileges. From the viewpoint of the internal political ratio of forces, however, its opposition cannot be sufficiently effective faced with the numerical superiority of a politically mature mass of working people. Naturally, however, we must take into consideration also the fact that it will try to use

its international relations with global imperialism for the sake of provoking an intervention from the outside against a democratic mass movement.

At this point we return to the initial point of our article: foreign policy conditions and the international ratio of forces remain an important factor in the success of the struggle. "In order to make full use of all opportunities within their own country, the Austrian progressive forces require international solidarity, above all on the part of the socialist states; a favorable international ratio of forces is necessary in order to block mass reactionary intervention from the outside and the export of counterrevolution or else to rebut such a counterrevolution effectively."

Therefore, we must consider as a favorable prerequisite of our progress toward socialism without civil war the territorial-political position of our country. The position which Austria holds, bordering the socialist world, is one of the national characteristics which guides us as we develop our political prospects.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9



## BOURGEOIS CULTURE RIDING THE CREST OF NEOCONSERVATISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 94-104

[Article by K. Razlogov]

[Text] The 26th CPSU Congress noted that the aggravation of international tension, caused by the forces of imperialism and reaction, was to a certain extent the consequence of the increasing difficulties experienced by capitalism today. The ideological-political and spiritual crisis experienced by bourgeois society is manifested in the intensification of the ideological struggle, affecting even the most developed capitalist countries. The turn to the right in the realm of politics is paralleled by an expanded ideological campaign the purpose of which is to discredit the progressive forces and divide the anti-imperialist movement.

The aggravation of contradictions among the Western intelligentsia, an increasing share of which is opposing the ruling class and the policy of reactionary circles, is a relatively new factor in the deepening of the spiritual crisis in capitalism. Although this opposition is not always consistent, it represents a tangible threat to monopoly power, for it affects social strata which can have a rather substantial influence on the convictions of millions of people. This was manifested with particular clarity through the mass anti-imperialist movements in the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, in which university students, intellectuals, and men of literature and the arts played an important role.

However, the influence of the bourgeois ideologues who oppose the ideas of social progress through a variety of reactionary-utopian "theories," aimed, in particular, at the "moral substantiation" of capitalism, is increasing as well. This shift in the emphasis of bourgeois propaganda from economics and politics to religion and morality is hardly accidental.

The policy of imperialism clashes with the realities of the contemporary world: the strengthened socialist comity, the growth of national liberation movements and the aggravation of the class struggle in capitalist countries. Under these circumstances the obsolete religious-ethical views are becoming the support of imperialist ideology. Setting themselves the aim of regaining the role of rulers of the destinies of nations, the reactionary circles, in the United States in particular, are trying to present themselves as defenders of "virtues" which are allegedly threatened by hostile forces, naturally, the communists above all. The primacy of "moral rhetoric" over a realistic

assessment of the ratio of forces in the international arena has been reflected in the antisocialist campaigns for the defense of "human rights" and against "international terrorism." U.S. President Reagan formulated quite clearly the ideological underlining of the latest spiral in the arms race in one of his first press conferences. He particularly emphasized that the Russians "do not believe in God and have no religion," for which reason "what is moral to them is only that which contributes to the success of socialism." The mercilessly logical conclusion was that the Americans and their allies must be ready to wage war in the defense of God and morality. The restored cold-war spirit required a new "crusade" against the progressive forces.

The neoconservatives, who consider the "cultural contradictions within capitalism" (such was the title of a book by American sociologist D. Bell, one of the leaders of this trend, published in 1976), play an important role in the ideological reactionary counteroffensive.

Who are these neoconservatives and for what (or, rather, against what) are they fighting?

Neoconservatism, or "new" conservatism, as it is frequently described is a reactionary bourgeois ideological-political current which appeared in the 1970s in the developed capitalist countries, the U.S. and the FRG above all, as a reaction to the expansion of anti-imperialist movements and the crisis of bourgeois-liberal and left-wing radical concepts. Neoconservatism, which expresses the interests of the big bourgeoisie, is characterized by a programmatic anticommunism which frequently, as is the case in the FRG and Italy, comes closer to neofascism. In France the so-called "new philosophers" are close to the neoconservative positions. In an effort to counter the dissemination of antibourgeois social movements, views and feelings, many neoconservatives favor the imposition of rigid repressive regimes. They oppose democracy and are in favor of "restraining" the broad popular masses. They pay particular attention to cultural problems, which will be discussed in this article.

To believe the neoconservatives themselves, their main enemies are the "new class" and the "counterculture." By the "new class" they mean the intelligentsia at large--all workers engaged in mental labor and men of science and culture. Their opposition feelings, which were most clearly manifested in the "counterculture," from the neoconservative viewpoint, are accused of being the main if not the only reason for the crisis experienced by bourgeois civilization.

The "counterculture" is given an exceptionally broad interpretation by its right-wing critics. Indiscriminately, they include in it political demonstrations and works of progressive socialist art, actions of "left-wing" terrorism, drugs, the "sexual revolution," religious revivals, and so on. Indeed, in recent decades the struggle waged by the proletariat and the student troubles, mass antiwar demonstrations and the movement for the emancipation of women, petit bourgeois rebelliousness and racial troubles in the West have frequently merged within a single stormy current which has shaken to its foundations the entire structure of state-monopoly capital.

The mere mention of the "stormy 1960s" triggers among the supporters of the bourgeoisie a truly sacred horror. This neoconservative feeling seems to have concentrated in a blinding hatred for the "counterculture," which is quite erroneously proclaimed the dominating outlook and perception of the world in the 1960s as a whole--a period which, in fact, was noted by the energizing of all anti-imperialist forces.

Such a trend of shifting emphases has its specific objective and subjective reasons. As representatives of the bourgeois intelligentsia, the neoconservatives reacted most sharply to the fact that the "kernel of treason" yielded such rich shoots in their own "intellectual" circle. Although the neoconservatives tended to exaggerate the scale of the "catastrophe," their apocalyptic visions had some real grounds as well. In the ideas of many participants in the protest movement, particularly in the United States, the "counterculture" was and remains one of the most vivid manifestations of the spirit of the 1960s, for in social practice (by far not properly reflected in "leftist" and rightist sociological theory) it included a variety of heterogeneous social movements and feelings, and styles of behavior and art which were joined only by the rejection of the bourgeois way of life, the bureaucratic organization and "mass culture." The idea of the "counterculture" was raised as a slogan by some student and intellectual circles. However, it had a substantial influence on other participants in the protest movement, for it reflected a spiritual hunger and impoverishment experienced by various social strata under the domination of a reactionary bourgeois culture. As a comprehensive socioculture phenomenon, the "counterculture" presumed the following:

"The establishment of new relations among people;

"The shaping and adoption of new values and the elaboration of new social norms, principles, ideas and aesthetic and ethical criteria;

"The education of a new type of individual, with new forms of consciousness and action" ("Istoricheskiy Materializm Kak Teoriya Sotsial'nogo Poznaniya i Deyatel'nosti" [Historical Materialism as a Theory of Social Knowledge and Activity], Moscow, 1972, p 298).

These rather abstract principles expressed the aspirations of a great variety of protest movements. This precisely was the reason for the conflicting nature in between the theory and practice of "counterculture," whose supporters, as a rule, misinterpreted the reasons, nature and objective of their protest, replaced the class struggle with a conflict between generations and social change with "cultural confrontation." As a result, phenomena appeared in the "counterculture," which were not only quite disparate but frequently entirely opposite on the sociopolitical and ideological-artistic levels. With the assistance of the bourgeois mass information media, reference was made among "countercultural" trends to ideologues hostile to the communist parties and the working class and the experience of real socialism and phenomena quite unrelated to any true revolutionism, pornography and drug addiction in particular, and social phenomena which led the protest movement to the dead end of mysticism, "left-wing" sectarianism and terrorism. In the

eyes of a number of bourgeois theoreticians and, which is particularly important, in the minds of the Western petit bourgeois "counterculture" became nothing but a drug-oriented-mystical and completely antisocial phenomenon.

Such an ideological-political "dimension" is unquestionably present in the "counterculture." Furthermore, it dominates its ideological substantiation. Marxist scientists have justifiably pointed out the petit bourgeois nature of H. Marcuse's, T. Rozak's and other theories shared by the supporters of "non-repressive civilization," who "failed to notice" the democratic principle in the protest movement of Western youth.

However, it is precisely this principle that the modern neoconservatives noted. It was no accident that one of their most important general political postulates was a criticism of the "excesses of democracy," allegedly inherent in contemporary bourgeois society and, as a result, the demand for a more rigid restriction of the "growing aspirations" or, in more specific terms, the restriction of already restricted human rights and freedoms by capitalism. The persistence of neoconservative attacks on the "counterculture" also proves that within it some definite although occasionally conflicting elements of democratic antibourgeois culture were ripening, and failure to notice them would have meant to belittle the significance and role of progressive trends in contemporary Western culture. In considering the "counterculture" in relation to specific historical experience, in this case in the context of the steadily expanding anti-imperialist struggle, we cannot fail to recognize it as a complex and multidimensional phenomenon requiring a differentiated study. The real content of the "counterculture" is not covered in the least by actions of petit bourgeois rebelliousness any more than it can be covered by the concept of its most influential ideologues. Cultural and artistic practice has always proved to be immeasurably richer than far-fetched plans. The creation of antiwar films and shows within the "counterculture," militant political journalism, political songs and many other phenomena in contemporary Western art are considerably closer to critical realism and, in some cases, even to socialist culture rather than to the extravagance of the "hippies" and the elements of universal destruction, which are metamorphoses of dominating bourgeois culture.

Therefore, from the viewpoint of Lenin's theory of the two cultures, "counterculture" is not a one-dimensional monolith but an arena for the struggle of undeveloped and suppressed democratic socialist elements, distorted from within, addressed against reactionary bourgeois culture which here again has retained its dominating position thanks to the capitalist ownership of means of spiritual production. Whereas the progressive aspect of the culture of protest is of particular importance to the Marxists, for, as V. I. Lenin emphasized, "we take from each national culture only its democratic and its socialist elements, we take only them and unconditionally them, contrary to bourgeois culture" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 24, p 121), naturally, the bourgeoisie is interested in the opposite interpretation. It is interested in emphasizing "mystical illumination," "aesthetic nihilism" and defense of "left-wing" terrorism, as the dead ends of the protest movement and in its anarchic self-denial to which a substantial share of anticommunism has been added.

Drawing the attention on the obvious contradictions within the protest movement in the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, the neoconservatives engaged in deliberate fraud by reducing, to begin with, all anti-imperialist movements to the "counterculture" and, secondly, the "counterculture" itself to its extreme, negative and aggressively irrational manifestations. By this token the broad antimonopoly front is replaced by a "new class" which, circumventing the gravest economic and sociopolitical problems, could be accused of "moral decay" by virtually all bourgeois social strata.

The main ideological purpose of the neoconservatives is to restore to the capitalist world its former stability by undermining the influence of the "new class" and properly restoring the age-old foundations of bourgeois society--its religion and morality. This conceals a second strictly practical objective: to seize the key positions in the government, the administration and the schools in order to impose its will on the nation (the real consequences of such a combination of science with politics in the interest of the monopolies was confirmed, in particular, by the activities of Z. Brzezinski as U.S. presidential adviser for national security affairs).

The shaping of a new "loyal intellectual elite" is the result of the rapprochement between the monopolies and the men of culture willing to cooperate with it. In the same way that gradually a labor aristocracy developed within the working class, which betrayed the interests of the class for the sake of its own well-being, a number of influential social scientists were directly or indirectly corrupted by the bourgeoisie in the interest of the corporations. It is precisely this segment of the bourgeois intelligentsia that became the nucleus of the contemporary neoconservative movement, the purpose of which is to give the ideology of the monopoly bourgeoisie intellectual respectability and, if possible, broad social acceptance. The resources of university scientists and artists and the mass information media were mobilized to this purpose.

The bribing of intellectuals was frequently direct and open. Thus, American polytologist (I. Christol), known for his connection with the CIA, advised the Ford Foundation management against giving financial support to the activities of the "new class" which threaten the existence of corporations but, conversely, to support those who believe in the preservation of a strong private sector. N. Podhoretz, editor-in-chief of the journal COMMENTARY--the semi-official tribune of neoconservatism--acknowledged, not without a certain cynicism, in his autobiography published under the significant title of "Getting My Own," which came out as early as 1967, long before the movement he represents became one of the leading in bourgeois sociocultural thinking, that "it is better to be rich than poor," and "better to give instructions than to obey them," and "pride seems to have replaced the erotic drive as the greatest shameful secret of the well-educated American."

The neoconservatives, who gained a place in the sun in the arena of ideological and political life, did not accidentally choose as their main opponent the antibourgeois intelligentsia, whom they accuse of efforts to undermine the foundations of bourgeois society. American historian P. Steinfels notes in this connection that "unlike the left diagnosticians of the same disease

(of contemporary bourgeois society--the author), the neoconservatives refuse to ascribe any particular significance to the role of capitalist organizations in creating a crisis situation.... The crisis we face is mainly cultural: our convictions have weakened, our morality has loosened and our concepts of decency have degenerated."

The ideological meaning of such a rather peculiar position was quite clear: to "justify" capitalism and the anti-people's policy of ruling circles at all cost and to lay the entire responsibility for the "ulcers of capitalism" on the cultural opposition. This stand, which brings back to memory the persecution of "red" and "pink" intellectuals, which was organized by the Committee for the Investigation of Unamerican Activities during the sinister McCarthy years, is now acquiring a theoretical substantiation in the views of the neoconservatives. While rejecting the determining role of the economic base in terms of the superstructural elements, neoconservative theoreticians, D. Bell above all, introduce the antiscientific thesis of the essential "division" among the realms of economics, politics and culture under capitalism. According to Bell, it is precisely this division that triggers the instability of contemporary bourgeois society in which the main nefarious impulses come not from economics and politics but precisely from culture.

Characteristically, the leading neoconservatives note quite accurately many of the essential features of the crisis in bourgeois culture. Setting aside for the time being the question of the direction of such evaluations, the neoconservatives have grounds to bemoan the spiritual impoverishment of the antagonistic society and the loss of its humanistic value and ideals. Furthermore, in an effort to aggravate the polemics, they even improperly inflate their significance. From their viewpoint, the culture of contemporary capitalism conflicts entirely and fully with the traditional bourgeois values, the list of which was drawn up by the American Puritans as early as the middle of the 18th century: moderation, silence, order, firmness, thrift, application, sincerity, justice, restraint, abstinence, calm, wisdom and humility. Bourgeois "mass culture" itself appears to conflict with this "catechism," for it pits against the ideals of thrift and wisdom the shameless commercializing of all and any pleasures, and the decadent currents, which radically separate themselves from "consumerism" and the broad public. All that is left is to proclaim the "counterculture" and the protest movement as a whole the result of the "democratization of the modernistic impulse," and a consequence of the shift of aesthetic rebelliousness from the closed area of art to social practice for the falsified cultural crisis, as understood by the neoconservatives, to gain the illusion of completeness.

While the Marxist critics are studying the struggle between the forces of progress and reaction, the degradation of bourgeois culture ("mass" and "elitist") and the perhaps conflicting and complex but increasingly and more tangibly strengthened positions of progressive democratic culture, the neoconservatives prefer to speak of the total "decline of civilization," allegedly caused by a categorical break between culture and bourgeois society.

However, the strength of antibourgeois culture in the West lies not in the fact that it is allegedly separated from social culture. The forms of

creativity needed by the broad masses, including those within the "counter-culture," are precisely no major threat to the stability of the bourgeois system; that is why, as a rule, they are not banned but encouraged by the ruling class. However, the works which express the basic interests of the people and their true concerns and expectations, gain their strength precisely from their close ties with social practice, which precisely enables progressive cultures to encourage the unification of anti-imperialist forces and the molding of revolutionary awareness.

The closely interwoven conflicting trends within the spiritual life of the antagonistic society, particularly the strange combination within the "counterculture" of antibourgeois aspirations with "leftist" extremism, nihilism and cheap ostentatiousness, are replaced by the neoconservatives with a one-dimensional system in which the weakest and most vulnerable aspects of the protest voiced by the leftist intelligentsia are concentrated. Through the lens of neoconservatism the dynamics of culture is presented as the result of an unrestrained gravitation toward pleasure and permissiveness. While sometimes criticizing the true symptoms of the intensifying spiritual crisis in bourgeois society quite perceptively, the neoconservatives try to separate it from its material base and political struggle, and present it as a kind of "intellectual syndrome," which requires global destruction. Sexual perversions, drug addiction, and the cult of cruelty and violence are transformed in their trick mirror from symptoms of lack of spirituality, which is what they are, into the cornerstone of all opposition to the bourgeois state. Naturally, the exposure of a protest movement, thus structured, presents no particular difficulty. However, an even more "profitable" topic, which directly leads the defenders of imperialism to the center of the ideological and political struggle is terrorism, the responsibility for which was initially laid on the "counterculture" and, subsequently, on the international level, the mythical "hand of Moscow."

Quite characteristically, shortly before the start of the anti-Soviet campaign on the question of the so-called "international terrorism," in 1978 to be specific, conservative circles in France and Italy openly accused a group of progressive men of Italian culture, in particular the writer Leonardo Scasca, movie directors Francesco Rozzi, Elio Petri and Damiano Damiani and scriptwriter Hugo Pirro, of "encouraging terrorism." The very logic applied by the right was curious: allegedly, their criticism of the bourgeois class, police and authorities, and the omnipotence of the Mafia, found in their works (which, incidentally, earned wide recognition throughout the world, including our country), undermined the "belief" in the reasonableness and eternity of the capitalist system.

Thus, slogans calling for "moral rebirth," piety and restoration of patriarchal relations between "father and son and the individual and the tribe," proclaimed as the foundation of the "new social philosophy," in fact turn into militant anticommunism and the preaching of conservative ideals aimed at rescuing state-monopoly capitalism from its inevitable collapse, in a hopeless attempt to counter the growth of anti-imperialist feelings among various bourgeois strata. That is precisely why the widening and strengthening of democratic trends and currents in spiritual culture are interpreted by the

neoconservatives as a certain loss of the protective insulation of the elite from the masses, as a crisis of traditional bourgeois authorities which expose the elite to the "whims of the masses."

In an effort to give new life to the "Protestant ethic," as though allegedly the only one capable of restraining the "excessive aspirations" of the youth and the intelligentsia and, ideally, obviously the citizens of the socialist and developing countries as well, the neoconservatives are unable to suggest nothing other than a return to religious sanctimoniousness and hypocrisy or even retrograde clericalism, which has long walked hand-in-hand with the most reactionary forces. A great deal of their ideological and political slogans reminds one of the notorious times of "witch-hunting." It is no accident that in the flood of mystical traumas, which has covered the Western book market and screen, social troubles are frequently and openly proclaimed the result of the "intrigues of Satan," while the bloody murderer Charles Manson, the "new Messiah," is described by the neoconservatives as just about the ideologue of the protesting youth. Such shameless exploitation of religion in the interest of reactionary policy has triggered the objections even of people who could hardly be accused of atheistic concepts. "Quite remote from the human and sensible understanding of the spiritual, neoconservatism cynically uses religion to accomplish its adventuristic objectives," writes, for example, American sociologist I. Horowitz. "Theoretically, neoconservatism claims that religion is the foundation of society. Practically, it considers religion a pragmatic means for the preservation of a society based on private ownership, order and duty. By this token it tries to give its hegemonistic aspirations a cosmic scale."

The curses addressed to left-wing intellectuals, who allegedly monopolize the impact of public opinion in the period of youth rebellions and the failure of the adventure in Vietnam, clearly reveal fears to the effect that the real development of spiritual culture, as in the past, will conflict with the apologetic-protective aspirations of the big bourgeoisie. As a result, neoconservatism, this influential "party of intellectuals," as the supporters of anti-intellectualism are paradoxically characterized, something which enables its supporters to present themselves as members of the opposition, is persecuted for its "excessively naked truth." However, as P. Steinfels justifiably pointed out, "to defend capitalism in the most powerful capitalist state is quite different from supporting the abolition of slavery in the slave-owning South."

Therefore, the new conservatives, allegedly persecuted for the "truth," have at their disposal the services of art and mass information, which enable this imaginary opposition to gain real power over the public.

As we have seen, in their criticism of the "new class" and "counterculture," the neoconservatives put the main blame for the "moral decay of the masses" on the creative intelligentsia. Art, the specific features of which enabled moral and religious postulates to acquire an emotional convincingness and the possibility of their extensive dissemination, became the center of polemics. The practical means used for the dissemination of neoconservative views on



sociocultural theory and art practice are here again distinguished by a characteristic "substitution of the opponent," artful camouflage and open political hysterics, as a result of which the illusion of intellectual and emotional convincingness is acquired, supported by doubtful arguments. According to that same Steinfelds, the neoconservatives have frequently been able to win merely thanks to the fact that they proclaim the criticized trend as "logically related to a variety of forms of extremism or insufficient opposition to them." Thus, antipollution measures allegedly lead to totalitarianism; the emancipation of women leads to the decline of the family, civil disobedience to Watergate and tolerance of counterculture to Jonestown,\* while "Ragtime," the novel by E. L. Doctorow, to terrorism.

The mass information media as well have not been spared from charges. In a debate on cultural problems, sponsored by the journal COMMENTARY, in 1974, M. Novak noted that "no more than a few years ago, at the peak of the counter-culture action, it was precisely the praise of counterculture by the national mass communications media that particularly hindered the preservation of standards and discipline. Actually, the news reflected the feelings of a minority among the students and the various organizations, although this was depicted as a mass cultural movement which it subsequently became. The attention of the information media changed its image." Therefore, the responsibility for the protest movement which, in the author's opinion, expressed the interests of an insignificant minority, was shifted to the mass information media the control of which by the ruling class could be hardly questioned. The real situation here was far more complex and contradictory than the neoconservatives claim. In adapting itself to the new social moods (since ignoring them was no longer possible), the bourgeois press, radio and television were forced to pay considerable attention to the demonstrations of protest and student rebellions in the 1960s. If they changed (or, rather, even distorted) their image, this was done quite tendentiously, to suit the power of the rich, deliberately emphasizing the superficial, most sensational, vivid and entertaining elements of the "counterculture." This concealment of the true sociopolitical reasons for the protest movement was facilitated by the fact that the left-wing radical programs in themselves, as we pointed out, distorted the significance of the concept of cultural revolution as understood by the Marxists.

When it became clear that the energy of the antibourgeois explosion had become uncontrollable and the effort to render harmless hostile trends and to

---

\* Jonestown--a religious community set up in Guyana by a group of Americans who emigrated from the United States, led by the preacher Jones, as a protest against the vices of bourgeois civilization. The collective suicide of hundreds of members of the community in the autumn of 1978, which was organized not without the participation of the CIA, triggered deep public indignation in the United States and other countries. In order to use the wave of protest to its own class interests, bourgeois propaganda proclaimed the tragic fate of the residents of Jonestown the result of communist intrigues.

limit their influence merely to a "lifestyle" had failed, the mass information media changed tactics drastically. They turned into a powerful loud-speaker for the voices which were excoriating the rebellious youth for preaching "terrorism" and "depravity." The powerful force of the counter-propaganda of the defenders of protective concepts spread to advertising, mass fiction and motion pictures.

The process of the penetration of neoconservative ideas among the masses and the ruling elite may be illustrated with the following examples cited in an American study.

A. Bickel, professor at the Yale School of Law, published in 1970 in THE NEW REPUBLIC an article on the failure of racial integration in the schools in the North. A White House adviser was quick to inform President Nixon of the author's conclusions, reporting that "the ship of integration is sinking ... and we should not remain aboard."

D. Bell wrote a book with limited circulation on the absence of discipline in capitalist society, while commentator George F. Will adapted his theses to his own considerations on the occasion of the bicentennial of the United States, in the 1 July 1976 issue of THE WASHINGTON POST, which is read by millions of people.

In THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, (I. Christol) accuses the "new class" of liberal intellectuals of snobbery toward the civilization of business. Mobil--one of the most powerful petroleum corporations--catapulted this idea into a national advertising campaign.

The paradox is that the contemporary neoconservatives--supporters of the idea of the sinfulness of man, innate inequality, militant antidemocracy and defense of "elitism"--are forced in order to reach their objectives to rely not on "elitist" forms of creativity in the least or on refined aestheticism but on surrogates which are most simply capable of serving the extensive dissemination of conservative moods.

It is true that in an effort to present themselves as defenders of humanism, the neoconservatives borrow from real cultural values. In their interpretation, the characteristics of an inevitable "conservative restoration" serve the interests of classical music, opera, ballet, the restoration of canonical stage genres, melodramas above all and even, according to art critic H. Kramer, "a taste for clarity and harmony, beauty and certainty, melody, emotionalism and romantic charm, ... in a word, a taste for art which would give pleasure and would not pose moral problems." This last remark is particularly significant. In this extensive list which puts virtually all achievements in world culture on the service of narrowly circumstantial tactical objectives, we find quite curious the rejection of "moral problems," which seems quite paradoxical in the context of moralizing neoconservative rhetoric. However, the contradiction here is merely superficial. Actually, the only thing rejected is the formulation of "moral problems" which clash with the foundations of bourgeois morality.

As to the efforts to strengthen such weakened foundations, art preaching conservative ideals is offered the broadest possible opportunities. In the struggle for the restoration of bourgeois puritanical morality, the neoconservatives make speculative use of the social significance of the ideals of humanism and the natural gravitation of the people toward goodness and beauty. Even the "pursuit of happiness," which is one of the basic human rights listed in the U.S. Declaration of Independence, is shamelessly aimed against political enemies.

In the West the attack on the democratic public may be either open or deeply concealed. For example, the motion picture "Kramer vs. Kramer" (1979), which won a number of awards of the American Academy of Motion Pictures, seems initially to have nothing to do with politics and to have a quite noble topic. The history of the character who, left by his wife, is forced to assume the full care of his young son, is touching to the point of tears. The efforts to develop a common language with the youngster, and attempts to cook for two as well as the need to pick the child up from school on time, and the resolve to sacrifice a successful career for the sake of his son, can only trigger the sympathy of the audience.

However, this variation of the traditional topic of the "seduced and abandoned" unmarried mother has another, far more questionable, topic. Here the melodramatic role of the "bad guy" is given to a woman who abandons her family for the sake of working and learning to live by herself. This is the inevitable result of the nefarious ideas of women's liberation, the authors claim. The lot of women, they go on to say, consists of children, the kitchen and the church, while the aspiration to go beyond these limits sanctified by Puritan tradition, could only result in the breakdown of the family and to general misfortune. This is a clear and emotionally convincing "exposure" of the women's movement for civil equality in the United States, where it has not been achieved by a long shot.

The scarcity of real artistic "restoration" resources is in striking contrast to the "lofty ideals" proclaimed by neoconservatism. In an extensive glossary published in a special issue of *ESQUIRE*, a bourgeois liberal journal, on neoconservatism, only one writer, Saul Bellow, a single poet, the Englishman Philip Larkin, one art expert, the already mentioned Hilton Kramer, and a single essayist, Tom Wolfe, are listed among the dozens of people involved with this current one way or another. We failed to find even a single strictly literary fact among the "Great Moments" in the history of neoconservatism. However, special mention is made of the "tremendous success" of motion pictures such as "Dirty Harry" (1971) and "Death Wish" (1974), which preach the idea of individual violence as the only possible means of struggle against crime. We could quite justifiably add to them "The New Centurions" (1972) which was shown in our country as well. In this screen production of the notorious novel by former policeman Joseph Wambaugh, the "Los Angeles jungle" is exposed and the "forces of law and order" are praised, of that same police which, according to Lenin, "under bourgeois rule invariably remains its most loyal weapon, bulwark and protection" (op. cit., vol 32, p 25).

Unlike the trend inherent in progressive art of identifying the social roots of delinquency as the creation of the social system, neoconservatism cultivates the concept of assessing crime as an anomaly, as the result of individual damaged personalities or human nature in general. The only reason given for the spreading of crime is the connivance and inaction of the authorities, and the principal method of fighting with it is police terror or individual violence, i.e., essentially breaking the law.

Therefore, while exposing the true evil--the increased crime rate, moral decay and corruption--such works lead the reader or viewer to the conclusion that stricter repressive measures are needed or the inevitability and justification of taking the law in one's own hands. A long-range projection leads to the historically quite well-familiar ideal of the "strong personality," "strong power" or "strong state." Here responsibility for crime is ascribed to the "unruly youth," "the blacks," the "intellectuals," and the "communists." However, the true forms of social protest are deliberately ignored while crime is relished.

It is easy to note that the mass information media and mass art have proved to be significantly more energetic in their emphases and in criticizing the vices of capitalism "from the right," compared with the dissemination of the ideals of the "counterculture." The "aesthetics of violence" over the audience, which has become quite widespread of late, has intensified its emotional impact and contributed to the promotion of concepts insulting to the intelligence. Whatever the neoconservatives may say by blaming art for social "depravity," under the conditions of the domination of mass information media by the bourgeoisie they remain its loyal servants.

In the final account, both "counterculture" and neoconservatism are different features of the crisis in bourgeois culture. The anarchic petit bourgeois rebelliousness and the other reactionary components of the "counterculture"--the objective allies of bourgeois ideology--are inexorably sliding into the past and exposing their reactionary nature. It is precisely they that are being reanimated by the neoconservatives by the very fact of the tendentious polemics against an artificially created opponent; it is precisely they who are comprehensively supported by reactionary circles, including direct financing of terrorist actions. It is no accident that the main enthusiasm of the neoconservatives is not only creative but of a critical-reevaluating nature. By claiming the role of spokesmen for "higher" truths and the only guardians of spirituality, they are forced to live "at the expense" of the "counterculture," claiming that its exposure by them has a positive content. The ideologues of monopoly capital are hastening to bury the protest movement by claiming that the allegedly cyclical development in global political and cultural-ideological life, which has triggered a "listing to the left" in the preceding decade, brought about in the second half of the 1970s and in the 1980s a respective right-wing correction of the course--a "decade of reaction" and an age of omnipotent neoconservatism.

As a whole, however, neoconservatism and bourgeois culture are countered by democratic and socialist culture, for all the truly antibourgeois, artistic, valuable and fruitful aspects of the protest movement of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s in the West did not disappear in the least with the new

decade. It is still alive. Furthermore, having abandoned its extremist slogans, the progressive Western intelligentsia is strengthening its positions allied with the other detachments of the anti-imperialist forces. It is precisely this fact that explains the stubborn and uncompromising exposure of the "new class" by the neoconservatives at a time when, according to their own claims, "counterculture" has long disappeared. For true art and the realistic members of the intelligentsia have retained their support of the ideals of socialism, peace and real humanism, and their interest in the spiritual growth of man and human progress.

The objective political meaning of the reactionary and utopian neoconservative program, which goes far beyond the limits of polemics among different bourgeois intellectual groups, is manifested with particular clarity on the positions on foreign policy problems. These defenders of private property, religion and morality believe that the victory of "virtue" can be guaranteed only by increasing U.S. military power. They oppose detente and defend the CIA. "Morality and 'cult of power' in the United States are the two opposites of neoconservative foreign political thinking. They remind us of two communicating vessels filled with the same substance--hegemonistic ambitions" (A. Yu. Mel'vil'. "Sotsial'naya Filosofiya Sovremennogo Amerikanskogo Koservatizma" [The Social Philosophy of Contemporary American Conservatism]. Moscow, 1980, p 132).

As we have seen, the direct tie linking the interests of monopoly capital and the theoretical views of the neoconservatives is quite clear. It is noteworthy that the special issue of ESQUIRE we mentioned, the editors of which could hardly be suspected of any kind of procommunist sympathy, opened with the epigraph of Marx's and Engel's "German Ideology:" "The thoughts of the ruling class are the ruling thoughts of their age" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 3, p 45). The fact that neoconservative ideology, which expresses the interests of the ruling elite, is forced today to defend and regain its lost positions even in the United States, the citadel of imperialism, is another confirmation of the intensification of the spiritual crisis in capitalism and the steadily growing influence of the ideas of peace and socialism on the minds and hearts of millions of people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9

GUARD OF THE ETERNALLY YOUNG

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 105-108

[Letter to the editor by Aleksandr Il'chenko, Kiev]

[Text] 1

This letter will be about a person who is still -- I am already past 70 -- exciting and nagging at my soul.

The first time I saw A. A. Fadeyev was in 1930, in a theater hall in Kharkov, at the Second International Conference of Revolutionary Writers. Fate, however, was to lead me to him later.

In the autumn of 1935 I frequently found myself in the very center of Moscow, on Granovskaya Street, which parallels Mokhovaya Street, in a home precious to me, that of the charming Klavdiya Vasil'yevna, M. V. Frunze's sister. During the civil war Mikhail Vasil'yevich, who had appeared as though out of a legend, was deciding the fate of the revolution for us in Kharkov, and is remembered forever as the good genie of the people of the Ukraine and of my own.

In June 1935, visiting the peaceful Talka, by the Ivanovskaya River, where the 30th anniversary of the founding of the very first organ of Soviet power on earth and its party nucleus, with which M. V. Frunze was closely involved, was being celebrated in a state of lofty poetic inspiration, on assignment by the Komsomol Central Committee (a short operation in which Kharkov writer Nikolay Skazbush, who is still hale and hearty was also involved) I travelled a long way in the footsteps of Mikhail Frunze, Pavel Postyshev and dozens of their bolshevik comrades in Ivanovo, Vladimir and Moscow Oblasts and the Urals, and collected a good 150 records and testimonies of participants of events and party members.

I spent that entire summer flying over the Angara, Baykal and Amur, along the ocean shore, the tayga and the quagmires, in the living footsteps of partisan detachments, landing in impassable areas in which my tiny old one-seater amphibious Sh-2 plane was looked upon as miraculous... That autumn, informed by P. P. Postyshev that some beginning writer had returned from the native area of Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, from which he had been absent for 2 years, Fadeyev had rushed to ask Klavdiya Vasil'yevna a few questions. For example, had I been able to find the traces of three youngsters who had been sent once by

Aleksandr Fadeyev, the young Far Eastern partisan brigade commissar, via different routes, to the left bank of the Amur and its tributaries Kur and Urmi, to establish contact with the detachment commanded by Pavel Petrovich Postyshev....I had failed to trace Fadeyev's youngsters, however, although I had heard about a couple of boys who, after covering hundreds of kilometers had been shot by the Whites on the Amur... Such was the topic of my first conversation with Aleksandr Aleksandrovich.

This was the topic of my talk at the Fadeyev anniversary meeting in Kiev, in December 1981. Here, however, I shall discuss something infinitely more precious to me, as though I were responding to the article on Fadeyev in KOMMUNIST.

I met with Fadeyev in the alarming quiet of Moscow in 1943... He had just returned from fascist-besieged Leningrad. He was thin, gaunt and evil-looking, but tanned, weather-bitten and impetuous. His heroic perception of the world, mentioned by Vitaliy Ozerov, made Fadeyev look far younger than his age.

As IZVESTIYA special correspondent, coming and going, I lived in the capital and, in addition to the newspaper, worked as an editor of the new journal UKRAINA, which we were publishing in Moscow at that time. That is why in those war times Muscovites occasionally spent the night on duty at the Union of USSR Writers. The first night I was on duty I came across Fadeyev in the hall and he, the tireless "organizer of the country's literary forces," began to talk as though we had parted the day before. In particular, he recalled our distant meeting in Klavdiya Vasil'yevna's home and, stunning me with the power of his memory, quoted parts of my "Petersburg Autumn" (naturally, we were discussing blocaded Leningrad), although my story had been published in the journal OKTYABR' before the start of the war.

It so happened that I never visited with Aleksandr Aleksandrovich's family, or met his relatives. For brief periods, however, fate let us meet on official business only.

I shall never forget one summer night in 1943, for instance, during which I spent several hours with Fadeyev, although nothing particular happened.

At the beginning of August, once again I was on duty in the house on Vorovskiy Street, where the Union of USSR Writers was housed. I was in the union secretary's office.

That memorable night began in a worrisome, noisy and strange way. The guns opened up on the evening of 5 August. I telephoned the city's commandant. It turned out that this was not a bombing or an alarm signal. It was the first salute fired in the capital: The Red Army had just liberated Orel and Belgorod. Several rocket flares shot up in the dark sky. Meanwhile, the telephones kept ringing on Fadeyev's desk, of the city and the commandant's. Our comrades were asking what had happened in the city? The high leadership was giving the necessary orders. I recalled that A. S. Shcherbakov called

\* See V. Ozerov's article "Power of Inspiration, Depth of Thought," KOMMUNIST No 1, 1982.

asking that we share his happiness with his writer friends. Suddenly, I heard on the receiver a familiar voice. "Aleksandr, is it you?" It was Fadeyev. "What is going on?" I answered. "Flares have been seen over the Krymskiy Bridge." After a brief silence he added: "I'm coming immediately. Go down, tell the guard to let me in." There was only one person on duty, coping with a number of things on the second floor, while an elderly Red Army man stood guard with a rifle at the entrance to the house, facing a vast courtyard.

It took Fadeyev a long time to come... Although usually quick, like a watchful bird in flight, now, as soon as he opened the door I could see the stamp of trouble on his passionate face. To my unspoken question, he said: "It hurts!" He had just been informed that a young comrade of ours had died in battle the day before and Fadeyev had hurried here, to avoid the pain of loneliness. "Did you know him?" he asked referring to the deceased. Without looking he took out of a pigeonhole on the desk his last letter, the triangular army envelope, still warm, received the day before, and again he said, "How painful life is!"

I had heard Fadeyev voice the same heart-rending words before, subconsciously. As a communist everything hurt him, he considered himself answerable to the party (he had become a bolshevik at the age of 17), the people, the future and himself...although he tried to conceal his wounds bravely. It took me some time to realize that without this noble pain the great love of people and optimistic perception of the world inherent in us, bolsheviks, could not exist. Such is the nature of dialectics....

The telephones kept ringing and I answered, I kept answering and dialing. Hearing nothing, Fadeyev heavily paced in his office.

During a short break I spread on my desk the proofs of a most urgent project: That same night I had to go over the September sixth issue of UKRAINA.

I spread out some sheets, still moist and smelling of printer's ink, and Fadeyev, casually glancing, suddenly cried out, excited, blushing. Pages 22 and 23 carried previously unpublished photographs of Lyubov Shevtsova, Sergey Tyulenin, Ul'yana Gromova, Ivan Zemnukhov and Oleg Koshevoy with his mother. Under the photographs there were three pages of text of a first article on the exploits of the young guards.

Fadeyev, who was standing behind me, froze. He broke the tense silence asking, "Can I take them?" He took the sheets and sunk into thought.

This "inspired talent, lofty and ringing," as Konstantin Fedin was to describe him later, had already managed to go several times over the file sent to the Komsomol Central Committee on the exploits of "The Young Guards," a material which, as Fadeyev said, "could melt a stone." He had found two or three photographs by himself but had not as yet seen the ones published in the journal, had not visited Krasnodon yet and had not spoken with the surviving young guards. However, he was already feeling their pain.



Collecting his thought, as though praying, he communicated with the soul of Ul'yana Gromova. In the photograph the girl's eyes seemed mercilessly to stare at the enemy. Naturally, he could not see himself in this moment of inspiration, but I could. I saw around him the halo of ideological and spiritual beauty typical of Fadeyev's characters.

2

One again, the night seemed endless. The telephones kept ringing, but Fadeyev, remote from all this, lived the fate the young heroes. He was far away in that small Donbass city washed in the blood of the patriots. I tried not to look at him, for it is a sin to look at an artist at a time when he begins to blend with his future character.... Still, by the will of fate, I froze in the presence of this sacrament: It was in the spiritual clashes that the light of the novel arose over the world, of the essential novel, one could say, of those heroic times of war.

I should have left, but the war was still there and I could not abandon those writers' telephones entrusted to my care, which kept ringing tirelessly.

Fadeyev spent the night staring at the photographs. When we left the house together and found ourselves in the spacious garden in front of Tolstoy's statue, his mind still elsewhere, he leaned his face against a tree, touched its bark and showed such a tremendous burst of joy that I felt this entire city at war hush....

We walked rapidly, almost running down Moscow's dirty, deserted and tense streets. Tanks thunderously lumbered to the west. Tired soldiers marched out of step. Barrage balloons floated in the skies.... I did not know where Fadeyev lived. We crossed the Krymskiy Bridge. Fadeyev rushed ahead smartly, like the legendary eagle, great and swift....

"Why do your eyes show hurt?" Fadeyev asked, looking at me closely. "Who are you thinking of now? Is it of David Kanevskiy, so close to so many of us? Who is he and where is he? In the army. A young communist, our comrade, a poet. I saw once in his notebook, as he was passing through Moscow, words of prose: 'How beautiful Krymskiy Bridge is over the Moskva River. Like a good poem, light and transparent seeming, but made of steel.' I am now suddenly aware of another type of poetry, that of Ulya Gromova, who was unable or unwilling to keep in her heart words which were neither steel nor weapons."

Today, as I look at the Krymskiy Bridge or the old pages of the Ukrainian journal, I almost groan: Fadeyev is long gone and Ulya Gromova stares from the photograph, through unsatiable love, looking archly at the future pains of the planet, at the catastrophic pain of the 1980s, which today's fuhrers of neo-fascism and Zionism and their overseas patrons, having lost their human faces, are trying to inflict with tireless hatred on all nations striving toward peaceful toil....

I read in the journal the first chapters of the first edition of "Molodaya Gvardiya" [The Young Guard] written with the heart's blood, filled with anger and even humor, translated them and...was not pleased by the translation

(writer A. Ye. Il'chenko was the initial translator of Fadeyev's "The Young Guards" into Ukrainian -- the editor). Not only because during those difficult years zealous editorial officials were bending over the editions and re-edited editions of such an important work: As though for the sake of accuracy, on all occasions they turned the magic of words into nauseating copy, offering the reader not the active mechanism of the work but each separate cog, each word by itself. But the main culprit was I. The talent required for the translation of such a novel had to be lofty, melodious, like Fadeyev's own.

To this day this translation of mine saddens and embitters me. I also do not care for doing translations. But the spiritual firmness of the giant, the author of "The Young Guards," taught me strictness toward myself and my work.

3

I have long been aware of the fact that Fadeyev continues to live in the hearts of the readers.... In 1944, for example, in early spring, tired of waiting, 8 days before the arrival of the Red Army, 16 people (party, Komsomol and soviet workers, teachers, physicians and nurses) captured the small town of Storozhinets, in Bukovina, surrounded on three sides by fascists, the fourth side consisting of steep ice-covered rocks. Our daring people, together with their wives and small children, crossed the mountains despite a bitter snow storm and almost all of them survived. They were fired at along the way but managed to break through. They were guided by the urge to see their native land where they had lived less than a year before the start of the war, an urge stronger than death.

At that time I described the heroism of these civilians in IZVESTIYA, in the essay "Native Side," and I still remember my amazement at the flood of letters this generated... In that same August issue I also mentioned the name of the teacher Anastasiya Ivanovna Skrobotova (an old acquaintance of mine, about whom I had had the opportunity to publish something nice on the very eve of the war), a teacher who had come to Storozhinets with advance Red Army elements... I remember how frequently the Huzuls visited this stern woman who taught Russian to the Ukrainians, something I personally witnessed in 1940... I saw her there again in 1944, obeying this mysterious thrust which made this teacher return to the mountains like birds to their old nests.

I was present at the first meeting between her and her surviving girl students. Skrobotova was looked upon as a miracle, as were actually all those who had rushed to them from the east at that time. There were many questions asked, but the first was, Is our Fadeyev alive, what is he doing, what is he writing?.. Before the war, Skrobotova had frequently mentioned him in her classes. Now, answering her former students, she described his breakthrough into fascist-besieged Leningrad and his work for the party and the government. She also mentioned Bernard Shaw's letter which, to the best of her knowledge, he had sent in the summer of '41, some 3 weeks after the fascists had attacked the land of the soviets: "Once Russia has crushed Hitler it will become the spiritual center of the world!" She said that Fadeyev was fulfilling Shaw's prophecy and faith in Russian, in Soviet truth, which had become the hope of the planet with each step he took, with his life's work, and his faith in the great Soviet writer. It was quite obvious why the young Bukovina girls in

Storozhinets, just freed from the hell in which they had lived, were asking the brave Russian woman about Fadeyev first of all.

"Bernard Shaw," Skrobotova thought out loud, "I am confident that...before the war, somewhere in Europe he must've met our Fadeyev and the writer's charm, is it not so, girls, became to this great philosopher a symbol of the Soviet character."

Yes, the symbol of the Soviet character!

4

That is why to this day passions are triggered by this eternally living symbol, by Aleksandr Fadeyev, this pearl of Soviet spiritual wealth, this brave soldier who fought with words. I would be happy if bits of my bitter truth on the hard life of the giants of our time would erase from his image silent passages, innuendos, slanders and strained interpretations, if I could promote the bright passions and eliminate even a few dark ones. Fadeyev's thorny road should neither be embellished nor refurbished or stained. The patience of history is not everlasting. Fadeyev's supporters today are alive and well, and the guard of those forever young is active in the spiritual center of the world.

Aleksandr Fadeyev followed Lenin's hard and steep road, which made him great in his own way. He lives in our future concerns and hopes and our look at the past, at Ulya Gromova and the gigantic accomplishments of the knights of the October Revolution and the pioneers and defenders of socialism for the sake of future peace in our restless earth; for the sake of making life on earth better; for the metal of Krymskiy Bridge to ring across the Moskva River like a Lermontov poem in the angry lips of Ul'yana; for her great love for the Soviet fatherland to live always inside us, along with unabated hatred of the enemy and the foe. At the ceremony in honor of the 20th anniversary of our historical victory, addressing himself to the entire planet, Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev spoke of the ranks of most noted literary workers who fired the Soviet "flame of hatred for the aggressors," with the firmness and courage of soldiers, naming, naturally Aleksandr Fadeyev among the first. Such is the writer's burning "light of youth" and such is his memory eternally alive in the people and the party.

That is why his pain remains eternally alive in the hearts of the readers...

....Sometimes we find life hard perhaps because the same stereotyped words are repeated over and over again in today's press, lectures, and trivial bureaucratic reports. A couple of hundred or even a 150 words are used, as though no other words exist. Yet our contemporary multiple-volume Russian and Ukrainian dictionaries contain an endless amount of words, 120,000 of them. All of these 120,000 words could become weapons in the battle of ideas, but through original and precise combinations, words used by the people, eternally living words, all of them used by Lenin...

We see in Lenin's Kremlin office, by the right side of the desk, on a light turning shelf, still extant, eight thick volumes -- two four-volume dictionaries, Russian and Ukrainian, works with magic power, the Slavic words of two

related peoples... At one point Fadeyev embarrassedly admitted that once he was lucky... The usual janitorial cleaning had been more slow in the silent Kremlin. An elderly janitor, a clean rag in his hand, cleaning the precious shelf by Lenin's desk, glanced at the silent stranger who had stopped midway as he was leaving the room...and in a sudden burst of trust the old man nodded to him for little help and asked Fadeyev to lay on the desk the eight heavy volumes and enjoyed his burst of happiness: a brief touch of the treasury of Lenin's words, through the magic crystal of which we look at life, an instant which gave Fadeyev courage, firmness and the explosive power of the mind...

This conflicting burst of emotions and thoughts could not vanish, and that is the way the diamond-sharp edges of the party's discussion on A. A. Fadeyev affected his many readers, a discussion which was held a year ago on the occasion of the 80th birthday of the fiery communist writer.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9

## URBAN RESOURCE UTILIZATION STANDARDS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 108-111

[Letter to the editor by T. Sudadze, candidate of economic sciences]

[Text] The need to ensure a scientific, comprehensive and planned urban development and to provide urban residents with the most favorable working, living and recreation conditions possible and the satisfaction of their material and cultural requirements is being felt with increasing urgency.

The creative application of the principles and methods governing the planned purposeful development of the cities is one of the vital problems in perfecting the managing of a complex urban economy. At the present time urban (territorial) and sectorial plans are being formulated on a parallel basis. After receiving the draft sectorial plans, broken down by individual indicators, the city organs draft their plan for the city's comprehensive economic and social development. Naturally, they study the indicators, compare them to the level of development of the city's economy reached during the preceding planned period and make corrections. After approving the plan, they organize continuing control over its implementation.

The large settlements include enterprises and organizations under the jurisdiction of several dozen ministries and departments, and one can easily imagine the difficulty of formulating a plan for the city's comprehensive economic and social development when enterprises and organizations are under different ministries and protect their departmental interests first. The practical result is that the local authorities participate in the formulation of the plans of the various economic sectors only nominally, essentially limiting themselves to reducing them to a single document.

In formulating the planned assignments of enterprises and organizations on the territory of a given city, and allocating them the necessary funds, the ministries and departments also determine the amount of urban resources their enterprises will consume. Their sum total, however, may disagree with the city's possibilities. This disturbs the balancing of the plans and leads to inefficient use of resources. It involves the number of workers and employees, the urban space occupied by the enterprises and organizations; water, gas and electric power consumption; construction and installation projects; and the requirement of taking environmental protection measures.

The sector and the city hold different views on urban resource planning. A particularly frequent phenomenon in the large settlements is that manpower resources are limited, for which reason they must be concentrated and efficiently used above all in resolving the main problems of the production and nonproduction infrastructures. This requires the formulation of an efficient system for their allocation, and the most scarce of them assigned to the implementation of national economic tasks and to the solution of problems related to the fulfillment of the city's social functions.

As a rule, the ministries and departments are interested in greater production concentration and, therefore, in the manpower resources available in the large cities. Naturally, the organization of the production process in a developed area also requires the creation of a strictly "urban" economy and cadre training. A large city has skilled cadres and its own economy, and the city's enterprises and organizations here are almost entirely served by them. Therefore, from the viewpoint of the sector, better results can be achieved with lower labor and financial outlays. However, if the sectors undertake to develop their own production facilities without coordination with the urban authorities, the consequences are as a rule negative; the balance of city labor resources is disturbed, resulting in a shortage of cadres. The result is that the sectors find themselves in a difficult position and begin to look for ways of drawing people away from other enterprises (through higher wages, faster housing allocation, etc.) or else request of the urban authorities to allow them to draw people from other parts of the country. For example, between 1970 and 1981 Moscow's population increased by 1,126,000 people. This was essentially the result of new arrivals needed to meet manpower shortages. Their requirements, in turn, called for increased urban resources.

Today Moscow and Leningrad limit the number of workers on a sectorial basis. Naturally, this is a step forward in coordinating sectorial with territorial development. However, as practical experience indicates, limiting a specific resource, even one as important as manpower, does not help us to resolve all problems related to planning urban economic and social development.

The economic and social processes taking place under urban conditions are closely related to territorial problems, water, power and gas resources and the state of the environment. For example, the city's power grid and gas mains are connected to the general state systems. They receive and allocate these resources among enterprises and organizations on the basis of amounts stipulated by the superior ministries and departments. The following situation may develop: as the volume of output grows the sector increases its consumption of one or several types of resources. This exceeds the set limits, thus disturbing the urban balance. The sector can substantiate the need to raise the limit and obtain the proper permission from the superior organizations. However, the allocation of higher limits to enterprises and organizations by the ministries and departments does not mean at all that the problem of securing such resources has been met, for this calls for expanding the capacity of the city's engineering systems. In turn, this increases the use of other urban resources. For example, the allocation of capital investments for the installation of new infrastructural capacities obviously increases the volume of construction and installation operations which, in turn, requires more workers and employees not only for the given sector but for those which service it.

For example, between 1970 and 1978 construction and installation work in Moscow increased by nearly 41 percent and the installation of capital assets by 43 percent. This increased the number of workers engaged in construction-installation and planning-engineering work servicing construction operations.

The importance of the environment in human life and the creation of conditions for normal work is self-explanatory. If we bear in mind that the volume of output in the city is systematically increasing it becomes entirely clear that in order not to exceed the present level of environmental pollution we must correspondingly reduce the emission of pollutants by enterprises. This, however, requires the use of great pressure, for it "worsens" the enterprise's economic indicators.

Therefore, the city soviet organs can ensure the normal socioeconomic development of their territory on the basis of a comprehensive coordinated approach, and combine the efforts of ministries and departments in resolving territorial and sectorial problems. This is possible only by setting up an efficient economic mechanism which will relate changes in the volumes and other technical and economic development indicators of the city sectors to long-term changes in the employment structure and use of other resources, if the "mechanical" population influx is to be stopped and disturbance in the balance of the development of the urban economy and other disproportions prevented.

This calls for a mechanism responsive to the system of standards governing the utilization of urban resources. In developing such a system we must also take into consideration the specific details of each economic sector. This means that the need for resources must be related in the norms to the volumes of output. The specific nature of the ministries and departments must be considered due to the differences in outlays of urban resources based on type of activities per, let us say, 1 million rubles of output (work). In Moscow, for example, according to our estimates, the number of workers per million rubles of marketable output at Ministry of Heavy Machine Building enterprises exceeds that of the USSR Ministry of Food Industry by a factor of 8.3. This results in increased outlays of many types of resources. For example, petroleum refining and petrochemical enterprises use more water by a factor of 3.8 compared with the Ministry of Chemical Industry, and 18.5 compared with the Ministry of Instrument Making. The dependence of the norms on the type of enterprise activities is due to the fact that all economic sectors operating within city limits have both specialized and nonspecialized enterprises. For example, in addition to 80 specialized enterprises within Moscow's city limits, the USSR Ministry of Food Industry runs seven construction and repair administrations, nine scientific research organizations and administrative offices, and so on.

Naturally, full information on all developments in the activities of economic sectors must be available in formulating the plan for the city's comprehensive economic and social development. This is particularly important, for today indicators related to the basic activities of a specific sector are planned, while nonspecialized activities are ignored. Nevertheless, the nonspecialized subunits employ a substantial number of people, use capital assets, etc. For example, the specialized and nonspecialized enterprise of the organizations and establishments of the USSR Ministry of Food Industry, USSR Ministry of Transport Construction and USSR Ministry of Culture, in Moscow, respectively account

for 16.3, 48.5 and 39.4 percent of the total number of workers and 38.5, 37 and for 57 percent of capital assets.

In order to formulate norms and observe said planning principles it becomes necessary to set standard measurements for all types of activities of economic sectors. This would enable us to measure the scale of activity by economic sector per million rubles of net (normative) output for the following outlays of urban resources: number of workers, volume of construction and installation work; city area occupied by enterprises and organizations; water consumption, including water taken from the city mains; power and gas consumption; and the volume of noxious substances from all pollution sources.

The development of subordinate enterprises and organizations operating within city limits must be planned within the norms of their ministries and departments. This will make them cautious in drawing up their lists for the development of equipment and technology and improvements in organizing production. Together with the ministries and departments the city authorities will be able to formulate scientific norms and use them in planning comprehensive city economic and social developments. The final result would be a real combination of sectorial with territorial planning through the mechanism of the reciprocal influence of norms and elements of production development, which would yield substantial economic and social benefits.

A system of norms and balances of urban resources would enable us to develop variants of an optimal plan for urban economic development and help us to estimate the increased volumes of output (work) per unit of measurement in one sector or another and the increased need for related resources. An overall system for the formulation of an optimal plan for the development of the urban economy on the basis of norm systems could be as follows: The admissible and minimal volumes of output for the planned period of time would be determined for each economic sector; resource utilization norms which are to be reached by the end of the planned period are adopted. The absolute amount of urban resources at the end of the period is estimated. The maximized gross social product or contribution to the national income could be used as criteria in formulating the optimal variant.

The question of the maximally admissible and minimally required rates of production growth by economic sector should be coordinated with the respective ministries and departments. This kind of approach to the comprehensive economic and social development of the city would be consistent with the basic principles of scientific planning and offer the possibility of extensively applying balance and technical-economic computations and program-target methods and optimizing plans. To this effect, on the basis of the records of economic sectors and administrative rayons a city plan would be drawn up. This would upgrade the role of socialist accounting and control and contribute to achieving information unity in urban planning and management and defining the role and place of specific sectors and administrative rayons in the development of their economy and balancing all activities of sectors and administrative rayons and meeting their resource requirements. All of this, combined with the norms for the production and nonproduction infrastructure, transport facilities and social services, would ensure the optimal comprehensive development of the microrayon and the urban administrative rayons.



A system of norms would also enable us to enhance the economic interest and responsibility of ministries (departments) in the substantiated planning of the development of their subordinate enterprises in each city, and the rational utilization of urban resources. To this effect, the more efficient use of financial resources must be ensured: penalties for exceeding norms must be imposed and rewards presented for saving on urban resources, in order to create the type of conditions under which ministries and departments would no longer ineffectively concentrate their organizations and enterprises in the large cities, based on the viewpoint of the national economy.

The wide application of such a system would enable us to upgrade efficiency in managing the process of the harmonious and balanced development of the urban and sectorial economy and achieve more rapidly comprehensive improvements in the working, living and recreational conditions of the Soviet people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist, 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9

## RAISING CONVINCED PATRIOTS-INTERNATIONALISTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 112-120

[Review by B. Arkhipov, candidate of historical sciences, of the following republic theoretical and political journals: KOMMUNIST UKRAINY, UZBEKISTON KOMMUNISTI (KOMMUNIST UZBEKISTANA), AZERBAYDZHAN KOMMUNISTI (KOMMUNIST AZERBAYDZHANA), SAKARTVELOS KOMUNISTI (KOMMUNIST GRUZII), KOMUNISTAS (KOMMUNIST, Lithuania), KOMUNISTUL MOLDOVEY (KOMMUNIST MOLDAVII), PADOM'YU LATVIYS KOMUNISTS (KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII), EESTI KOMMUNIST (KOMMUNIST ESTONII), and TATARSTAN KOMMUNISTY (KOMMUNIST TATARII) come out in two editions--in the language of the nation after which the republic is named and in Russian. KOMMUNIST BELORUSSII is published in Russian. The journals KAZAKHSTAN KOMMUNISI (KOMMUNIST KAZAKHSTANA), KOMMUNIST (Kirghizia), KOMMUNISTI TOCHIKISTON (KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA), TURKMENISTAN KOMMUNISTI (KOMMUNIST TURKMENISTANA) and LENINYAN UGIOV ("Along Lenin's Way," Armenia) are published in the language of the republic's native nationality]

[Text] The CPSU has invariably paid tremendous attention to problems of the patriotic and international education of the party members and all working people.

The 26th CPSU Congress gave new emphasis to the task of improving this work further. The Central Committee's accountability report to the congress stipulated that "it is the party's sacred duty to raise the working people in a spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism and proud feeling of belonging to the single great Soviet homeland."

The mass information and propaganda media--radio and television, newspapers and journals--play a great role in resolving the problems set by the party in patriotic and international education and in all ideological and mass political work.

"The convincing and specific depiction of our accomplishments, the serious analysis of new problems steadily created by life, and fresh thoughts and words," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, pointed out, "is the way to improving our entire propaganda, which must always be truthful and realistic, interesting and inventive, and, therefore, more efficient."

In 1982 the party organizations of republics, krays and oblasts and the mass information and propaganda media worked hard to implement the CPSU Central

Committee decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Founding of the USSR." This decree, based on the decisions of the 26th congress, demanded of the party organizations and the radio, television, newspapers and journals to conduct preparations for the celebration of the anniversary of the USSR in such a way as to enable it comprehensively to contribute to "further improvements in the ideological-political, patriotic and international education of the working people."

How have the republic party journals implemented these requirements? What positive experience have they acquired, what have they been unable to accomplish and what shortcomings have been revealed?

Fifteen theoretical and political journals of the central committees of the communist parties of union republics and of the Tatar CPSU Obkom are published in our country. All of these journals traditionally extensively covered topics of Soviet patriotism and proletarian and socialist internationalism. KOMMUNIST has frequently printed reviews of republic party journals, including materials covering this topic (the latest, "United Family," was published in No 15, 1977).

The steady attention which the journals paid to problems of patriotic and internationalist upbringing is natural and legitimate. As our society develops the need increases for a profound mastery of the ideas and principles of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism and of turning them into convictions, behavioral norms and the active lifespans of every person. As they materialize in the practical activities of the Soviet people, at each higher stage in the maturity of Soviet society patriotism and internationalism acquire an increasing role and become mandatory prerequisites for its further progress and successful advance toward communism.

The increased attention paid to such problems dictated by the size of the process of laying the material and technical foundations for communism, the need to improve national relations, as a structural component of party activities in shaping the entire system of communist social relations, and the implementation of the party's programmatic objectives related to the education of the new man.

The importance of the international-patriotic training of the Soviet people at the present stage, naturally, is based on external reasons as well. Considering the aggravated ideological struggle in the international arena, such training is an effective antidote to extreme anti-Soviet propaganda, which is one of the principal means of subversive imperialist activities.

In considering the materials published of late in the republic party journals in accordance with these stipulations, they could be divided into several basic directions in terms of their coverage of such topics.

The study of the theoretical problems of patriotism and internationalism, their clarification, the dialectics of the national and the international, Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism and the interpretation of the Marxist-Leninist theory of nations and the Leninist national policy of

the CPSU account for a substantial number of articles. Such materials are typical of all journals. For example, KOMMUNIST UKRAINY carried the articles "Vivid Manifestation of the Triumph of the Leninist Ideas of Proletarian Internationalism," "The Soviet Person--Patriot and Internationalist" and "Vivid Facets in the Development of the New Historical Community."

A number of symposiums and practical science conferences were held in connection with the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR. Some of them were reflected in the party journals. For example, KOMMUNIST MOLDAVII carried a report on a session of the USSR Academy of Sciences Scientific Council on the History of Social Thought, held in Kishinev, with "Dialectics of the International and the National in the Development of Contemporary Philosophy and Social Thinking in the Light of the Decisions and Documents of the 26th CPSU Congress" as its theme. KOMMUNIST TATARII printed a report on a scientific conference on "Reciprocal Influence and Enrichment of the Cultures of the USSR Peoples," taking as an example the autonomous republics along the Volga and the Urals. In addition to a detailed report on the all-union practical science conference on "Development of National Relations Under Mature Socialist Conditions. Experience and Problems in Patriotic and International Education," KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII published a report by B. Ponomarev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and CPSU Central Committee secretary "CPSU Leninist National Policy at the Developed Socialist Stage and Its International Significance," as well as an article by A. Voss, CP of Latvia Central Committee first secretary, "Topical Problems of the Further Strengthening of the Patriotic and International Education of the Working People." The same journal published in its section "On the 60th Anniversary of the Founding of the USSR" a number of interesting theoretical materials. Let us single out among them the article by A. Favorskiy "The Universal-Historical Significance of the Soviet Experience in Resolving the National Problem" (No 1) and by I. Apin "Under the Leninist Flag of Proletarian Internationalism" (No 4). This section scored a particular success in Issue No 6 with a selection of the following articles: A. Voss, "Spreading the Experience of the Fraternal Republics Is an Important Trend in the Activities of Party Organizations," V. Miller, "Unity in All-Union and National Statehood in the USSR" and A. Rudzite, "We Are Educating Internationalists-Patriots." The study and dissemination of progressive experience in the fraternal republics is considered in A. Voss's article as a means for reciprocal enrichment and development of all nations and nationalities in the USSR. The Latvian party members consider this their international duty. In studying and applying the progressive experience of the fraternal republics, they try to disseminate the experience of the republic's leading production workers, thus ensuring the successful implementation of national economic plans.

Despite a great variety of materials it publishes, KOMMUNIST UZBEKISTANA ascribes a leading position to theoretical articles. Noteworthy among them is the editorial "Triumph of the Immortal Leninist Ideas" and the article by V. Ten "Rapprochement Among Nations Is a Pattern of Developed Socialism," which discusses the creative development of the principles of Leninist national policy under contemporary conditions. "In managing the process of

rapprochement among nations and nationalities under mature socialist conditions, the CPSU ascribes great importance to the proper scientific interpretation and, on this basis, prevention of still-encountered manifestations of national narrow-mindedness..." the author points out. "Naturally, the reasons for these phenomena are found in the vestiges of capitalism in the minds of the people and the influence of anticommunist propaganda from abroad. Another consequence of the durability of nationalistic prejudices is the erroneous refraction in the minds of individual people of the process of accelerated social development, which is greatly assisted by the not always sufficiently profound and scientifically argued interpretation of the ideas of proletarian and socialist internationalism" (No 5, 1982, p 61).

The creative search for an active approach to the topics makes the scientific study of specific experience, historical facts and present-day life in Uzbekistan in the articles published particularly convincing.

The theoretical articles in the journal KOMMUNIST BELORUSSII are of equal unquestionable interest: "The Patriotism and Internationalism of the Soviet People," and "The Increased Role of the Working Class in Social Life."

Theoretical articles on internationalist and patriotic education may be found in virtually every single issue of KOMMUNIST GRUZII for 1982. Noteworthy among them are "On the Development of National Relations in the USSR" by R. Grzelidze (No 1), "Creative Development of Marxist-Leninist Theory" by A. Gonashvili (No 4) and "In the Single Family of Nations of the Land of the Soviets" by G. Dzidzaria (No 7).

However, KOMMUNIST GRUZII has been unable to avoid inaccuracies and errors. It has printed materials containing erroneous conclusions and recommendations, which were the topic of a special discussion by the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee.

Noteworthy among the theoretical articles carried by the journal KOMMUNIST ESTONII are the editorial "Invincible Force of Proletarian Internationalism" (No 5), "The Struggle of the Estonian Working People for State Unification With the USSR" by A. Libman and V. Maamyagi (No 7), "Loyalty to Proletarian Internationalism" by O. Kuuli (No 8) and "Variety Within Unity" by G. Naan (No 1, 1983).

The latter is distinguished by its lively and fresh style, publicistic nature, clear internationalist position and polemic sharpness. It is true that it is precisely in the heat of the polemics the author is not entirely correct in his interpretation of the concept of ethnicity. He has also exaggerated the role of the right side of the human brain and practically reduced to the "subconscious" the reasons for racial and national fights in the United States (see p 34), which, naturally, should be sought in the ineradicable vices of capitalist society.

It is social reasons, rather than problems of "deep structure of the brain," as the author claims, that determine the still-existing cases of "'national' unconscientiousness and narrow-mindedness" (p 35). Such reasons must be studied profoundly and eliminated promptly.

The argued exposure of bourgeois propaganda, which is trying to misrepresent USSR history as a whole and that of individual union republics as well as the national policy of the CPSU, is an important line in the theoretical activities of republic party journals.

Typical in this respect are the articles published in 1982 in KOMMUNIST UKRAINY "Racism--A Tool for Oppression and Class Division of the Working People" by N. Tkachenko (No 5), "Bourgeois Nationalism--A Weapon of Imperialism" by V. Popov and B. Shuvalov (No 10) and the editorial article in KOMMUNIST ESTONII "National Relations in the Mature Socialist Society and the Fabrications of Bourgeois Ideologues" (No 8).

An interesting article was published in KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII. In their article "Historical Significance of the Unification of the Baltic Republics With the USSR" (No 8, 1982) its authors, A. Drizul and V. Maamyagi, vice presidents of, respectively, the Academy of Sciences of Latvia and Estonia, describe how for the first time in the history of the world revolutionary movement the proletariat in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia defeated the bourgeoisie without armed uprising, through free parliamentary elections. The Baltic events confirmed V. I. Lenin's brilliant prediction. As early as 1916 Lenin described the possibility of a peaceful development of the socialist revolution in individual cases and as acceptance (see p 53).

On 21 July 1940 the national assemblies of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia solemnly proclaimed a Soviet system and decided to petition the USSR Supreme Soviet to accept the republics within the Soviet Union. The authors prove that this great victory would have been inconceivable without the selfless aid of the peoples of the USSR in 1939 and 1940, and that the presence of Soviet troops on Baltic territory in accordance with the 1939 treaty blocked imperialist aggression and the outbreak of civil war. The article convincingly exposes the bourgeois distorters of Baltic history, who claim that the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia joined the USSR allegedly as a result of an act of aggression.

In the article "Friendship Among the Peoples of the USSR in the Trick Mirror of Anticommunism," carried in KOMMUNIST UZBEKISTANA (No 1, 1982), K. Inoyatov and G. Khidoyatov bring forth arguments exposing the anti-Soviet fabrications of reactionary "experts on Central Asia." Accurate hits at the writings of bourgeois distorters are also dealt by this journal in its section "In the United and Fraternal Family," which has published articles by V. Brovnikov, Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee second secretary, A. Voss, Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee first secretary, M. Gapurov, Communist Party of Turkmenistan Central Committee first secretary, K. Kazybayev, Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee secretary, and S. Grossa, Communist Party of Moldavia Central Committee first secretary. The facts, figures and documents cited in the articles clearly confirm the triumph of the Leninist national policy.

The article "Critique of the Concept of the 'Muslim Way of Life'" by R. Kurbanov, T. Effendiyev and B. Shaniyevov, carried by KOMMUNIST TURKMENISTANA (No 2, 1982) proves the groundlessness of the efforts of our

class enemy to use religious feelings in promoting national hostility among the peoples of the Soviet Union.

The party journals publish extensive materials on processes of further production socialization and strengthening the single national economic complex, which is the material foundation for the all-round rapprochement among nations and nationalities in our republic, propagandizing the experience of republic, kray, oblast, rayon and primary party organizations in developing the anniversary socialist competition and the experience gained in the patriotic and internationalist upbringing of the working people.

It is natural that during the anniversary year considerably more attention was paid to this topic. From their very first issues all journals started permanent sections, such as "The Soviet Union--A United Family" in KOMMUNIST UKRAINY, "In Fraternal Alliance and A United Family" in KOMMUNIST BELORUSSII, "The Soviet Union--A United Family" in KOMMUNIST MOLDAVII, "In the United Fraternal Family" in KOMMUNIST UZBEKISTANA, "USSR-60" in KOMMUNIST (Lithuania), "In the Fraternal Family" in KOMMUNIST ESTONII, and so on.

Using similar headings and sections, each journal has been able to manifest its approach to the interpretation of this important topic. Thus, KOMMUNIST UKRAINY offered its pages to the first secretaries of central committees of communist parties of union republics. Issue No 1 carries the article by D. Rasulov "Tajikistan in the Fraternal Family of the Peoples of the USSR;" No 4 carries the article by M. Gapurov "Vivid Manifestation of the Triumph of Leninist National Policy," and No 6 carries Sh. Rashidov's article "Under the Banner of Internationalism." The articles by the first secretaries of republic party committees were accompanied by selected topics which provided the readers with varied information on the life of the labor collectives in fraternal republics.

For example, this is the way the information "bloc" on Tajikistan was carried by KOMMUNIST UKRAINY. In his article, D. Rasulov emphasized the fact that "the building of socialism in Tajikistan is the result of the joint efforts of all peoples in the land of the soviets." The author described the ties between the republic and the other republics, and the fact that along with the native population of Tajikistan, since the very first years of the Soviet system, Ukrainians, Russians and members of neighboring Central Asian republics have worked here. Detailed information was provided on economic, scientific and cultural relations between Tajikistan and the Ukraine, socialist competition and mutual aid among industrial enterprises and exchange of experience in agriculture.

In selected materials combined under the title of "In a Single Line in Labor and Combat," the article by D. Rasulov is followed by an essay on the South Tajik Territorial-Production Complex, which describes the "worker relay race," which was started at the Nurek GES. In her article "We Were Inspired by Aleksey Stakhanov's Example," the legendary Mamlakat Nakhangovala, the heroic pioneer of the 1930s and now docent at the Dushanbe Pedagogical Institute, described the labor heroism of that time, and Ukrainian journalist M. Prikhod'ko wrote on his fellow countrymen who build the Vakhsh Georgiy

Subbota and the three Shul'gach brothers and their fate. The Bobodzhanovs, Tajik journalists, described the frontline combat service of Hero of the Soviet Union Khoda Kendzhayev and his Ukrainian friends Mikhail Buryak and Nikolay Gurko.

The materials published in the section "The Soviet Union--A United Family" were written on a high scientific level, distinguished by their vivid and expressive style. Some of the sketches meet the high level of artistic publicism.

LENINYAN UGIOV, the journal of the Communist Party of Armenia Central Committee, dealt extensively with important theoretical and practical problems such as the sociopolitical and cultural development of Soviet society in the light of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, strengthening the USSR's economic and defense power, and increasing and upgrading the efficiency of ideological activity under contemporary conditions. In 1982 the journal systematically covered the work of the republic's party organizations on developing in the working people feelings of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, the life of multinational labor collectives and the socialist competition in honor of the 60th anniversary of the USSR.

The articles by L. Nersesyan, first secretary of the Yerevan city party committee (No 9), L. Saakyan, Armenian Council of Trade Unions chairman (No 6), A. Kirakosyan, first deputy chairman of the republic's council of ministers (No 5) and other senior party, trade union and soviet workers describe in detail the course of the anniversary socialist competition and the fraternal mutual aid among Soviet republics in resolving problems of communist construction and building most important national economic projects.

On the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR, LENINYAN UGIOV published a large number of articles in cooperation with similar party publications in the Ukraine, Turkmenia, Estonia and other union republics. The journal's various issues carry articles by K. Vayno, CP of Estonia Central Committee first secretary, A. Vosese, CP of Latvia Central Committee first secretary, P. Grishkyavichus, CP of Lithuania Central Committee first secretary, I. Lott, Estonian SSR minister of culture, M. Alimov, editor in chief of the journal KOMMUNIST TAJIKISTANA, Kh. Durdyyev, editor in chief of KOMMUNIST TURKMENISTANA, R. Andguladze, deputy head of the Georgian SSR Institute of Economics and Organization of Agriculture, and other senior officials and men of science and culture in fraternal republics. In turn, articles by leaders, workers, personalities and scientists and men of culture of the Armenian SSR were published in other republic party journals.

Generally speaking, we must say that articles by members of the fraternal union republics published in all the journals were an outstanding feature of the anniversary year. KOMMUNIST BELORUSSII was no exception. In 1982 it published articles by D. Lutsenko, deserving artist of the Ukraine, R. Nurullin, editor in chief of KOMMUNIST UZBEKISTANA, P. Grishkyavichus, CP of Lithuania Central Committee first secretary, V. Shchikno, chairman of a Lithuanian kolkhoz, and others.



The experience in covering the socialist competition between the Belorussian and Lithuanian SSRs by KOMMUNIST BELORUSSII and KOMMUNIST (Lithuania) is quite interesting. The competition between labor collectives in these neighboring republics has an old tradition. Belorussia and Lithuania signed competition contracts as early as 1973. In 1977, in honor of the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution, labor contracts were concluded among 650 enterprises, associations, sovkhozes and kolkhozes in Lithuania and Belorussia, and working people of 52 cities and rayons; the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR gave this competition a new impetus.

The published materials, which describe the experience in the competition among labor collectives, emphasize its significance in terms of the patriotic and internationalist upbringing of the working people, for internationalism under the conditions of our multinational country today means above all honest, conscientious and totally dedicated work by all peoples in the country for the common good. It means the ability to put national above departmental and local interests and to ensure the efficient work of the country's single national economic complex. It means the timely and qualitative implementation of all interrepublic deliveries, maximal utilization of domestic resources and active participation in the solution of problems which determine economic upsurge and popular well-being.

Characteristically, the party journals of Lithuania and Belorussia describe not only the experience acquired in reaching high production indicators by industrial enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The journals extensively cover the systematic exchange of experience in organizational-party and party-political and educational work on the republic, rayon and primary party organization levels. This is described in KOMMUNIST BELORUSSII in the article "enriching ourselves with the experience of our friends" (No 2, 1982) by I. Grablevskiy, head of sector at the Grodno Oblast party committee. Joint seminars for party organization secretaries were sponsored in the neighboring Grodnenskiy (BSSR) and Lazdiyskiy (Lithuania) Rayons; joint party worker training was organized between the Ostrovetskiy Rayon party committee, CP of Belorussia, and Shvenchenskiy Rayon party committee, CP of Lithuania, the Voronovskiy Rayon party committee, CP of Belorussia and Shalchininskiy Rayon party committee, CP of Lithuania. Cadre selection and placement, improving party training, socialist competition and educational work (including patriotic and international upbringing) are problems jointly discussed by middle- and primary-level personnel in Belorussia and Lithuania.

It would be useful to trace the way the competition between the two republics is reflected in Lithuania's KOMMUNIST. The journals' sections coincide and even some of the authors are the same. In addition to such articles, KOMMUNIST steadily publishes essays not only on the life of its own republic and its neighbor, but other republics, krays and oblasts in our homeland as well. For example, Issue No 2 carried the essay "Lithuania-BAM" by journalist S. Bukhayev. Issue No 6 carries the article "Model of National Peace" by M. Butayev, which describes Dagestan, its history, contemporary accomplishments and role of the Russian language in the cultural and economic development of this mountain area. KOMMUNIST has adopted an interesting method in describing fraternal republics by publishing reviews and reprinting articles

from other party journals. One of the journal's permanent sections is "Following the Party Journals."

Let us note that the various sections in KOMMUNIST generate great interest among the extensive readership. The materials in the various sections are small in terms of volume: as a rule, between 22 and 25 articles are published in 9.1 printer's sheets. The republic's working people value their journal which has now reached a publication of 73,100 copies. For comparison's sake let us mention that KOMMUNIST BELORUSSIA is issued in 31,100 copies, KOMMUNIST UZBEKISTANA in 16,700, KOMMUNIST MOLDAVII in 19,000, KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII in 21,600 and KOMMUNIST ESTONII in 18,100 copies.

All republic journals pay great attention to the organization of the socialist competition and its influence on patriotic and internationalist education. For example, such materials are regularly published in KOMMUNIST, the journal of the CP of Kirghizia Central Committee. As a result of extensive organizational and political-educational work of the party, soviet and public and economic organizations, a valuable patriotic and internationalist initiative entitled "All Deliveries to Fraternal Republics On Time and With Excellent Quality!" was started and is successfully developing in the republic. It was initiated by the progressive enterprises in Frunze, the republic's capital. This important movement, which was approved by the CP of Kirghizia Central Committee, was given extensive coverage in the journal.

The journal published a number of articles by senior party, soviet and economic officials, including "The Role of Socialist Competition in the International and Patriotic Upbringing of the Working People" by Dzh. Saadanbekov, Frunze city party committee secretary. The author described the tremendous organizational and educational role of socialist competition and one of its methods--competing under the slogan "All Deliveries to Fraternal Republics On Time and With Excellent Quality!" The readers can see that this movement combines the results of intensive search and organizational work on the part of party and trade union organizations, party gorkoms and raykoms and broad toiling masses, efforts aimed at relating and coordinating the targets and methods of socialist competition with the new economic management conditions developed in the light of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Improving Planning and Intensifying the Influence of the Economic Mechanism on Upgrading Production Efficiency and Work Quality." At the same time, this movement developed on the basis of the study and creative application of the practice of leading Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev and Lvov, Rostov and other oblast enterprises.

Problems of the socialist competition were steadily covered by KOMMUNIST AZERBAYDZHANA. The journal regularly published articles on the labor competition among Transcaucasian republics, between the Leninskiy and imeni 26 Bakinskikh Komissarov rayons in Baku and the Leninskiy and Gagarinskiy rayons in Moscow, the competition among cotton growers in Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Azerbaijan, the friendship between the working people of Masallinskiy Rayon in Azerbaijan and Novonikolayevskiy Rayon in Zaporozhye Oblast, the labor contribution of Azerbaijan to the construction of the BAM, and the cooperation among scientists in Azerbaijan, the RSFSR, the Ukraine,

Belorussia, Armenia and Georgia. Issue No 1 for 1982 opens with the CP of Azerbaijan Central Committee decree "On Measures for the Further Development of International Relations Between the Azerbaijani Working People and the Working People of the Fraternal Soviet Republics." It earmarks a number of measures of different forms and content aimed at strengthening and internationalist upbringing of the working people. On the basis of the same decree a medal imeni Nariman Narimanov was created, which will be presented annually for best sociopolitical publicistic works on the friendship and fraternity among the peoples of the USSR.

The journal efficiently discussed and explained the significance of this document in its editorial "Under the Banner of Internationalism." A series of journal publications on the implementation of this decree and the CP of Azerbaijan Central Committee decrees "On Measures to Provide Sponsorship Aid to Arkhangel Oblast in 1981-1985," "On the Exhibitions 'The Tyumen Exploit' in Baku and 'Azerbaijan's Large Steps' in Tyumen" were noted by their practicality and clear emphasis on the close ties between ideological-educational and organizational party work.

The section "Under the Banner of Socialist Internationalism" carried articles on party history topics and documents prepared by the party archives of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism Azerbaijan Branch Party Archives. They informed the readers of the main items of the treaties concluded between the RSFSR and Azerbaijan on the military and political alliance between the republics, their single economic policy and other proofs of the friendship and fraternity among peoples. All documents were accompanied by extensive comments.

During the anniversary year the topic of patriotic and internationalist education was among the most important in KOMMUNIST TURKMENISTANA as well. Party and state leaders and contributors to newspapers and journals in fraternal union republics published articles such as "Among Equals" by G. Kochemasov, RSFSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman, "Triumph of the Great Brotherhood" by G. Yenukidze, CP of Georgia Central Committee secretary, "Triumph of Fraternal Friendship" by A. Myalovitskiy, editor in chief of KOMMUNIST UKRAINY, "Under the Banner of Internationalism" by T. Abdushukurov, head of the propaganda and agitation department, CP of Uzbekistan Central Committee, and others. All of these materials are an instructive tale of the accomplishments of the peoples of our country over the 60 years from the founding of the USSR.

In 1982 two important events determined coverage of problems of patriotic and internationalist education in KOMMUNIST KAZAKHSTANA: the 250th anniversary of the voluntary joining of Russia by Kazakhstan and the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR.

In its January issue, the journal published the editorial "The Leninist Course," in which it presented the basic concepts governing Leninist national policy, emphasizing that such an economic, social and cultural upsurge of previously backward and semifeudal outskirts of Russia and such a strengthening of friendship among the peoples of our country could be achieved only under socialism.

The article is based on the collection of speeches, articles and reports entitled "The Leninist National Policy of the CPSU in Action" by D. Kunayev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CP of Kazakhstan Central Committee first secretary, which was published at the end of 1981. It describes the successes achieved by the Kazakh people in the development of its economy and culture and gives examples of the fraternal aid given by Kazakhstan to other republics (such as the construction and commissioning of the three huge territorial-production complexes--the Pavlodar-Ekibastuz, Karatau-Dzhambul and Mangyshlak). This editorial set the proper tone and determined the nature of the coverage of this international-patriotic topic during the anniversary year.

The journal carried six articles in its issues 1-4 in the section "On the Occasion of the 250th Anniversary of the Voluntary Unification of Kazakhstan With Russia." In Issue No 5, all 18 articles in that section include articles by Heroes of Socialist Labor miner S. Tokumtayev and metallurgical worker A. Kaliyev, B. Tulenbayev, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, A. Akhmetov, director of the Party History Institute, CP of Kazakhstan Central Committee, Twice Hero of the Soviet Union V. Shatalov, cosmonaut, party worker K. Sultanov, mechanizer N. Gellert, teacher V. Pigavayev and others. The main thought expressed in all the articles is that of the tremendous historical importance which the unification of Kazakhstan with Russia had in the fate of the Kazakh people.

The topic of patriotic and internationalist education was most extensively presented in the 12th issue of the republic theoretical and political journals in 1982. They shared the fact that the articles by leading party and state officials described the accomplishments of their specific republic on the anniversary of the USSR, its position in the single national economic complex of the country, and its contribution to the development of the single multinational socialist culture. Another noteworthy feature of the anniversary issues was the articles by members of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, describing the tremendous importance of internationalism and friendship among the peoples of the USSR in the lives of the authors, their labor collectives and their republics. For example KOMMUNIST ESTONII organized a round table meeting on "Socialist Internationalism in Our Life" and published the statements of all participants in the meeting.

In that specific issue many journals carried articles on Moscow, the capital of our multinational union state.

In its anniversary issue KOMMUNIST UKRAINY described the Russian Federation around which all Soviet republics rallied on a voluntary basis. The issue carries an article by M. Solomentsev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and RSFSR chairman of the Council of Ministers and a large selection of materials under the common heading "Russia's Open Heart."

A number of journals reported on the anniversary celebrations in their republics in connection with the 60th anniversary of the USSR.

The thought that the creation of the USSR is the living embodiment of Lenin's ideas and national policy principles runs throughout the materials on problems of the patriotic and internationalist upbringing published in the republic journals during the anniversary year. The peoples of the land of the soviets have been able to see through their own experience that their unification within a single union multiplies their forces and accelerates socioeconomic development.

As such articles clearly prove, the great fraternity among working people of all nationalities and a feeling of belonging to a single family developed in the joint struggle for building a new society in the USSR, and an unbreakable Leninist friendship among nations appeared as an inexhaustible source of creative inspiration for the Soviet people in labor and mass heroism in combat. During the difficult years of the Great Patriotic War the fraternal peoples took up the defense of their single homeland--the USSR--shoulder to shoulder, showing their inflexible will for victory, defeating the fascist aggressors and rescuing the peoples of the world from slavery and destruction. The postwar restoration of the economy was an unforgettable nationwide exploit.

The articles, selections of facts and figures and essays describe with legitimate patriotic pride the way the peoples of the former national outlying areas, doomed to backwardness, marching in the lines of the working people of all nationalities in the country, confidently progressed toward socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development and reaching high-level social progress. Indeed, never before in history has there been a state which was able to accomplish so much within such a short time for the comprehensive development of nations and nationalities as the USSR, the socialist fatherland of all our peoples. Each individual republic is characterized by modern industry and agriculture, a high level of science and true cultural blossoming. However, they have retained their unique appearance and national features. Let us point out that such characteristics are clearly seen in the materials published by the republic journals. All of them combined depict the vivid and beautiful image of our homeland--the amazing variety of its different regions, the unbreakable unity of its components and the great international entity--the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

We have a single economy on the scale of the entire USSR, a single national economic complex and nationwide socialist ownership of productive capital, including natural resources. Their development, deliveries and reciprocal procurements of industrial and agricultural commodities are based on a single national economic plan the implementation of which is a sacred duty and object of patriotic and international pride of each republic and nation within our multinational family.

The republic party journals also write that the party's course, as was noted at its 26th congress, calls for upgrading the material and spiritual potential of each republic and its maximal utilization for the sake of the harmonious development of the entire country. The nationwide nature of the social policy pursued by the CPSU and the Soviet state, as convincingly and eloquently described by the journals, is manifested in the solution of

problems which are vital to all republics, nations and nationalities in the country as upgrading the well-being, improving working and living conditions, developing housing construction, perfecting the systems of social insurance and medical and cultural services and ensuring environmental protection.

While extensively covering the achievements of fraternal union republics, the journals clearly prove that the socialist system alone and the strengthening and consistent development of socialist democracy in the field of national relations and in all realms of social life, codified in the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of union and autonomous republics, ensures the political foundations for the friendship and fraternity among the peoples of the Soviet Union and their free, dynamic and comprehensive progress.

The theoretical articles and other anniversary materials published in the republic party journals invariably emphasize that our revolutionary Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the outlook of the working class, which is the decisive force, social mind and social heart of the continuing rapprochement among all classes and social groups in Soviet society and which leads to the establishment of its classless structure in its essential features within the historical framework of mature socialism, are the foundations for the ideological unity among all nations and nationalities in our country.

Soviet culture, socialist in content, varied in national forms and internationalist in spirit and nature, has become a great force in the ideological and moral unification of Soviet nations and nationalities. It is growing and strengthening on the fertile grounds of developed socialism, serving all working people and expressing their common ideals. It encompasses everything of universal significance in achievements and original traditions of national cultures.

Justifiably, the republic journals note the outstanding role of the Russian people and the RSFSR in the creation of the USSR. As the first multinational Soviet state, the Russian Federation was the prototype of the USSR. Despite difficulties and privations, the Russian people gave selfless aid to the other peoples in the country in defending their revolutionary gains and made an invaluable contribution to surmounting the backwardness of the former national outlying areas.

The republic party journals pay great attention to problems related to the study and teaching of Russian, voluntarily accepted by the Soviet people as the language for international communication. For example, in a number of editorials and editorial articles on problems of education, *KOMMUNIST*, the journal of the CP of Kirghizia Central Committee, describes the role of the Russian language in the international unification of the Soviet people. "In Kirghizia, which is inhabited by more than 80 different nationalities, Russian is the most important means of communication among them, a means which greatly accelerates the consolidation of uniform international values in the minds and feelings of the people," the journal wrote. In the article "The Beneficial Influence of the Russian Language" (No 9, 1982), Prof K. Sartbayev convincingly proves that the Russian language is a powerful factor in strengthening the sociopolitical and ideological unity of the Soviet

people, the development and reciprocal enrichment of national cultures and a means for exposing all nations in our country to the riches of world civilization.

In conclusion, let us express a few wishes. Problems related to the patriotic upbringing of Soviet youth and their readiness to defend the homeland and increase the gains of developed socialism must be covered far more extensively in topics related to patriotic and international upbringing, in which the party journals have achieved some successes. A positive example in this respect is the Lithuanian KOMMUNIST, which has a section on "The Young Communist" in each one of its issues. Materials on such topics are also regularly published in the "Education and Upbringing" section. Unfortunately, the other republic journals rarely publish materials on youth topics, directly dealing with the various detachments of Soviet youth.

Unquestionably, the republic party journals should pay far greater attention to problems related to the further growth of the national detachments of the republics' working class, particularly the fuller representation of native nationalities in the working class. The 26th CPSU Congress set the tremendously important task of improving the training of skilled workers among members of all nations and nationalities in the individual republics. This is understandable, for multinational labor and above all worker collectives are precisely the environment in which the internationalist spirit is developed best of all and the fraternity and friendship among the peoples of the USSR are strengthened.

It is proper for the economic and cultural progress of nations and nationalities to be paralleled today by increased national self-awareness and national pride. In this connection, however, it is also necessary to see existing shortcomings so that they can be promptly eliminated. Some of them are caused by vestiges of the past in the minds and behavior of individuals. However, it would be erroneous to reduce everything merely to vestiges. Their manifestation is frequently the result of our own blunders.

In describing ever more extensively the decisive role of the Leninist party in the creation of the USSR, strengthening and blossoming our fraternal union and mobilizing the working people of all nations and nationalities in the country for building socialism and communism, the republic journals prove that all of our outstanding successes and accomplishments are inseparably related to the revolutionary-transforming activities of the Soviet Communist Party. Profoundly international in ideology, organizational structure and principles of work, and multinational in composition, our Leninist party is the living embodiment of the unity and cohesion among all nations in the Soviet Union. Through its tireless defense of the basic interests of the working class and broadest popular masses, and constant attention to the national interests and feelings of the multilingual population in the country and intolerance of all manifestations of nationalism, our party has earned the right to be the true leader of the working people.

"When we say that 'people and party are as one!' we point out the immutable fact that the objectives and tasks which the party has set itself precisely

express the expectations and needs of all Soviet people," said Comrade Yu. V. Andropov in his report "60 Years of USSR." "Our multimillion-strong people are implementing through their actions the party's policy. One of the clearest confirmations of this fact is found in the successes with which all republics are welcoming the present anniversary."

Lenin's party has no interests other than those of serving the people. The duty of the party journalists is to help comprehensively through their individual and collective work and creative efforts the party and the people to perfect the developed socialist society and build communism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9



DONBASS WORKERS: HISTORY AND CONTEMPORANEITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 120-123

[Review by Prof V. Poletayev, doctor of historical sciences, and Academician A. Samsonov of the book "Istoriya Rabochikh Donbassa" [History of the Donbass Workers]. Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1981. Vol 1. "The Donbass Workers in the Epoch of Capitalism and the Transitional Period From Capitalism to Socialism," 326 pages; Vol 2. "The Donbass Workers in the Period of Completion of the Building of Socialism and the Gradual Transition to Communism," 431 pages]

[Text] The proletariat -- the most revolutionary and progressive class, politically mature, united and organized in the struggle for its liberation and that of society from exploitation and for social progress -- is the main motive force in the historical transition from capitalism to socialism. The profound study of its history, from its birth and development in the individual most important parts of our country is of major practical and scientific importance, for which reason the publication of this basic work on the history of the Donbass working class is unquestionably noteworthy.

The work under review sums up dozens of already published monographs and hundreds of scientific articles, a substantial portion of which written by the authors of this two-volume work. However, it also includes many previously unpublished documents drawn from central and local party and state archives. The authors systematically cover the main problems of the history of the Donetsk workers for a period of 3 centuries, from the middle of the 17th century, when the settling of the huge undeveloped territory in the southern outskirts of the Russian Empire was undertaken, to the present.

In their analysis of the shaping of manpower during the period of serfdom the authors avoid using the term "working class." They speak of "permanent workers" in the salt mines, with which the development of the natural resources of the region began, and of state and estate peasants, who extracted with primitive tools the "burning stones" needed in salt making and forging. Numerous facts are cited proving the exceptionally difficult life of the "working people," whether free men or serfs. We read with interest descriptions of the struggle waged by the "working people" against social oppression, their participation in the antifeudal peasant wars led by Stepan Razin, Kondratiy Bulavin and Yemel'yan Pugachev, and their first actions against capitalists and governmental entrepreneurial activities.

Extensive historical data are used to trace the birth of the new social force during the postreform period -- the many-thousands-strong Donbass proletariat. The authors describe the specifics of its rapid development through the mass proletarianization of the peasantry and the petty commodity producers. The area which only a short while back was referred to as a "wild field" was linked to the main centers of the country by rail, and grew alongside and outstripped many of them in its development. The readers will find data on the nature and scale of development of ore mining, the mining industry and transportation.

The legitimacy of the appearance of an industrial proletariat, the size and concentration of its individual detachments, its working and living conditions, wages and the new social features of the seasonal workers, who sought employment in the Donbass mines and plants, are questions raised and answered in the collective monograph quite fully and in depth. Unfortunately, the labor movement in the Donbass during the post-reform decades (1860s-1890s) is described all too briefly and fragmentarily, as a result of which some important actions undertaken by the workers against capitalist exploitation and the authorities are described schematically.

The history of the Donbass workers in the period of imperialism has still not been properly covered in scientific publications. An important feature of this two-volume work, therefore, is the authors' ability to present in a new light data on the participation of the Donetsk proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolutions. Particularly impressive in this light is V. I. Lenin's familiar statement that the Rostov 1902 strike was the first in which the proletariat pitted itself as a class against all other classes and the czarist government (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 9, p 251). Very interesting data are provided on the culture and way of life of the workers in prerevolutionary Donbass. The authors have focused on their cultural and educational level, living conditions and family and social life. The sections describing the birth of a proletarian folklore are quite informative.

The work considers in detail the participation of Donbass workers in the first Russian revolution. The topic has been covered in a number of monographs and definitive works based on materials of the UkSSR and the rest of the country. However, such studies have not considered the Donbass as a single territorial-social-economic entity. The work under review offers a general picture of the revolutionary struggle in the area. The participation of the Donbass workers in the Great October Socialist Revolution and the civil war has been covered repeatedly and in its various aspects in historical publications. However, here again the authors have gone further. They have provided a more profound description of the role which the Donbass played in the struggle for the organization of soviets and depict quite extensively the heroism of its workers during the period of military intervention and civil war. Extensive historical data prove the combat and labor contribution of the area's workers to the defeat of the counterrevolution and their self-sacrifice in the struggle against dislocation and hunger. Tortured by the war and exhausted by hunger, the Donetsk proletariat found the strength to prove its leading role in the restoration and development of the production process.

The first years of peaceful socialist construction were characterized by the efforts to drain the flooded mines and repair the destroyed railroads and

idling metallurgical plants. This was a labor feat on the part of our entire people, comprehensively covered in the work. In particular, one of the vivid displays of the patriotism of the working class was the shock groups set up at many Donbass industrial and transportation enterprises. The labor heroism displayed by the shock workers -- mining, metallurgical and chemical -- clearly proves their conscientious attitude toward the common weal. The work sums up the extensive historical data on the mobilizing role of the communist party which called for "All for the Donbass!" The role which Lenin personally played in the economic restoration of the area is convincingly described.

The chapters on the socialist industrialization of the Donbass reveal the truly enormous significance of this industrial area in the country's economy at that time. Scrupulously, using considerable statistical and other data, the authors trace the changes in the social aspect of the workers and their participation in production management, socialist competition and economic planning. The innovators who lent their names to mass patriotic movements -- N. A. Izotov, A. G. Stakhanov and P. V. Krivonos -- were Donetsk workers.

The authors have been able to deepen and expand the existing view on the contribution of the workers and all working people in the Donbass to the defeat of the German-fascist aggressors. They cite numerous cases of the heroism of the Donetsk workers who fought the hated enemy in the ranks of the Red Army and the people's militia and in clandestine organizations behind enemy lines. The Donbass workers evacuated to the eastern regions of the Soviet Union with their enterprises displayed equal labor heroism.

To this day historical publications have not properly described the great exploit of the Donetsk workers who, after the liberation of the Donbass and with the fraternal support and aid of the entire country, were able to rebuild a considerable part of its production forces in a very short time and under difficult wartime conditions. The present work fills this gap to a certain extent. It shows that toward the end of the Great Patriotic War, the Donbass mines, flooded only a short while back, were yielding more coal than any other coal basin in the country.

Great attention has been paid to the heroic accomplishments of the working people in the Donetsk area in the postwar period. By the end of the 4th Five-Year Plan the prewar industrial production level had been surpassed by one quarter. All mines, metallurgical plants and railroads were operational; cities and worker settlements, kolkhozes, sovkhoses and machine-tractor stations had been rebuilt and new capital construction was under way. The work under review provides extensive data on the labor accomplishments of the Donetsk workers in the 1950s.

Unlike the first parts of the work, the topics of which have been already covered to one extent or another in monographs and scientific articles, the final part of the work "The Donbass Workers Under Developed Socialist Conditions (1960s-1970s) is original. It studies the dynamics of the social structure of the working class over the past 20 years, the struggle for higher production efficiency, growth of sociopolitical activeness, strengthening of international relations and enhancement of material well-being. It also describes the spiritual life of the workers.

As emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress, under present conditions "Strengthening the leading role of the working class is unquestionably related to the growth of its ideological and political maturity, education and professional skills." This concept is convincingly illustrated in the monograph in the description of the efforts made by the Donbass workers to ensure the technical retooling of industry, improve technology and create and apply means for comprehensive mechanization and automation and install new machines and mechanisms. Abundant factual data are cited on the participation of machine-building workers in improving installed equipment and modernizing and redesigning labor tools. The authors provide a profound comprehensive study of the various forms of participation of leading workers in improving metal production technology and chemical output. They assign an important role to the participation of the workers in the activities of comprehensive innovator brigades, commissions for promotion of technical progress, innovators' councils, economic analysis bureaus, public design bureaus, organizations of the All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalizers, and scientific and technical societies. The authors show the trend toward increasing the contribution of Donbass workers to increasing the growth rate of the country's fuel and energy complex and the development of machine and instrument making, metallurgy and the chemical industry -- the basic heavy industry sectors which ensure the technical retooling of the entire national economy.

The authors describe the way in which, as the general educational and cultural-technical standards of the workers raise they begin to play an increasing role in resolving many national economic problems, particularly those related to accelerating the pace of technical progress.

The data confirm the considerable contribution made by the Donetsk workers to laying the material and technical foundations for communism and the social progress of Soviet society. The leading role of the party organizations in developing socialist competition, technical retooling of the production process and upgrading its efficiency is extensively described. The authors sum up the new forms of trade union work under developed socialist conditions and sponsorship relations between industrial labor collectives and agriculture. They describe the international nature of the labor activeness of the workers, the development of interrepublic socialist competition and its influence on strengthening the fraternal friendship among the peoples of our country. Also described in the monograph are the international ties between Donbass workers and the working people in the other socialist and developing and capitalist countries and their contribution to the struggle waged by the Soviet people for strengthening international security, detente and peace.

The work studies the main directions leading to improving the material well-being of the working class -- growth of real income, improved housing and living conditions and development of health care, physical culture and sports. It reflects the tremendous accomplishments in upgrading the general and cultural and technical standards of the workers and the development of artistic creativity and amateur art. The continuity of the great traditions of the working class in our country is extensively revealed through examples showing the firm ties existing between shock work and the Stakhanovite movement and between the latter and the movement for a communist attitude toward labor. This is particularly worth noting, for it is precisely thus that the best

results in raising the Soviet youth in the traditions of the working class are achieved -- a better understanding of the tasks of the present and the prospects of our future social development.

Naturally, such a broad study makes it difficult to cover with equal thoroughness all aspects of the life and activities of the working class in the Donbass throughout its historical development. Nevertheless the authors should have considered in greater detail the question of the transition from the stage of building mature socialism to its maturity.

The overall high scientific standard of this new work is an unquestionable success in Ukrainian scientific history in the field of the history of the working class in the USSR.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda." "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9

BOOK ON ANCIENT RUS'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 123-126

[Review by A. Gorskiy, doctor of historical sciences, and Z. Udal'tsova, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, of the book "Kievskaya Rus' i Russkiye Knyazhestva XII-XIII Vv." [Kiev Rus' and the Russian Principalities in the 12th and 13th Centuries]. Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 592 pp]

[Text] The publication of this work is a noteworthy event in Soviet historical science. It sums up the results of long years of work by the author on the most ancient period of the history of our homeland, making creative use of the accomplishments of historians, archeologists, ethnographers, philologists and art experts, who have studied our country's remote past.

In formulating a new concept on the origins, establishment and development of Kiev Rus', B. A. Rybakov convincingly proves the need to study the long period of maturing of Russian statehood. Through the history of Kiev Rus' he has contributed to our knowledge of a huge period in the history of the ancient Slavs. Unlike his predecessors, who concentrated primarily on the history of Rus', the author considers its pre-history as well, with the help of most abundant archeological data. He has been able convincingly to prove that the establishment of Kiev Rus' was the result of exceptionally complex and lengthy processes which occurred in Slavic lands as of 2000 B.C.

The range of problems covered in the work is exceptionally broad. It involves the origin of the Slavs, the time and means of colonization, the establishment of Slavic tribal alliances, Slav-Scythian relations, the influence of Sarmat, Hun, Hazar and other invasions on the development of Slavic society and the development of the religious concepts of the eastern Slavs. However, he has concentrated on the prerequisites for the appearance of an early feudal Slavic state, the process of organization of the Rus' state with Kiev as its center, the socioeconomic, political and cultural development of this the largest state in Europe and the direct antecedent of Kiev Rus' and the Russian principalities. The territorial span of the study is equally broad, covering all of Eastern Europe and adjacent Western and Central European territories and Near Asian areas, with the populations of which ancient Rus' maintained trade, political and cultural relations.

The second chapter deals with the main sources on the history of the eastern Slavs and ancient Rus' -- chronicles, tales and works of early Oriental

Medieval authors. B. A. Rybakov notes the achievements of his predecessors in the study of most ancient Russian chronicles, analyses their origin, structure and chronology and multiple meanings, the "Tale of the Times" in particular, and looks critically at many chronicled reports (see pp 110-142).

The author discusses in detail the Russian epic sagas, which are outstanding monuments to folk creativity, and to the characterization and evaluation of the main lines followed in the study of such works of epic. He substantively identifies the historical bases of many heroic poems (see pp 142-172).

The new interpretation given to testimony regarding the Slavs and their neighbors and Kiev Rus' in the works of Oriental authors of that period is of unquestionable interest. The scientist's conclusions, largely based on a scrupulous historical and geographic study and mapping of Oriental sources (mainly the anonymous work "Hudud al-Alem" -- "Areas of the World From East to West") are not only interesting for their novelty but are of exceptional importance, for they substantially change traditional concepts prevailing in Orientalist publications related to the "geographic horizon" of Oriental 9th-12th century authors who wrote about the Rus' and the Slavs. Thus, Rybakov writes that "Until the middle of the 10th century the Caliphate scientists had a very vague idea of the northern area of the Old World" (pp 175-176), for which reason much (if not all) of their information on the Rus' or the Slavs does not apply to the northern parts of Eastern Europe, for they considered these lands "uninhabited deserts of the north" (pp 197-198). Unquestionably, such conclusions will be of interest to the orientalists and contribute to the further deeper study of an important variety of historical sources.

Many of the questions posed and thoroughly discussed are original. Thus, in our view, it is entirely proper to begin the study of the Slavs not with the first centuries AD, as is the custom in existing publications, but with the period of the "separation of the family of Slavic languages from the general Into-European group" (beginning or middle of the second millenium BC).

The development of the Slavs is described in the book as a complex process with periods of upsurge and decline, based on both internal and external circumstances (such as reviving of relations with ancient countries, on the one hand, and the Sarmat and Hun invasions, on the other). The author expresses the exceptionally interesting idea that the ancient Slavic tribes approached the stages of the appearance of statehood repeatedly in the course of their social development (at least twice).

A firmly imbedded scientific concept is that on the eve of the formation of the early-feudal Old Rus' state, the eastern Slavs were organized no longer in tribes but in tribal unions. The author describes quite specifically (naturally to the extent to which existing sources permit) the process of maturing of class relations among the Slavs on the basis of his study of one of the eastern Slav tribal union -- the Vyatichy. His study covers the geographic location of the tribal union, its economy, settlements and housing, clothing, weapons, family life, customs, social system and foreign trade. The novel aspect of such a comprehensive description of the life of an easter Slav tribal union in the course of the transition to a class-oriented society is unquestionable.

The class process was based on the advancement of the production forces of the Slavs, primarily agriculture and various crafts.

The author traces the growth of property inequity, the gradual rise of tribal and union nobility and the prince's unit, the members of which, initially engaged in performing the necessary social administrative and judicial functions (based on common law) and meeting the military needs of the individual tribes, gradually became the exploiting population stratum and its ruling class. All of this took place on the basis of the slow but steady development of feudal land ownership, the primary form of economic implementation of which or, in other words, the primary form of exploitation among the eastern Slavs, is justifiably considered by the author as tribute. The author interprets this tribute as a feature of the "leap from primitivism to feudalism," or the transition in eastern Slavic society to a new qualitative stage. The tribute was "A cumbersome institution of direct noneconomic coercion, a semi-war and semi-subjugation of the subordinated population in which relations of domination and subordination clearly stood out, as well as the initial stage of the conversion of the land into feudal ownership" (p 258). One of the most interesting parts of the book in terms of both method used in the study of sources and the daring nature of conclusions deals with the study of the sources of tribute and the assessment of this characteristic early-feudal means of exploitation of the toiling eastern Slavic (and other) toiling strata.

The description of the marketing of the products collected in the course of these tribute rounds, some of which were used directly by the prince and his unit, but a considerable share of which was marketed abroad, to Byzantium and the oriental countries, is the direct continuation of the discussion of the tribute. The special and important role which foreign trade played at the initial period of the early feudal state was based, as the author points out, on the as yet underdeveloped craft trade among the eastern Slavs.

This makes it obvious that the foreign policy of the first Russian princes, who tried to maintain normal relations with the steppe, saturated with militant nomads, the Byzantine Empire and the adjacent oriental countries, as well as being concerned with protecting their southern borders, was also dictated by their interest in ensuring the necessary prerequisites for the unhindered marketing of goods and trade with Rus' southern neighbors. Objectively, the same objective was pursued in their campaigns against Byzantium, the treaties initiated with it by Princes Oleg and Igor, Princess Olga's diplomacy, and the seemingly arbitrary and inconsistent sallies of the aggressive Svyatoslav in various directions, such as the northeast (against Volgan Bulgaria), the southeast (the Hazar Khannate), the southwest (Danube Bulgaria and Byzantium) and the south (the Pechenegs), and the strengthening of the southern borders of the Rus' under Vladimir Svyatoslavich.

The author discusses in detail the origin of Rus' and the Rus' people, an object of long debates among historians on the origins of the ancient Russian state, which sometimes become far from academic. The so-called "Norman Theory" (its supporters claim that the state set up by the eastern Slavs was not the natural result of internal independent socioeconomic development but the creation of Scandinavian princes -- "Norman" or "Varangian" settlers) has been frequently used as a means for misrepresenting our country's history.



As a result of a thorough study of complex and occasionally conflicting evidence drawn from various sources, B. A. Rybakov convincingly proves that "A powerful alliance among Slavic tribes developed in the 6th-7th centuries in the Middle Dnepr area. It was known to the foreigners as 'Ros' or 'Rus.' ...By the middle of the 10th century the name 'Rus'' began to apply to all east Slavic lands which paid tribute to Rus' and the mercenary Varangian detachments which participated in Rus' affairs. The unification of all eastern Slavic lands under the name of Rus' lasted until the end of the 14th century..." (p 90).

Necessarily, the study of the great variety of difference sources leads to the entirely accurate claim that the southern part of the Eastern European plain (the future Kiev, Chernigov and Galicia-Volyn areas) was the area of the initial class formation and appearance of the first state of the eastern Slavs. All of this, added to the studies by other Soviet scientists, proves the groundlessness of the notorious "Norman Theory." The status and significance of this "theory" is precisely characterized by the author: "Throughout its further progress over a 200-year period, Normanism simply developed as an anti-Russian and, subsequently, anti-Soviet political doctrine, whose propagandists carefully avoided any contact with science and critical analysis" (p 296).

The chapters directly dealing with the history of Kiev Rus' comprehensively discuss the socioeconomic and political development of this largest European early-feudal state, the strengthening of feudal relations, its administrative system, the domestic and foreign policy of the Kiev princes, the activities of the Orthodox Church, the situation of the people's masses, social conflicts and the intraclass and class struggles. All of these topics of the history of ancient Rus' are presented in an exceptionally lively style, with a deep understanding of the essence of the phenomena and processes and the spirit, and feel of the age.

A thorough study of the tremendous volume of various sources of information on the history of Kiev Rus' justifiably allows the writer to say that "The historical role of Kiev Rus' in Europe was, first of all, the fact that the establishment of this eastern Slav state doubled the area of European feudalism; secondly, that a powerful farming shelter appeared in the eastern part of Europe, which blocked the advance of the nomad hordes from east to west. Kiev Rus', a united state which appeared in the 9th century, existed until 1130..and laid the foundations for the development of dozens of independent principalities as important as the largest kingdoms in the West" (p 5).

The final chapter deals with the history of the largest among these Russian principalities and lands during the 12th and beginning of the 13th centuries. The author considers the geographic location, natural conditions and socio-political and cultural development of the Kiev, Chernigov, Northern, Polotsk Smolensk and Vladimiro-Suzdal Principalities, the Galicia-Volyn lands and the Novgorod Feudal Republic and their interrelationships. He describes both the main historical processes and the characteristic of the development of the individual principalities and describes historical personalities such as princes, chroniclers, artists, etc. He traces the new features in the socio-political development of Russian lands in the 12th and beginning of the 13th centuries, such as the evolution of the power of the princes, the then relatively progressive role of the local nobility, relations between princes

and the nobility, the role of the cities as economic, political and cultural centers of the feudal principalities and the new phenomena in culture. He substantiates conclusions on the progressive nature of that new stage in the development of feudal relations in ancient Rus'. The feudal splintering was not representative of a decline but the natural result of the development and growth of the early feudal state. Kiev Rus' was "the grain out of which grew the stalk of several new grains-principalities," or "the mother who raised many sons who formed the new generation." The material in this chapter proves that from the sociopolitical and cultural viewpoints the Russian principalities in the 12th and beginning of the 13th centuries had reached the same level of development of their contemporary European countries and that, like Kiev Rus', their predecessor and parent, they constituted an indivisible part of Europe, the feudal civilization of which they were to protect against the destructive Batu invasion in the middle of the 13th century. B. A. Rybakov's study proves yet once again that the Russian principalities of the 12th and beginning of the 13th centuries were ready to carry out this truly historical mission, which they did at the cost of tremendous casualties and severe trials.

Rybakov's fundamental work strikes a blow at the foreign falsifiers of the history of ancient Rus' who do everything possible to belittle the role of the ancient Russian state in the universal historical process, reducing it to the status of a backward second-rate state, allegedly isolated from general European progress.

The book under review proves that for centuries, until the Tatar-Mongol conquest, ancient Rus' was an area where various Medieval civilizations met and interacted. Trade, political and dynastic ties linked it with Western and Central Europe, on the one hand, and Byzantium and the Asian East, on the other. Such economic and political contacts were a firm foundation for the development of comprehensive cultural relations between ancient Rus' and Western and Eastern countries.

Until the beginning of the 13th century the culture of ancient Rus' developed not isolated from the other civilizations, as some Western scientists claim, but in constant contacts with them. It used the most valuable and useful features of their rich historical experience. However, even during the period of most extensive contacts between ancient Rus' and other countries and nations, all cultural impetus it received from them (from Byzantium, Bulgaria, Central and Western Europe and the Orient) were invariably profoundly reworked on the basis of the firm and varied local Slavic traditions and organically blended with the high original culture of the ancient Russia state.

At the same time, the culture of ancient Rus', which had reached such a high standard, was an important component in the establishment of the cultural unity of the Medieval world, while fully preserving its typological characteristics.

In addition to the general problems noted, the work contains a number of fresh and interesting observations and refinements related to individual problems of the history of ancient Rus', some of them hypothetical and controversial. The latter will inevitably draw the attention of specialists and, possibly, trigger a discussion which will prove useful in the further study of the history of the ancient Russian state.

Although dealing with the distant past and describing events and personalities of long-forgotten times, the work encourages not a speculative but a specific respect for the work and struggle of our distant predecessors, the activities of outstanding historical personalities and those who were able to understand the progressive trends of social development and to make their contribution to the treasury of material and spiritual culture. The book promotes respect for the military exploits of the Russian and other nations in our fatherland, who were able to defend and preserve a culture which has made a substantial contribution to the cultural development of all mankind in an age of gravest political cataclysms of a then universal scale -- the conquests of Ghengis Khan and Batu and other pretenders to world domination.

Unquestionably, the book will be of interest not only to specialist historians but to anyone interested in the history of our homeland.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda." "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9

## SHORT BOOK REVIEW

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 126-127

[Text] F. F. Petrenko and V. V. Popov. "Leninskiye Printsipy Rukovodstva Sovetskoy Vneshney Politikoy" [The Leninist Principles of Soviet Foreign Policy Management]. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1981, 304 pp. Reviewed by G. Rozanov, doctor of historical sciences.

The objectives and principles governing Soviet foreign policy trigger increasing interest on the part of the Soviet and foreign public in the current complex international situation, when a most acute ideological struggle is taking place on the vital problems of war and peace.

The book under review can largely satisfy such an interest, for it deals with the fundamental theoretical and political concepts governing the international course pursued by the CPSU and the Soviet state. The book is divided into two parts. In the first, the authors describe the basic contribution which Marx, Engels and Lenin, the creators of scientific communism, made to the elaboration of the theory of international relations. The second describes the system of principles governing the party's guidance of socialist foreign policy.

The work broadly depicts the wealth of the Marxist-Leninist legacy related to problems of international relations, refuting the fabrications of bourgeois "politologists," who claim that Marx, Engels and Lenin left no integral theory in this field. The authors' summations, based on a thorough study of the works of Marxism-Leninism's founders, the study of their approach to international events and their assessments of the foreign policies of the largest countries on earth show the universal-historical significance of the scientific conclusions reached by the creators of the communist doctrine on basic problems of international life. Their substantiation of the class nature of foreign policy and its unbreakable ties with domestic policy, the exposure of the contradictions dividing the international class interests and objectives of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, their study of the social nature of wars, the elaboration of the principle of proletarian internationalism and the Leninist conclusion on the possibility of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems are particularly valuable.

The scientific bases of the foreign policy of the communist party and the Soviet state are analysed in close connection with the practical efforts along the main directions of the struggle for peace and social progress. The

historical-problem interpretation of the course charted at the 24th-26th CPSU Congresses and the party's comprehensive activities in the international arena clearly show the manner in which the party and the Soviet state have undeviatingly followed the fundamental Marxist-Leninist principles of socialist foreign policy, creatively applying and developing them under specific historical circumstances. The authors prove equally convincingly the way in which one of the main conclusions of the Marxist-Leninist theory on the unbreakable unity between socialism and peace is gaining increasing recognition today thanks to the active foreign policy practiced by the CPSU and the Soviet state, which are systematically implementing the peace program.

They also thoroughly study the impact which the example set by the USSR and the other socialist countries has on world processes and their achievements on the path to socioeconomic progress, a factor which Lenin considered primary. They note that "the growth of the international division of labor, economic integration and specialization, foreign policy coordination and the development and strengthening of comprehensive fraternal relations among the members of the socialist comity create qualitatively new conditions for domestic and foreign policy interaction" (pp 194-195).

The readers' attention will be unquestionably drawn to the study of the principles governing the party's guidance of socialist foreign policy. The authors' study of the main features of the class and scientific approach to international relations and the meaning of the Leninist principle of party-mindedness in this area of social life is a specific contribution to the elaboration of such important problems.

The authors substantively emphasize that today's international situation is distinguished by its exceptional difficulty, high-level dynamism, sharp confrontation and frequent shifts in ways and methods of struggle. The rapidly changing situation in various parts of the world steadily raises a number of problems in which not only specialists in international affairs but the public at large must be accurately oriented. Marxist-Leninist doctrine provides the only proper key to the profound and accurate understanding of the various and complex international events.

The authors convincingly prove the groundlessness of efforts to promote a nonclass or aboveclass approach to international politics. They expose the bourgeois concepts which justify openly or underhandedly the aggressive foreign policy course charted by the imperialist states, the U. S. above all, concealed behind "love of peace."

The study of the Marxist-Leninist principles governing Soviet foreign policy and their interpretation, closely related to contemporary world events, contained in the book convincingly prove that they are a reliable scientific foundation of the socialist foreign policy course and an exceptionally important factor of the strength and effectiveness of Soviet international activities.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/9

## BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 3, Feb 83 pp 127-128

[Text] 1. Aliyev, G. A. "Sovetskiy Azerbaydzhan" [Soviet Azerbaijan]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 176 pp (Within the united fraternal family).

2. Kiselev, T. Ya. "Sovetskaya Belorussiya" [Soviet Belorussia] Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 128 pp (Within the united fraternal family).

3. Ponomarev, B. N. "Real'nyy Sotsializm i Yego Mezhdunarodnoye Znacheneye" [Real Socialism and Its International Significance]. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 95 pp.

4. Shevardnadze, E. A. "Sovetskaya Gruzziya" [Soviet Georgia]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 120 pp (Within the united fraternal family).

5. "Aktual'nyye Problemy Sovremennogo Politicheskogo Razvitiya (Ocherki Teorii)" [Topical Problems of Contemporary Political Development (Theoretical essays)]. G. Kh. Shakhnazarov and Yu. A. Tikhomirov, responsible editors. Yuridicheskaya Literatura, Moscow, 1982, 222 pp.

6. Belyayev, A. A. "Ideologicheskaya Bor'ba i Literatura. Kriticheskiy Analiz Amerikanskoy Sovetologii" [Ideological Struggle and Literature. Critical Study of American Sovietology]. Third expanded edition. Sovetskiy Pisatel', Moscow, 1982, 462 pp.

7. "Vzaimosvyaz' i Vzaimovliyaniye Vnutrenney i Vneshney Politiki" [Interconnection and Interaction Between Domestic and Foreign Policy]. 1980 Yearbook. Editorial collegium headed by D. A. Kerimov. Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 198 pp.

8. Volodarskiy, L. M. "Na Blago Sovetskogo Cheloveka" [For the Good of the Soviet Person]. Mysl', Moscow, 1982, 188 pp (26th CPSU Congress: Problems of theory and practice).

9. "Yezhegodnik Bol'shoy Sovetskoy Entsiklopedii, 1982. Vypusk 26" [Yearbook of the Large Soviet Encyclopaedia. Issue No 26]. Editorial collegium. V. G. Panov, editor in chief. Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, Moscow, 1982, 599 pp.

10. Zimin, S. S. "Rossiya na Rubezhe XV-XVI Stoletiy" [Russia by the Turn of the 16th Century] (Sociopolitical history essays). Mysl', Moscow, 1982, 333 pp.
11. Iovchuk, M. T. "Leninizm, Filosofskiye Traditsii i Sovremennost'" [Leninism, Philosophical Traditions and Contemporaneity] Second expanded edition. Mysl', Moscow, 1982, 277 pp.
12. "Istoriya Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny. 1939-1945" [History of World War II, 1939-1945]. In 12 volumes. Chief editorial commission, D. F. Ustinov, chairman. Vol 12. "Itogi i Uroki Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny" [Results and Lessons of World War II]. Voenizdat, Moscow, 1982, 495 pp.
13. "Mezhdunarodnoye Rabocheye Dvizheniye" [The International Workers' Movement] Reference. V. V. Zagladin and B. I. Koval', responsible editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 383 pp.
14. "My Druzhboy Leninskoy Sil'ny" [We Are Strong With Lenin's Friendship] Based on the materials of the Riga All-Union Practical Science Conference (28-30 June 1982). Edited by I. A. Zubkov. Izvestiya, Moscow, 1982, 160 pp (Experience and topical problems of ideological work).
15. Nabiyeu, R. N. "Sovetskiy Tadzhikistan" [Soviet Tajikistan] Politizdat, Moscow, 1982 (Within the united fraternal family).
16. "Narodnoye Khozyaystvo SSSR. 1922-1982" [The USSR National Economy, 1922-1982]. Anniversary statistical yearbook. L. A. Umanskiy, in charge of publication. Finansy i Statistika, Moscow, 1982, 623 pp (On the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR).
17. "Partiynnyy Komitet -- Organizator Patrioticheskogo i Internatsional'nogo Vospitaniya Trudyashchikhsya" [The Party Committee -- Organizer of the Patriotic and International Education of the Working People]. Based on the materials of the All-Union Practical Science Conference on "Development of National Relations Under the Conditions of Mature Socialism. Experience and Problems of Patriotic and International Education." (Riga, 28-30 June 1982). Ye. M. Tyazhel'nikov, general editor. Compiled by V. P. Polyanichko and A. G. Kolmakov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 221 pp (Experience and topical problems of ideological work).
18. "Razvitiye Aktivnosti Trudovogo Kollektiva" [Development of the Activeness of the Labor Collective] From the experience of the party organizations in industrial enterprises. V. Ya. Bondar', A. G. Zdravomyslov, V. N. Ivanov, et al. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 270 pp.
19. "Real'nyy Sotsializm i Sovremennyy Mir" [Real Socialism and the Contemporary World]. A. M. Rummyantsev, editor. Ekonomika, Moscow, and Dietz, Berlin, 1982, 262 pp.
20. "Sovershenstvovaniye Khozyaystvennogo Mekhanizma" [Perfecting the Economic Mechanism]. Collection of documents. Second expanded edition. Pravda, Moscow, 1982, 351 pp.

21. "Sotsial'naya Politika i Natsional'nyye Otnosheniya" [Social Policy and National Relations]. 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 International Education" (Riga, 28-30 June 1982). Compiled by V. F. Pravotorov. Mysl', Moscow, 1982, 213 pp. (Experience and topical problems of ideological work).
22. "Sotsial'nyye Problemy v Perspektivnom Planirovanii" [Social Problems in Long-Range Planning]. Edited by V. N. Kirichenko. Ekonomika, Moscow, 1982, 303 pp.
23. "SSSR: Natsional'no-Gosudarstvennoye Ustroystvo (Konstitutsionnyye Osnovy)" [The USSR: National-Governmental Structure (Constitutional Foundations)]. Edited by V. V. Yevgen'yev, M. G. Kirichenko and V. A. Pertsik. Yuridicheskaya Literatura, Moscow, 1982, 304 pp. (On the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR).
24. Usubaliyev, T. U. "Sovetskiy Kirgizstan" [Soviet Kirghizstan]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 135 pp. (Within the united fraternal family).
25. "Frantsiya" [France]. G. G. Diligenskiy and V. I. Kuznetsov, responsible editors. Mysl', Moscow, 1982, 431 pp. (Contemporary monopoly capitalism).
26. Shal'nev, A. A. "Britaniya: Mezhd Strok 'Nepisanoy' Konstitutsii" [Britain: Between the Lines of the "Unwritten" Constitution]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 286 pp.
27. Shandra, V. A. "Gazeta, Propaganda, Zhizn': Voprosy Teorii i Metodiki" [The Newspaper, Propaganda and Life: Problems of Theory and Method]. Mysl', Moscow, 1982, 143 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO 1802/9

END