

The level of utilization of auxiliary products of the processing of basic raw materials will be radically enhanced on the basis of wasteless technology. Production of skimmed milk and buttermilk will reach 22.5 million tons in 1985 and 33.1 million in 1990; whey production will reach respectively 7.9 and 15.4 million tons. The use of whey will be increased in the production of bakery and confectionery goods and macaroni. Along with enriching such products with valuable whey proteins, this will enable us to achieve substantial flour savings (1 ton of whey used in bread-baking saves 40 kilograms of flour).

The personnel in the meat and dairy industry must also make their contribution to resolving the currently exceptionally grave feed problem facing the farm workers. The full collection of noncomestible protein byproducts obtained in meat processing and the use of additional sources of raw materials for the production of dry animal feeds will reach 622,000 tons by 1985 and 817,000 tons by 1990. Experimental work is being done to develop the use of vegetal feed additives. The Ministry of Light and Food Industry must participate more energetically in resolving this problem, for the manufacturing of feeds from animal husbandry origin will require a 50 percent increase in the available equipment currently installed in meat combines. However, it is the meat industry workers themselves who must undertake the development of the mass production of feeds on an industrial basis.

The Food Program calls for increasing production by sectorial enterprises of whole milk substitutes for young animal offspring, so as to reach 381,000 tons by 1985 and 650,000 tons by the end of the 12th Five-Year Plan. Currently agriculture uses more than 7 million tons of whole milk annually as feed for calves and young pigs, a considerable percentage of which could be replaced by valuable surrogates and used in the production of butter, cheese and other goods. This would be a substantial contribution to increasing the marketability of dairy animal husbandry and the use of milk in food production. One million tons of whole milk yields 44,000 tons of butter and yields additional returns of 140 million rubles.

Good experience has been acquired in recent years in the construction of interkolkhoz shops for the production of whole milk substitutes at existing dairy plants on the basis of production cooperation. In our view, this experience deserves comprehensive support. We are doing everything possible to ensure its further popularization. Another ripe problem is the creation of interkolkhoz feed production based on animal husbandry at the meat combines, such as bone meal with vegetal additives. This new task facing the sector can be resolved far more successfully on the level of the agroindustrial associations, which will enable us to eliminate departmental lack of coordination. We shall steadfastly pursue the solution of this problem together with the kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

The use of the blood of slaughtered animals, which totals about half a million tons per year, is an important problem. The Food Program calls for the full utilization by the food sector of the blood of slaughtered animals for the production of comestible goods. The more efficient processing of so-called second-category subproducts and foods, which total more than 1.5 million tons per year, offers a major opportunity for increasing food resources.

The Food Program requires their maximal utilization in sausages, canned goods and other locally made products.

Estimates show that the contribution of the meat and dairy industry to the Food Program may be expressed, in terms of value, as follows: compared with 1980, in 1985 the overall volume of industrial output will total 44.2 billion rubles or a 23.7 percent increase; the respective increase by 1990 will be 52.5 billion rubles or 47 percent above the 1980 figure. Let us note that these planned indicators are based on prices of meat and dairy products which have remained stable over a number of years. Maintaining stable food product prices is a characteristic feature of the party's social policy; the satisfaction of the vital requirements of the people has been and remains the party's most important programmatic requirement.

As we know, measures ensuring the social reorganization of the countryside and further improvements in the well-being, culture and medical and consumer services to the rural population are an organic component of the Food Program. Our sector can and must make its contribution to the solution of this problem in terms of improving the rural population's nutrition. Today, alongside meat, sausage goods, semiprepared foods and sour milk diet products, cheeses and butter are becoming an increasing part of the rural population's consumption structure.

The policy of the ministry and Tsentrosoyuz is gradually to terminate the primitive slaughtering of cattle directly at the farms. To this effect the mass construction of refrigerated slaughterhouses--mainly meat combine branches--will be undertaken in the vicinity of the farms. These branches will process the cattle brought by their owner who will receive in return finished goods in meat, sausages and smoked ham. Unquestionably, this will substantially increase variety and upgrade the quality of meat products used within the farm, i.e., by the kolkhoz members and sovkhos workers.

Currently more than 70 million head (i.e., more than 40 percent) of various types of cattle are butchered in the country outside state specialized enterprises. Here very valuable food and technical waste are lost and (due to the lack of refrigeration) the quality of the meat, leather and fur declines. Valuable endocrinal-ferment raw materials are wasted, although at technically equipped meat combines they could be used for the production of very efficient drugs of animal origin. The All-Union Scientific Research Meat Industry Institute has estimated that the overall losses from slaughtering cattle at the farms without proper technical equipment total about 200 million rubles per year. Therefore, a total conversion to industrial cattle processing at meat combines would bring substantial benefits to kolkhozes and sovkhoses, to private and auxiliary farms and to the state at large.

The practice of processing milk used for intrafarm needs and the manufacturing of dairy goods as ordered by kolkhozes, sovkhoses, consumer cooperatives and auxiliary and private farms will be also expanded within the Food Program on the same contributory basis.

It is a question of improving rural population supplies with meat and dairy products in the same variety as in the cities and to ensure the high level of observation of sanitary-hygiene norms and veterinary requirements in the production of such items. The implementation of these measures will make it possible to reduce to a minimum trips by rural residents to the city in search of food and related unproductive time losses. In the final account, this will be of major social significance by contributing to the practical rapprochement between town and country living conditions. In this condition, the USSR Gosplan should define a procedure for planning meat production at state enterprises and branches and within the Tsentrosoyuz system, for nationwide needs and intrafarm local consumption.

The USSR Food Program stipulates measures for further improving the organization of farm product procurements. The meat and dairy industry will be gradually converting to a system of farm orders for cattle, poultry and milk deliveries based on specific quality indicators reflecting population demand for various types and varieties of meat and dairy products.

We know that the meat and dairy industry directly depends on agriculture and on the livestock products they receive for processing. In this case ensuring high reciprocal strictness and intolerance of any kind of violations of stipulated procedures and rules governing the acceptance and processing of animal husbandry goods is very important.

Let us frankly say that many such violations and even abuses are allowed in the meat and dairy industry in settling accounts for goods delivered by kolkhozes and sovkhoses. An irreconcilable struggle will be waged with this and the culprits will not be spared.

As to the quality of animal husbandry products, we deem it necessary, together with the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and its local organs, to implement most firm measures aimed at totally excluding farm deliveries to the state of low-quality products contaminated with pesticides and harmful microflora. The solution of this problem is directly linked to the health of the people. This unquestionably applies also to farms directly under USSR Ministry of Meat and Dairy Industry jurisdiction.

Currently the ministry operates 165 cattle-feeding farms and more than 800 auxiliary farms set up at large enterprises. The number of such farms will continue to increase. The managers of oblast production associations and enterprises have the task of increasing the volume of output in auxiliary farms in order to meet the need of public catering enterprises for meat, milk, vegetables and other products.

Today the partners in the agroindustrial complex focus their attention on ensuring the implementation of the plans for state cattle and milk purchases, the prompt delivery and processing of the products, full preservation and increased output of high-quality goods for the population.

The solution of the long-term problems of improving the procurement system must begin with streamlining their very structure. Currently 81 percent of

all cattle sold to the state is shipped to the meat combines, on the basis of direct relations in kolkhozes and sovkhozes, bypassing the procurement organizations which act as middlemen. However, cattle procurement functions have not been entirely centralized. They are performed by two departments: by the USSR Ministry of Meat and Dairy Industry in nine union republics (the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kirgizia and the Transcaucasian and Baltic republics) and 29 oblasts in the RSFSR, and the USSR Ministry of Agriculture in the remaining union republics and RSFSR oblasts.

The production-technical cattle-processing facilities, particularly if we bear in mind their future development, make intermediary procurement units totally unnecessary. In this case, direct relations must be organized between enterprises and kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The existence of intermediary units divides and weakens responsibility for plan implementation, lowers procurement discipline and hinders the conversion to acceptance of the cattle directly at the farms and its centralized shipment through specialized automotive transportation vehicles owned by the processing industry. As we know, conversion to centralized cattle and milk haulage directly from the farms should be entirely completed by 1990.

Every year the meat industry pays cattle procurement organizations more than 40 million rubles to cover organizational-overhead expenditures mainly incurred for the upkeep of the apparatus of such organizations. It is entirely clear that the time has come to concentrate cattle procurements within the USSR Ministry of Meat and Dairy Industry system, which should take over the material and technical facilities of procurement organizations and reduce the size of the apparatus somewhat.

A unified procurement system would make it possible to organize more even cattle deliveries for processing. In turn, this would increase the volume of deliveries of fresh unfrozen meat to the population and thus eliminate the losses which arise in freezing the meat and its subsequent storage. Furthermore, additional quantities of meat can be obtained as a result of the increased weight of the cattle which meat combines would take from feeding farms, at preslaughter fattening stations and as a result of further weight increases at such farms.

Improvements in the procurement system also presume the further efficient organization of raw material areas assigned to enterprises processing cattle, poultry and milk, taking them closer to raw material sources. We are frequently and justifiably criticized for excessive production centralization and for the distance separating reception centers and processing enterprises from farms. Taking this into consideration, together with the agricultural organs we intend to refine the sectorial system for the development and location of enterprises and the reception and procurement network in the immediate future, in order to take such enterprises closer to the direct production areas for meat and milk and to shorten the distance for hauling raw materials for processing. The implementation of such measures will lower the losses occurred in the transportation of animal husbandry products and eliminate existing cases of violations of rules governing the acceptance of cattle and milk. We shall promote the further concentration and specialization of

output on an economically substantiated basis, taking comprehensively into consideration the reciprocal interests of industry and agriculture.

The creation of agroindustrial associations will enable us to strengthen state procurement discipline, establish reciprocal responsibility for the implementation of cattle and milk delivery contracts, and ensure rhythmical deliveries of raw materials for processing and control and the observance of requirements governing quality standards to be met by animal husbandry goods delivered to the state. We would be fully justified to claim that within the framework of the new system for managing the agroindustrial complexes the implementation of production plans for meat and dairy products will truly become a law for industry and agriculture.

In the area of cattle procurements, we intend to plan state procurements not in live but in slaughtered weight, i.e., on the basis of end results--the actual amount and quality of meat sold to the state. Following the necessary preparations, this conversion will enable us to avoid the complex and labor-intensive computations based on conventional coefficients to determine the volume of processed meat in terms of the live weight (mass) of the cattle, the current basis for planning such purchases. In the final account, it is now a question of improving the efficiency of the meat and dairy work system: from farm to meat combine or from dairy plant to consumers.

The methods used to rate the quality of the milk must be improved as well. Currently, the main quality indicator in setting milk prices is its fat content, whereas milk protein, which is the most valuable and most necessary product for the human body, is ignored in determining the nutritional value of the milk. It would be expedient in the near future, in setting milk purchase prices, to take both the fat content and milk protein into consideration. Naturally, this will require proper preparations and the search for more advanced fast methods for physical and chemical analysis of the quality of the milk. Encouraging work is being done in this respect by the scientists at the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department, together with the Altay branch of the All-Union Scientific Research Meat and Cheesemaking Industry Institute, on developing a laser-optical instrument for determining quickly the fat and protein content in the milk (LAKAM). This instrument should be applied as soon as possible.

Our computations show that this measure would make it possible not only objectively to assess milk quality but to reduce considerably the army of laboratory technicians, which currently numbers 100,000 people; milk outlays currently wasted because of obsolete methods used in determining its fat content would be lowered by 130,000 tons per year; and the annual consumption of chemical agents used in such analyses would be eliminated, thus saving approximately 15,000 tons of sulfuric acid and 700 tons of isoamyl alcohol.

III

During the 11th Five-Year Plan capital investments for the development of production capacities in the meat and dairy industry will total 4.2 billion rubles, which is somewhat more than during the 10th. More than one-third of

these funds will go into technical retooling and reconstruction of operating enterprises. A total of 170 new meat combines and dairy plants are scheduled to be built during the five-year plan. This will enable us to process additionally per shift 3,800 tons of meat, 14,000 tons of full milk products, 252 tons of cheese and 676 tons of powdered skim milk and whole milk surrogates for feeding young children. Refrigeration capacities will be increased by 126,800 tons of simultaneous storage. This will ensure the uninterrupted cattle deliveries from kolkhozes and sovkhoses within the amounts stipulated in the Food Program.

Today one of the important tasks of the ministry is to make full use of allocated funds and, together with contracting organizations and construction ministries, to ensure the timely completion of projects under construction and to master quickly the use of the new production capacities.

So far the implementation of plans of many construction projects remains unsatisfactory. The building of a number of projects has been delayed inadmissibly. Thus, the city dairy plant in Ust-Kamenogorsk and the meat combine in Torbeyevo have been under construction since 1976. The construction of the smoked sausages plant in Moscow has been delayed as well.

Taking into consideration the increased amount of construction of new and forthcoming reconstruction of many operating enterprises, the sectorial design organizations are working on new, more economical designs which call for the installation of more advanced equipment which upgrades production efficiency on the basis of wasteless technological processes and reduces construction costs and outlays of construction materials, water and fuel and energy resources.

The increased production of meat and dairy products and animal husbandry feeds, and reducing losses in processing cattle, poultry and milk can and must be achieved by upgrading technical production standards and labor productivity, developing in applying new types of equipment and technologies and packaging materials, and fully ensuring the enterprises with contemporary, highly productive equipment.

Together with the machine-building ministries, the USSR Ministry of Meat and Dairy Industry will undertake the more energetic solution of the problem of creating and utilizing in industry equipment for separating the meat from the bones, processing animal blood for food, developing lines for the comprehensive processing of bone meal, machines for vacuum grinding and mixing sausage meat and equipment for concentrating and drying milk and milk whey, and other technological processes.

The purposes of all this is not only to upgrade work efficiency and quality but to improve working conditions and to enhance the level of mechanization which so far has reached no more than 41.2 percent in the sector. The fact that the sector employs a large number of women makes this situation even less tolerable. Shortcomings in this area have developed as a result of a disproportion which was allowed to occur for a number of reasons between the increased volume of output in the meat and dairy industry, on the one hand,

and the pace of development of machine-building, on the other. That is why the personnel in dairy plants and meat processing enterprises are so very grateful to the collectives of design bureaus and medium machine-building, defense and machine tool-building industries for their creative participation in the development of new equipment with high technical features, which makes it possible to process primary raw materials and their byproducts more efficiently, with minimal losses. The participation of machine-building organizations, the Ministry of Light and Food Industry above all, in the creation and manufacturing of new systems of machines, apparatus and automated lines for the comprehensive processing of cattle and milk based on wasteless, energy-saving and technological processes, will be a major contribution to the fulfillment of the production program. The initiative of the machine builders in this matter is worthy of the greatest possible support and extensive dissemination.

In order to reduce losses in meat and dairy products, ensure their preservation in their hauling and marketing and make their purchases convenient for the population, the production of prepackaged goods will be increased substantially. To this effect the production of packaging materials, paper containers, cardboard lined with polyethylene on both sides, special heat-developing fabrics, viscous-lined sausage skins, polymer-lined foil and many others will be increased considerably within the sector. Within the framework of the Food Program, the USSR Gosplan and Gossnab have been instructed to take the necessary steps to meet the requirements of food sectors for containers and packaging materials. This problem requires an urgent solution, for the lagging which has developed in this area is causing substantial harm to the national economy, holding back the shipping of finished products by the enterprises and lowering the standard of services to consumers.

The comprehensive development of the refrigeration industry and the more extensive use of artificial cold not only for processing, storing and transporting goods but for producing a wide variety of high quality fresh, fast-frozen foods, such as precooked meals, semicooked meals, fruits, berries and vegetables, will be of great importance in the successful implementation of the Food Program.

Large refrigeration facilities have been developed in our country. The number and capacity of freezers in the meat, dairy and fish industries have been significantly increased in recent years. The level of concentration of refrigerated facilities has been raised, which has had a positive impact on reducing capital outlays and operational costs. The construction of standardized specialized automatically controlled freezers for the preservation of fruits and vegetables has been extensively initiated in kolkhozes and sovkhoses. Despite a considerable increase in the scale and technical facilities, such construction remains substantially behind facilities available in many other countries. In some countries, the United States, France and Britain in particular, refrigeration facilities developing below-zero temperatures are increasing. This is related to organizing the production of fast-frozen mixed meat products, fresh fruits, vegetables, concentrated fruit juices, precooked meat and fish meals, cookery items and semifinished products.

The USSR Ministry of Meat and Dairy Industry has built small experimental product-freezing plants. So far the scale of such output remains insignificant. About 280,000 tons of frozen products of various types were produced in 1982, including pelmeni, dumplings, curd fritters and precooked meat dishes. However, this is no more than the beginning of a major project. The production of fast-frozen foods is of major socioeconomic significance and will be developed more intensively.

The successful implementation of the program for increasing the production and marketing of fast-frozen foods will contribute to the timely preparation and technical equipment of stores and public catering enterprises with refrigeration facilities and the opening of specialized stores, coffee shops and trading sections and the building of company stores and cookery establishments in the large cities.

The increased production of fast-frozen, precooked and semicooked meals, fruits, soft fruits and vegetables will change the present one-sided development of the refrigeration industry. Refrigeration facilities will develop into comprehensive enterprises performing both storage and production functions. This will increase their economic effectiveness and they will play an important role in resolving the problems set with the Food Program of creating conditions for fast services to the population in finished products at public catering enterprises, increased labor productivity and release of manpower resources in the service industry.

Science is assigned a major role in the implementation of the USSR Food Program. The scientists and specialists in scientific research organizations in the meat and dairy industry are called upon to make a substantial contribution to the solution of the nationwide problem of increasing food production. Today the meat and dairy industry has a significant scientific and technical potential. Its efficient utilization offers possibilities of further improving the work in the entire sector, particularly through the utilization of already developed wasteless technologies.

The scientists in the sectorial institutes must contribute to the implementation of the program for comprehensive standardization, which calls for an interrelated enhancement of requirements regarding production quality and expanded use of modern methods for its assessment. State standards related to procured cattle and milk must be improved above all. Having broadened the realm of its activities, Gosstandart must assume total objective control over production quality. This will enable us drastically to reduce the number of quality inspectorates currently operating under various departments.

The further development of joint operations involving the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences Nutrition Institute, a number of USSR Academy of Sciences institutes, the Higher Academy of Agricultural Sciences imeni Lenin, higher educational institutions and design organizations in machine-building and other sectors is assigned a major role in resolving the scientific and technical problems facing the sector.

The exchange of research results will be energized and so will the development of a number of joint scientific projects with the sectorial meat and dairy industry scientific research institutes in socialist countries and with some companies in the capitalist countries, in France, Italy and the United States in particular. For example, a large plant was built in Balta, Odessa Oblast, with the cooperation of Abbot Laboratories (United States). The plant produces detolakt, a children's food based on milk and as good as human milk. Dairy combines for the production of children's foods have been built in Istra, Volkovysk and Khorol in cooperation with the French Syphai company. Two plants for the production of a protein-rich sausage skin have been built in Leningrad Oblast and the Ukraine in cooperation with Czechoslovakia.

The task now is to ensure the more intensive turn on the part of the sector to face agricultural requirements within a short time and make fuller use of internal reserves in increasing the production of meat and dairy goods further.

New forms of competition under the slogan "Maximum High Quality Output Per Ton of Raw Materials!" are being increasingly developed as enterprises, production and industrial associations, sovkhozes, auxiliary farms and scientific research sectorial institutes. The competitors are focusing on the fuller utilization of intensive factors for production growth, identifying and utilizing existing reserves and ensuring the extensive dissemination of leading experience. A specific meaning is being given to the competition based on contracts for labor cooperation between meat and dairy industry enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhozes, on the one hand, and collectives of transportation and trade organizations, on the other.

Obligations to increase the volumes of output, the marketability and the quality of animal raw materials to ensure their preservation in procurements and transportation, achieve their more economical and efficient utilization in processing and, in the final account, increasing the production of finished goods, are becoming structural components of labor cooperation contracts.

The successful implementation of the Food Program for increasing the production of meat and dairy goods also depends on the solution by the USSR Gosplan and the corresponding central departments of a number of problems facing the sector. Thus, so far the USSR Gosplan has not resolved the problem of allocating the necessary specialized automotive transportation facilities and capital investments for laying the material and technical foundations for automotive transportation facilities.

During the 10th Five Year Plan the meat combines accepted and took directly from the farms no more than 10 million tons of cattle and 37 million tons of milk. However, even these amounts enabled the kolkhozes and sovkhozes to release some labor and material resources for the production of agricultural commodities and to save more than 300 million rubles in transportation costs. The comprehensive conversion to this progressive method of procuring animal husbandry goods is held back precisely and above all by the shortage of

specialized transport facilities and the lack of developed garage services and paved roads leading to the livestock farms.

The implementation of the Food Program will demand of the personnel of all sectors within the agroindustrial complex the search for new interaction and cooperation methods. Today it is no longer sufficient to think of improving the economic management mechanism within the individual sector. We must improve production, economic and financial relations with all partners in the complex and find new management and planning methods, subordinating all administrative and economic activities to reaching high end indicators, both sectorial and intermediary. Ensuring the stable and uninterrupted supply of the population with a variety of high-quality foods is the main such indicator. The efforts of managers, specialists and workers on all levels of the sector, starting with cattle drivers and receivers of milk, must be subordinated to this project.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

MEMORANDUM ON THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF EDITORS IN CHIEF OF THEORETICAL AND POLITICAL JOURNALS OF FRATERNAL COMMUNIST AND WORKER PARTIES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 83 pp 85-87

[Document drafted by the editors of NOVA MYSL, CPCZ Central Committee theoretical and political journal]

[Text] An international conference of editors in chief of the theoretical and political journals of the fraternal communist and worker parties was held in Prague on 9-10 February 1983. The conference was attended by representatives of the following journals: NOVO VREME (BCP), TARSADALMI SZEMLE (MSZMP), TAP TI KONG SAN (Vietnamese Communist Party), EINHEIT (SED), CUBA SOCIALISTA (Cuban Communist Party), NAMYN AM'DRAL (Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party), NOWE DROGI (PZPR), ERA SOCIALISTE (Romanian Communist Party), KOMMUNIST (CPSU) and NOVA MYSL (Communist Party of Czechoslovakia). The conference was also attended by a representative of the journal WEG UND ZIEL (Austrian Communist Party) and the editor in chief of the journal PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM.

Problems related to the intensification of reciprocal relations and expanding cooperation were discussed at the conference. The practical experience of the editors of said journals and the place and role of the journals in building a developed socialist society, the struggle against contemporary anticommunism and various forms of opportunism, and contribution to the implementation of the political line of the fraternal communist and worker parties were discussed.

The participants in the conference noted the permanent impact of Marx's ideas on the mission of the theoretical party press, as developed in V. I. Lenin's works and in the creative and practical activities of the CPSU and the other communist and worker parties operating on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian and socialist internationalism. Particular attention was paid to coverage of the economic policy of these parties, especially in connection with the processes of economic intensification and increased international socialist economic integration.

The role of theory in the development and implementation of the party political line and shaping the outlook, way of life and life stance and activeness of the working people and strengthening the ideological and political unity of the people was emphasized. A number of speakers noted the need for

permanent attention to work with the youth. It was also pointed out that in this area creative theoretical activities are the basis for propaganda and are an inseparable aspect of the party's leading role and guiding activities under socialism.

The participants in the conference exchanged the experience acquired by their journals in covering the political line of their parties in decisive sectors of social life, economics in particular, and in the implementation of Lenin's idea of the unity between theory and practice. Information was exchanged on the way conceptual ideas and the daily rhythm of editorial work reflect key problems related to building a socialist society, domestic and foreign policy and ideological work, and how more efficiently to join efforts and increase cooperation in this direction.

The participants considered some theoretical and methodological aspects of the economic and political interrelationship between the scientific and technical revolution and the advantages of socialism, mainly from the viewpoint of the contemporary requirements for economic intensification and international socialist economic integration. Attention was paid to positive results and problems, including tight spots and gaps, in the work of editorial collectives in covering topical problems of building socialism and the world communist and worker movements.

Close attention was paid on the way the journals treat problems of improving methods for the implementation of the party's leading role and the contribution they could make to ensuring a closer tie between the social sciences, on the one hand, and the party and the practical needs related to building developed socialism, on the other.

The conference noted the irreplaceable role which the party theoretical journals play in the creative development of Marxism-Leninism, the social sciences, the struggle against revisionism and dogmatism and the opposition to a narrow academic and pragmatic approaches to theory. The speakers recalled Lenin's concept of the mission of such journals as collective organizers in the search for new scientific knowledge and propagandists of new ideas, as well as consistent critics of erroneous trends and views indicating a retreat from Marxism-Leninism. The participants in the conference emphasized the need to ensure the theoretical depth, clarity and practicality of the materials published, their militant party-mindedness and aggressiveness, their relevance and their close ties with events and party policy. The conference discussed the contribution made by the journals to the creative interdisciplinary development of problems of building developed socialism, the study and dissemination of topical problems of the global revolutionary process and the ideological struggle against all current varieties of anti-communism.

The statements noted that particular attention should be paid to the theory and practice of the growth of the democratic revolutions of a new type into socialist revolutions and the creative development of problems of transition from capitalism to socialism, as well as refuting erroneous views prevailing in this area.

The participants exchanged views on the activities of the journals under the conditions of the intensified political and ideological aggressiveness of international imperialism and its enhanced activeness in the organization of ideological subversion.

The conference emphasized the importance of publishing materials covering the various aspects of and the comprehensive and topical dialectics and inter-connection between the building of socialism and the preservation of peace on earth, the struggle for democracy and socialism today and throughout the global revolutionary process, and materials exposing the plans of imperialism and explaining the depth and significance of the peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union and the other countries of real socialism and the role of anti-wa. movements; it was a reminder of the need substantively to expose the falseness of the anticommunist propaganda regarding the so-called "Soviet military threat" and the imaginary military superiority of the Warsaw Pact over NATO.

The participants exchanged experience based on the activities of their journals in connection with important anniversaries. The significance of these anniversaries in terms of our reality, the conceptual upbringing of the working people and the struggle against hostile ideology was considered; they also exchanged experience in their work with authors and readers and views on how to determine the efficiency of the work of their journals and how to respond to readers' requests.

The participants formulated some specific problems related to the further development of reciprocal cooperation, such as:

To organize once every 3 years conferences such as the Prague meeting. In addition to exchanging practical experience, the editors would discuss precoordinated topical problems of journal activities;

To exchange experiences in connection with their long-term and current plans;

As necessary, to sponsor working meetings among heads of departments (sections) within these journals;

To exchange basic articles on problems of party domestic and foreign policy;

In the interest of more intensive and better quality work, to draft an agreement on regularly exchanging most important bibliographic data, scientific publications and journal articles;

To consider the expedience of having sections with annotations regarding basic materials published in fraternal journals;

To supply each other with information and to cooperate in providing materials to authors in their own countries;

To hold round-table discussions on topical theoretical and practical problems whenever necessary;

To hold theoretical conferences on key problems of the global revolutionary movement and the building of socialism, as this becomes necessary, and on the topic of how most efficiently to cover such problems in the theoretical and political journals of communist and worker parties.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

CAMPAIGN AGAINST...EVERYBODY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 1983 pp 88-97

[Article by S. Vishnevskiy and V. Kobysh]

[Text] During the present poignant period of human history, when all people of good will are concerned with the main problem of the present--how to avert the threat of nuclear war from our planet--the responsibility of the state figures invested with power increases more than ever before. The fulfillment of both this vitally important task and other problems directly connected with it, namely, how to curb the arms race, defend and expand detente and achieve an improvement in the international political climate, to a great extent depend on their far-sightedness, their feeling for political realism and the breadth of their thinking.

The program for peace for the '80s put forward by the 26th CPSU Congress contains clear and concrete directions marking practical ways of solving these cardinal questions. They were clearly expressed in the constructive proposals formulated by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, in his report "The 60th Anniversary of the USSR" and in the Prague Political Declaration.

The declaration emphasizes the urgent need to undertake immediate actions aimed at reducing the level of international tension, stopping the arms race and placing a secure barrier on the way to war. The document states: "On the basis of these considerations, the Warsaw Pact member states, in the persons of their highest representatives, address the North Atlantic Treaty member states with the proposal of concluding a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and maintaining relations of peace.

The mutual obligation of the member states of both alliances not be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons against each other and, therefore, not to be the first to use military force against each other at all, could become the core of the treaty."

Such is the position of the world of socialism. With our entire policy and our practical actions we demonstrate that the Soviet country and the other socialist states are in favor of developing and expanding detente and securing the peaceful coexistence of peoples. We are in favor of solving all controversial problems by way of negotiations.

How do the present U.S. leaders look on international affairs?

"The West will outlive communism...we will write communism off as a sad and painful chapter in the history of mankind, whose last pages are being written in our time."

"We will leave Marxism-Leninism in the smoldering ruins of history."

"We do not adhere to the position of defense any longer. That is why in my recent speech in the Parliament of Great Britain I appealed for a worldwide 'crusade' in defense of liberty..."

If 2 or 3 years ago anybody with common sense had been asked who these maxims may have come from, he would probably have just shrugged his shoulders in surprise: "In any case, they do not come from somebody who is interested in the peaceful future of mankind and who takes a sober view of the events taking place in the world, not from somebody who can be entrusted with power."

The words quoted above come from the present head of the White House. The list of quotations could be complemented by similar statements by other Washington leaders, including Defense Secretary C. Weinberger and Secretary of State G. Shultz. This is what the "rulers of destiny" of the American people--who substantially influence the course of international affairs--say and, what is more important, this is the way they act.

The fact that these militant speeches are supported by corresponding actions is attested by the monstrous U.S. military budget--unprecedented in times of peace--and by the new systems of weapons on the production line--from chemical (binary) to laser and space weapons--which Washington officials manipulate like circus jugglers. ~~Isn't such an act of "juggling"~~ the deployment of the U.S. "Pershing-2" and cruise missiles--planned by Washington--in five West European countries--first-strike weapons which, by bringing closer the danger of war, will make it even more difficult to reach an agreement on the limitation of the arms race.

Thus, the "crusaders" armed with nuclear and other mass destruction weapons have made themselves ready for a campaign against communism. But where exactly are they heading, what do they specifically strive to achieve? They do not conceal the fact that their accelerated military preparations, their policy carried out "from the position of strength," threats, diktat, gross interference in other countries' internal affairs and creation of hotbeds of military conflicts--in one word, their course of confrontation--is aimed at foisting on the world the notorious "pax Americans," that is, the United States' domination.

They maintain that immediately after the end of World War II the United States allegedly had better opportunities for this but it missed those and is now left with one last chance: it is now or never. They are in a hurry and they are nervous, they are hatching such irresponsible plans in connection with the deadly weapons which turned out to be in their hands that a group of prominent American scientists--experts in the armaments sphere who held high

positions in previous administrations, and who to all appearances are greatly worried, deemed it necessary to make public the following statement: "There are a number of reasons for believing that Reagan and his advisers are pushing through programs which will weaken our country and increase the probability of our becoming victims of a nuclear catastrophe." The statement points out that the present President of the United States "is not only less well-informed about the problems of nuclear arms than all the other presidents since the start of the nuclear age, but also less well-informed than all those Americans who are concerned about the threat of a nuclear war."

This is the opinion of the people in the know. As we can see, they do not have a very high opinion of the state of information of the present Washington leaders on political and military questions. In the direct connection between ignorance and aggressiveness they see a serious danger to mankind including the American people.

The "crusaders" are in the heat of passion. To implement their hegemonistic course the Washington leaders are putting into operation their entire arsenal of means--military, political and economic--and in recent times, to a growing extent also ideological.

The U.S. ruling circles have started the practical implementation of their "crusade" against the socialist states. One of their noisy actions in this anticommunist campaign was the "Conference on the Questions of Democratization of Communist Countries" which was conducted at the end of October 1982 by the U.S. State Department. Although this gathering took place behind closed doors its organizers did not conceal the fact that it laid the foundations for a large-scale ideological diversion and a long-term campaign of lies and slander against the socialist countries. What is more, the leaders of the State Department declared that a whole number of conferences and meetings had been planned for the elaboration of purely subversive anti-Soviet and anticommunist measures and it is planned to have "experts" from other Western countries participate in these measures.

After the "Conference on the Questions of Democratization of Communist Countries" the same State Department organized a propaganda sabbat on the subject of "free elections," inviting among others, representatives from Honduras, El Salvador and Israel. They got so carried away that they entirely lost, as we see, all political orientation: stranglers from Honduras, ravishers from El Salvador and the Israeli murderers of Lebanese and Palestinian women are playing the part of teachers in regard to freedom and democracy!

In February a regular Washington propagandist-diversionist meeting announced with great pomp the "Program for Democracy and Public Diplomacy." On the pretext of "defending democracy," the authors of this program appropriate the right to carry out massive interference in the internal affairs of other states, primarily of the developing states. They do not conceal their intention to form a kind of "fifth column" in these countries which would, after coming to power, obediently fulfill the will of the ruling class of the United States. They openly declare that they intend to foist the American way of life on the rest of the world as the only possible and obligatory one.

All this is accompanied by vicious attacks against the USSR and the entire world of socialism.

The militant anti-Sovietism and hysterical anticommunism of the present U.S. Administration are, of course, no news to anybody. The hatred of all that is progressive and, primarily, of real socialism is the "symbol of faith" of the right wing of the Republican Party which is now in power. The power in the United States is in the hands of what is probably the most reactionary government in the entire history of the United States, a government which THE WASHINGTON POST called "a living fossil from the 19th century." It is logical for such fossils to hate socialism since socialism is the main obstacle preventing worldwide imperialist plunder and global domination by the United States.

The adventurist doctrines of "limited" and "victorious protracted" wars have their edge directed primarily against the socialist community. The arms race whipped up by the Pentagon is directed at gaining military superiority over the socialist countries after "wearing out" and "exhausting" them. An economic war has been waged with the aim of undermining the national economy of the USSR and other fraternal socialist countries.

The U.S. diplomacy is exacerbating its feverish activity by organizing hostile blocs around our community and even conceiving of the creation of some kind of worldwide antisocialist alliance.

This is not the first campaign against the new world. After the Great October the Soviet people have seen quite a few varieties of "crusaders" and every time they have been swept out with an iron broom. All these "crusaders" not only boiled with fierce hatred of socialism and progress, but also feared the future. The same fear haunts the organizers of the present "crusade." The revolutionary renewal of the world and the forward movement of real socialism infuriate the reactionaries from across the ocean all the more since the most acute domestic and foreign-political problems, which are overpowering them, give them no breathing room.

Since the R. Reagan administration assumed power, the multifaceted crisis--economic, social, political, and moral--has been sharply exacerbated in the United States. There was no promised "new start" in American life: On the contrary, all the old ailments of capitalism were aggravated. The Republican leaders prefer at the moment not to recall their preelection promises of "reviving the economy" and raising the well-being of the people--all of these have remained on paper.

Soon after his inauguration, the U.S. President characterized the situation in the country as the worst economic chaos since the times of the "Great Depression" of the late '20s and early '30s. U.S. economists are making the same evaluation today with even better reasons after this administration has been in power for 2 years.

Since the summer of 1981, industrial production in the United States has dropped by over 10 percent, and according to experts' forecasts, a certain

"economic revival" advertised by the authorities which is allegedly not far away will bring no substantial changes to the country and will not solve its sore problems.

Two years ago the U.S. President said: "Seven million Americans are without work and are finding themselves in a tragic and humiliating situation. If they are placed in a row, each person placed 3 feet from the next, this line of unemployed would stretch from the coast of the Isle of Man to California." Today the people in this line would be lined up in triple formation, since there are 12 million officially registered unemployed, though in reality their number is placed as high as 20 million.

The highly praised American "quality of life" now sounds like a joke. "The decay of America"--this is the verdict of serious economists and political scientists in the United States and other Western countries. A prominent U.S. economist (Robert Heilbroner) asks the "accursed" question from the pages of the weekly NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE: "Does capitalism have a future?" He writes: "This question makes people nervous...it paralyzes all thought. This is nevertheless the question which must now be considered..."

The U.S. Administration also has few reasons to be proud of its foreign policy. In spite of whipping up its militarist preparations, the approximate balance of military forces between the USSR and the United States, between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, has not been upset. The attempts of the U.S. ruling circles to "bury" detente have not been crowned with success. Detente is alive. The methods of U.S. diktat and threats vis-a-vis its allies have caused serious problem. The allies avoid blind submission to the leadership from across the ocean; they refuse to join the antidetente operations and take part in the economic war against the socialist countries. The differences between the United States and its allies have exacerbated to such an extent that Washington was forced to declare the lifting of "sanctions" on the deliveries of equipment for the construction of the gas pipeline from Siberia to Western Europe. The crude methods applied by Washington against the national liberation movements and the gendarme actions of the colonizers from across the ocean have sharply intensified the resistance of the peoples of the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

U.S. prestige in the world has never plummeted so fast. This is acknowledged by the U.S. authorities themselves. Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs L. Eagleburger complains: "The positions and initiatives of the United States are often treated with suspicion and hostility."

The warlike declarations and adventurous actions of the Washington leaders have shown the peoples where the threat to peace really comes from. They realize absolutely clearly that the present U.S. policy is pushing the world toward nuclear catastrophe. Hence the unusual scope of the antinuclear and antiwar protest movement which has engulfed Western Europe, Japan and other countries and regions.

The vast majority of the U.S. citizens negatively evaluate the foreign and domestic policy of the Republican Administration. This was clearly demonstrated

both during the so-called midterm elections which were held on 2 November last year and in the course of the referendum on the question of freezing nuclear arms which was carried out simultaneously in a number of states. The results of the elections and the referendum can be summed up as a no-confidence vote by Americans to "Reaganomics" and their protest against Washington's nuclear strategy. According to the recent opinion poll carried out by L. Harris' organization, the majority of Americans are concerned about the fact that "President Reagan may involve the United States in a new war."

These sentiments are of course known in the White House, and this causes the extreme nervousness of its masters. It is not accidental that in the months preceding the November elections the U.S. President traveled around the country and made one demagogic speech after another attempting to justify his unsuccessful course. A typical example of this demagoguery was his radio address to the country on 23 October 1982. It was entirely devoted to "unmasking the great myths" about the government policy. However, in fact what was described as "myths" turned out to be outspoken reproaches based on undeniable facts and addressed by the U.S. public to the administration. These are just accusations that "Reaganomics" has failed and that the record-level military spending aggravates the economic troubles and leads to reduced expenditures for social needs, causing human suffering. Is it a myth and not a fact that many million Americans are "doomed to a future without happiness," as much as R. Reagan may try to refute the truth?

The ruling circles of the United States demonstrate to mankind their political insolvency and moral and intellectual poverty. They can offer the Americans nothing real that can cure their ailing society which is wallowing in the quagmire of crises. They have no ideas capable of lighting up the minds and hearts of the people.

At one time the former U.S. president J. Kennedy said: "We, our nation, are now in greater need than the need for nuclear, air, financial, industrial, or even human might; this is the need for the might of ideas." Since these words were spoken, and particularly in the last couple of years, this need of which the late president complained has become simply glaring in the highest echelon of power in the United States.

The present U.S. leaders are trying to divert at any price the attention of the international public from the unappetizing spectacle of "decaying America" and from their unpopular--even in the United States itself--policy which causes anger and repugnance abroad. Such is the political horizon of the present U.S. leaders, and in these conditions they find nothing better than to undertake distracting maneuvers in the field of militant anticommunism. This is the real state of affairs behind the new "crusade" against the world of socialism.

The words "democracy," "freedom," and "human rights," can be heard again in the speeches of Washington leaders. This is something new, for in the extreme right wing of the Republican Party where the figures of R. Reagan's government come from, concepts such as "human rights" have always grated on the ears and immediately provoked a guarded reaction.

The rightest Republicans came to power under the banner of a broad offensive against democracy and civil rights. The report--published in autumn 1980--of the brain center of the neoconservative "heritage foundation" which provided the new administration with "ideas," states in black and white: "It does not need to be proved that civil rights have to recede to the background before considerations of guaranteeing national security and internal civil order." The document contains advice on how to intensify the shadowing and persecution of those who think differently with the assistance of the FBI and other special agencies. These recommendations seem to have laid the foundation of the government's practical activity, however many invocations of "human rights" are made.

If the Washington leaders had really decided to finally occupy themselves with the question of human rights, what should they have started with? Obviously, they should have started with what is happening in their own house. In this sphere they would have no end of work to do. Tens of millions of Americans are craving the implementation of their rights as human beings and citizens.

Equal rights are denied to blacks, Indians, Latin Americans and other national minorities which are subjected to merciless discrimination and racist repressions. Here is a recent example: the bloody reprisal carried out by the Boston police against peaceful black demonstrators.

The right of work is denied not only to the 20 million unemployed who are in fact denied all human rights and doomed to be outcasts in their own society, which is not overflowing with charity, but also to those who still hold a job. The rights of the trade unions suffer cruel blows which is shown by the reprisal carried out by the authorities against the traffic controller and engine-driver unions. Up to now--as the 20th century is drawing to a close--tens of millions of American women still do not enjoy equal rights with men. The vast majority of the average voters are in fact denied the right of being elected, despite all the conferences staged in Washington, for in order to acquire an elective office, in Congress for example, millions of dollars are needed.

It is impossible to talk of real freedom of the press and speech in a country where the mass information organs, including the press and the all-powerful television, are under the vigilant censorship and surveillance of the monopolist associations which own them.

It is clear from the facts mentioned above that in the largest capitalist country there is sufficient room for efforts to help those who are humiliated and insulted and to restore at least in part the bourgeois-democratic rights and freedoms.

When Secretary of State G. Shultz, speaking from the rostrum of the UN General Assembly, stated "self-critically" that the United States is "not ideal" in the sphere of observing human rights, this was, mildly speaking, hypocrisy, whereas his grandiloquent statement made at the Washington "Conference on Questions of Democratization" that the United States "has made the extension

and defense of freedom the central task of its foreign policy" is altogether farfetched. A question inevitably suggests itself: Where specifically and when did the U.S. government defend freedom? There is no such place on the world map. There is no such date on the calendar.

From the first days of its activity, Reagan's administration rejected the bashful and hypocritical devices used by former president J. Carter and took an open course of encouraging pro-American military dictatorships abroad. A. Haig, who was the U.S. secretary of state at the time, declared that policy under the rubric of "human rights" does not correspond to the vital interests of the United States in relation to the "authoritarian regimes traditionally friendly to the West." This is utter cynicism, as we can see. Let them be murderers' regimes, but they are ours.

Washington took under its wing the butcher's regime of Pinochet in Chile and Stroessner's military dictatorship in Paraguay, and it actively participates in punitive actions against the patriotic forces of El Salvador. It strengthens its friendship with the terrorist cliques of Guatemala and Honduras, and expands cooperation with the South African racists. In fact, the U.S. government is the main sponsor of all contemporary repressive regimes.

On Washington alone depends the elimination of the gross violations of human rights in the countries with dictatorial regimes which are under its control. If the channels of military and financial aid to these puppets were closed even if only temporarily, the prisons and torture chambers would very soon inevitably collapse through lack of support.

A hint from Washington would suffice for the Israeli aggressors to stop the genocide in Lebanon and the bloody reprisals and violations of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples which are carried out with the help of U.S. weapons. Let the Washington "crusaders" remember: They will never be able to wash off the blood of the martyrs of Sabra and Shatila.

Finally--and this is the main thing--if the U.S. leaders were to renounce their aggressive military plans and militarist preparations, which endanger a sacred human right--the right of life--the world would become more secure and people would sigh with relief. This would be a real contribution to securing human rights. We must put all this in the subjunctive form because the practical actions of Washington's leaders, despite their "peace-loving" declarations, do not show that they are about to change their purely negative and hostile attitude to democracy and to human and people's rights.

Isn't it the height of cynicism, this behavior of a government which, while grossly violating the remnants of bourgeois-democratic freedoms in their own country, sponsoring butchers' regimes and violating the sovereign rights of other states, tries to preach on the subject of freedom and teach the other peoples how they should lead their lives?

With their preaching and pretensions the Washington leaders are breaking into the houses of the already liberated peoples of the socialist countries. They have gone as far as, for example, instructing the Polish people what their

own country should be like. "Let Poland Be Poland" was the name of a disreputable television show filmed on R. Reagan's personal initiative. Let it be. But in what form exactly does Washington want to see this socialist state? Presumably, in the form the Poland of the gentry [pan] which they could treat as a banana republic. They will not succeed! Just as they have not succeeded in throwing the people of revolutionary Afghanistan back into feudalism, regardless of how many bandits they have sent over there and how many teachers' and agronomists' heads they may have cut off.

The attempts of the U.S. leaders to don the pure white garments of "crusaders of democracy" confirm the conclusion presently drawn by many people, including those in the West, that we are facing the complete alienation of Washington's policy from reality. In the foreign press the Reagan administration is often compared to the ill-starred hero of American writer W. Irving--Rip Van Winkle. He had slept a long time, woke up in another century and could not grasp what was going on around him. The impression is created that the present leaders from across the ocean are incapable of soberly viewing the state of world affairs. U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger expressed himself openly on this matter: "We terribly dislike to acknowledge this publicly, but very few people in these positions have enough time to think...all our time is spent in action." Thus, quite often they act without thinking or at least without considering what their policy of the military fist, violence and diktat might lead to

If they had looked around and collected their thoughts they would have had to admit their complete ignorance in the questions of social development, including the world revolutionary process and the building of socialism and communism. Every one of their statements about the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries suggests not only class hatred but also thorough illiteracy.

The following aphorism by the head of the White House became, for example, an object of universal sneers: "The Soviet Union carries the responsibility for all the disorder in the world." The above-mentioned L. Eagleburger once went as far as to call our country the "enemy of mankind." The former U.S. ambassador to the USSR (M. Thun), who cannot be suspected of procommunist sympathies, commented on this statement as follows: "It is far too narrow-minded to blame the USSR for all the difficulties of the modern world."

The Washington figures are completely confused in their evaluation of the Soviet Union's might. On the one hand, they proclaim a "Soviet military superiority." On the other hand, they speak of the "obvious weakness" of the socialist society. The U.S. President, in his turn, overwhelmed the leaders of the biggest capitalist countries who were his partners at their last year's meeting in Versailles, by hurling a cowboy phrase: "If we push the Russians, they will collapse."

As a prominent American historian and public figure George Kennan attests, there is an "interminable series of falsifications" and a "daily distortion of the nature and positions of another great nation." Kennan states that the notions about the Soviet Union which prevail at present in the U.S. government circles, are so "primitive and subjective, so divorced from the results

of any sober examination of reality, that they are not only incorrect but also dangerous...."

This correct definition fully applies to the organizers of the new anticommunist "crusade." They do not see and do not want to see the historic achievements of the new society, its powerful vitality, the progressive movement ahead towards communism, the flourishing of science, culture and education in the USSR and the other fraternal countries, and the friendship and unity of our peoples. Neither do they see the essence of socialist democracy which not only proclaims but also guarantees human rights and freedoms unknown to the society of class exploitation.

They attempt to judge the situation in the socialist countries while really wearing blinders. The "black market" which will allegedly influence the way in which the communist countries will be run in the future is the only "bright spot" in the socialist world as seen by the propagandists from across the ocean. This is the yardstick with which they try to measure all the phenomena and tendencies of the socialist society's development, setting hopes on some "internal forces" which are supposed to become major factors contributing to "democratization." It is hardly worth recalling that in the language of the anticommunists, "democratization" simply stands for counter-revolution and the reestablishment of bourgeois laws.

What is the essence of such statements: ignorance, political blindness, uncontrolled fantasy or adventurism? There is enough of everything.

It is of course impossible to prevent the people of yesterday from cherishing their vain dreams of destroying socialism and resurrecting capitalism in our countries. Recent history has known quite a few such dreamers. However, in spite of their yearnings, real socialism lives and becomes stronger.

The "crusaders" not only console themselves with futile illusions, they want action. In January this year a special committee was formed by Presidential Directive No 77 on the ministerial level--a kind of a superministry--headed by W. Clark, R. Reagan's adviser on matters of national security. The committee, within which four subcommittees were also formed, is conceived as a headquarters where all the main foreign-political propaganda diversions will be planned. It has already been announced that the United States intends to expand even further the "psychological war" in broadcasting and at international forums. The Washington administration encourages "private sector organizations," following the example of the reactionary leadership of the AFL-CIO, to activate their subversive activity abroad, in particular in socialist countries. Let us recall that the special U.S. agencies, which are assigned a particular role in the planned diversions also took part in the Washington gatherings. Therefore, what we are talking about is the preparation of another massive interference of the United States in the domestic affairs of other states.

In violation of the basic norms of international law, the UN statute and the final act of the all-European conference which forbid, clearly and precisely, every interference in each other's affairs, the "crusaders" allow themselves everything they fancy. The end justifies the means--this is how they act.

Thus, the current "crusade" of U.S. imperialism against the socialist community has in fact a wider political and geographic scope. It is aimed against all freedom-loving and progressive forces on the globe, against all who disagree with the policy of diktat and tyranny foisted on them by Washington. The reactionaries from across the ocean would like to stop the clock of history and turn it back. By brute military force the United States would also like to secure access to natural resources which do not belong to it and which are predominately situated in the developing countries for whom a special role is reserved in the military-strategic plans of the White House. At present the U.S. economy practically entirely depends on the delivery of many kinds of raw materials from these countries, including aluminum, chrome, tin, vanadium, manganese, and platinum.

This fact explains a lot in the U.S. policy. The Pentagon chief, C. Weinberger, complained in one of his speeches that the United States has turned into an "insular state," since "many resources required by the United States to produce energy as well as many strategic mineral resources of major importance are situated thousands of miles away from the U.S. shores... To secure our access to these resources we must increase our military and naval might" --said the defense secretary frankly.

The declaration of the "crusade" is thus nothing more than an attempt on the part of the top ruling class of the United States to provide its purely expansionist and imperialist policy with a pseudo-ideological foundation. This is a campaign not only against the world of socialism but against all mankind, including the U.S. allies if one bears in mind how they grab them by the throat in all sorts of economic wars and with what cynicism the role of a U.S. nuclear firing ground is foisted on them.

This is where the heart of the matter lies, this is the real casual relationship. Losing in the competition between the two systems, feeling an acute shortage of many kinds of raw materials and lagging further and further behind a number of West European countries, and particularly Japan, in their competition, the present U.S. leaders want to solve all their problems at once by exacerbating international tension, intensifying confrontation and the arms race. They do not conceal the fact that they bank not simply on military force but on gaining an overwhelming military superiority on a global scale. Their medieval predecessors supported their claims by spears and swords. As for the present-day ones, they set their hopes on "Tridents," "Persings," cruise missiles and neutron bombs. However, in the contemporary world there is a real and powerful counterbalance to these armaments.

Comrade Yu. V. Andropov noted: "In the complex international situation when the imperialist forces are trying to push the peoples onto the path of hostility and military confrontation, the party and the state will staunchly defend the vital interests of our fatherland, maintain a high state of vigilance and readiness to give a crushing rebuff to any attempt at aggression. They will multiply their efforts in the struggle for the security of the peoples, strengthening their cooperation with all peace-loving forces of our planet. We are always ready for honest, equal, and mutually advantageous cooperation with any state which desires it."

This is our program. What do the "crusaders" counterpose? With which ideas would they like to attract the people into the ranks of their anticommunist army? They have nothing to counterpose, no ideas which could be the least bit attractive because the course of kindling hatred between peoples and thoughtlessly playing with death-carrying weapons is not something with which one can attract and lead the people nowadays. Even now, not only military specialists, but simply sober-minded citizens in the United States as well, are asking whether those who entertain the illusions of solving their problems with the help of "limited" or "protracted" nuclear wars ponder the fact that they are playing the part of suicides. There is no clear answer to this question. They have no precise political directions and no clear historical prospects.

The "crusaders" of the end of the 20th century are naked and intellectually poor. They are up in arms against history itself and the progress of mankind. However, it has been known for a long time that it is no use fighting against history.

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

1802/10

WHITHER JAPAN?

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 83 pp 98-109

[Article by Yu. Kuznetsov]

[Text] Two ways are opened to mankind today. The first is strengthening the peace and developing the peaceful cooperation among all states. The second, the dangerous way, is being actively promoted by the supporters of the arms race and balancing on the brink of nuclear war. The vital requirement of preventing a thermal nuclear catastrophe demands of the countries a clear definition of their positions on problems of war and peace. No indifferent and uninvolved attitude toward such vital problems, which affect literally one and all, is possible. As the political declaration issued at the Prague conference of Warsaw Pact members noted, "there is no more important task facing the nations today than preserving the peace and stopping the arms race. All governments and government leaders who make their country's policies have the duty to resolve it."

In this connection, Japan's position justifiably and legitimately draws attention. As the first country in the world which was subjected to the barbaric American atomic bombing and which proclaimed after World War II its refusal to develop its armed forces and to wage war, it could make a considerable contribution to the universal struggle for the elimination of the nuclear threat and the consolidation of the peace. However, Japan's policy clearly reveals alarming features which conflict with the interests of peace the world over and with those of its own nation. The country is being increasingly involved in the orbit of the arms race. Efforts are being made for the Japanese to forget their sad experience in participating in military adventures unleashed by militarism.

Naturally, Tokyo's further foreign policy course will affect not only the country's future but, to a certain extent, the situation in Asia and the Pacific Basin. Understandably, the road which Japan will follow and the choice it will make are hardly matters of indifference to its neighbors.

I

The Japanese example clearly illustrates Lenin's theory of uneven development of capitalist states in the imperialist epoch. In the postwar period the country made a headlong breakthrough, caught up with the Western European countries in terms of basic economic indicators and reached second place in

the capitalist world in the volume of its gross national product, the United States being first. For this reason, the Japanese "model of growth" is being presented with increasing frequency in the West as a "model" for resolving economic problems within the framework of capitalism and is advertised as an example for emulation by less-developed countries.

However, Japan's progress was not smooth and painless. It did not avoid the internal contradictions inherent in capitalism. The pace of Japan's economic growth in the 1950s and 1960s was secured above all by accumulation and exploitation norm indicators considerably higher than in other countries, i.e., achieved at the expense of neglecting a number of vital needs of the broad population strata, as a result of which the country fell behind in the development level of its social infrastructure and left a number of social problems unresolved.

Japan's powerful economic potential which was created in the postwar period is based on the use of huge amounts of imported raw materials and fuel. This faces the country with the acute need invariably to maintain a high level of exports to pay its imports. The practical way in which this potential could normally operate was by keeping wages within the country low and paying low prices for raw materials and energy on world markets. In other words, it could be accomplished at the expense of the Japanese working people and the peoples of the liberated countries. Changes in these circumstances, brought about as a result of the persistent struggle waged by the Japanese working class for its vital interests and the peoples of the liberated countries for the reorganization of international economic relations on the basis of equality, triggered major malfunctions in the work of Japan's economic machinery.

The 1974-1975 crisis, which coincided with the aggravation of the energy and other structural crises within capitalism and the sharp increase in the prices of petroleum and some raw materials put an end to the high growth rates of the Japanese economy and triggered the need for its reorganization, aimed at reducing material-, energy- and labor-intensive production and the all-round development of science-intensive sectors. Priority was given to lines such as the production of computers, machine tools with digital programming, industrial robots, microelectronics, aerospace technology, use of flexible production systems, biotechnology, etc. These areas are related not only to prospects for further economic growth but with the hope of settling the grave social problems within the framework of the existing system, i.e., in the final account, the very future of Japanese capitalism.

The striving to encourage economic development under the conditions of a decline led to an extensive floating of loans, chronic budget deficits and the growth of the national debt, which reached the huge sum of 100 trillion yen in 1982. The state financial crisis was one of the most important reasons for the political crisis of the liberal democratic government and the forced resignation of the Suzuki cabinet that same autumn. However, the Japanese economy was able to avoid major upheavals only as a result of the fast growth of new production facilities, although a number of sectors (the aluminum, petrochemical and textile industries, ferrous metallurgy and shipbuilding) remained in a state of serious crisis.

Under these circumstances exports, which had always been the main booster of the Japanese economy, became even more important. Making extensive use of scientific and technical achievements in mass production, the Japanese monopolies squeezed out their main competitors not only on third-country markets but domestically as well. Japanese automobiles and videotape recorders literally flooded the U.S. and West European markets. The active balance in Japanese-U.S. trade and trade between Japan and Common Market countries, which reached \$35 billion in 1982, is rising steadily. Tokyo's foreign trade expansion is triggering growing discontent in these countries. With increasing frequency Japan is being accused of the fact that the flood of its commodities increases the pace of inflation and unemployment in those countries. The aggravation of interimperialist contradictions, along with the continuing decline of the global capitalist economy, brought about a substantial slowdown in the growth rates of Japanese exports and, consequently, created new economic difficulties.

Despite its powerful economic potential and high technical standards, Japan is quite vulnerable, for it depends on supplies of a number of important resources coming from other countries. Such foreign sources meet 89 percent of energy and 55 percent of food requirements. The country depends almost entirely on imports of important raw materials such as iron ore, copper, phosphorites and bauxites. This situation has been extensively used by the ruling circles in recent years in support of their claim of the need to "protect" Japan's sea lanes and for increasing its military power to this effect.

Japan's situation in the contemporary world, its role in the global economy, the nature of its relations with other countries and its position within the system of the international division of labor objectively dictate an optimal foreign policy course, which is support for an end to the arms race, strengthening peace and developing a comprehensive and equal mutually profitable international cooperation. The country can gain true stability and, consequently true safety and, furthermore, can survive only under the conditions of a durable peace. This precisely is the key to the real and major problems of Japanese security rather than the fabricated "threat from the north," around which a noisy propaganda campaign has been waged for a number of years.

II

As Japan's economic positions strengthen, voices are being heard with increasing frequency calling for the need to make its political weight and international influence consistent with its economic power. It is true that Japan's political influence in the contemporary world is substantially weaker than its positions in the global economy. This is not only and merely a consequence of its defeat in World War II. Japan's voice is insufficiently strong in the international arena above all because it is closely tied to the United States through a military-political alliance--a "security treaty."

Throughout virtually the entire postwar period Japan has followed the lead of Washington's foreign policy. This became particularly clear at the

beginning of the 1980s, when the American administration charted a course of drastic increase in international tension and arms race. As the pursuit of this policy intensified, the United States increased its pressure on Japan, demanding the fastest possible growth of its military power and more active cooperation with American strategy in Asia and the Pacific. Relations between the two countries were described as an alliance officially and for the first time at the May 1981 American-Japanese summit. This formulation concealed Washington's desire to "raise" the "security treaty" to the level of the North Atlantic pact and to impose on Japan the burden of the obligations of an ally, similar to those of NATO countries.

The United States specifically raised for the first time the question of joint actions by the armed forces of the two countries beyond Japanese territory, should an "emergency situation" develop in the Far East, in 1982. Essentially, this inaugurated a new stage in the development of Japanese-American military cooperation. Washington is also asking Japan to carry out its promise to patrol sea and air lanes in a radius of up to 1,700 kilometers from its shores. The purpose of this is to "fill the vacuum," which has allegedly developed in the Far East as a result of the transfer of some American naval forces to the Persian Gulf area.

The administration in Washington is persistently demanding of Japan to increase its military power and military expenditures. C. Weinberger, the U.S. secretary of defense, is particularly zealous in this respect. He misses no occasion to remind the Japanese allies of the need to increase their military efforts. The Congress is not far behind the administration. Last December, the American Senate passed a resolution which called upon Tokyo to strengthen its military potential to increase its military budget annually. This action was quite justifiably considered an example of shameless interference in the country's domestic affairs, aimed at leading it along a dangerous path fraught with most severe consequences. One can easily see that the United States would thus like to achieve several objectives simultaneously: to force Japan to increase its military preparations, to weaken its competitiveness and, as a result, to reduce the huge negative balance in American-Japanese trade.

America's comprehensive pressure confirms the desire of the Reagan administration, under the conditions of the new ratio of forces between the two countries, to preserve the pro-American orientation of Tokyo's foreign policy and to use its leadership in the military area. At the same time, it is trying to avoid the growth of trade frictions into political differences, taking into consideration above all Japan's importance in terms of its political, economic and strategic interests.

The Nakasone government is increasingly yielding to Washington's solicitations. At the end of December it made the decision to increase its military expenditures in the 1983 fiscal year, which begins on 1 April, by 6.5 percent. This was despite the proclamation of a strictest possible economy given the crisis in state finances, holding back expenditures for social insurance and reducing expenditures for education. Furthermore, the actual growth of military expenditures, taking into consideration the expected increases in military salaries, will exceed 8 percent.

In the middle of January the Japanese government decided to agree to Washington's request and grant it the latest, most advanced technology to be used for military purposes. Tokyo had been avoiding this step by all possible means for 1.5 years, citing the ban on exports of Japanese armaments passed by the government and ratified by the parliament. An exception was made for the United States based on the "special" relationship resting on the "security treaty." The granting of Japanese military technology to the United States strengthens the material base of the broadening military cooperation between the two countries.

The Pentagon is also trying to secure access to developments by Japanese companies in the fields of microelectronics, laser technology, superlarge integrated circuits, latest-generation computers, and so on. Technology for the production of antitank, laser-controlled rockets has already been asked of the Kawasaki Zukogio company. Furthermore, as reported in the newspaper SANKEY, government circles in Tokyo are hinting of possible future supplies to the United States of weapons in addition to military technology.

A number of martial statements made by Prime Minister Nakasone in the course of his trip to the United States in January 1983 also confirm the readiness of the Japanese ruling circles to grant new concessions to Washington. His statements on the need to turn Japan into an "unsinkable aircraft carrier," the intention of the Japanese armed forces to block the international straits along its coast in the case of "exceptional circumstances," and thus to hinder international freedom of navigation, and Japan's readiness to ensure the "protection" of sea lanes "between Guam and Tokyo and between the Straits of Taiwan and Osaka" were received in the country with a great deal of concern. The West began to talk of the "Nakasone Doctrine," seeing as its essence the growth of militaristic ambitions of official Tokyo, which is trying to enhance Japan's role in the global strategy of a military confrontation with the Soviet Union.

In taking steps to strengthen the strategic alliance with the United States, the Japanese ruling circles are also trying to establish closer contacts with NATO. As reported by the press, last December Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs approved a course of energizing the country's participation in consultations and conferences within NATO. The question was discussed also during the trip which Shintaro Abe, Japan's minister of foreign affairs, made to Western Europe last January.

Recent foreign policy activities indicate that Japan's ruling circles, while paying increasing attention to strengthening the strategic alliance with Washington, are also pursuing their own interests. They are trying to enhance the country's role in the international arena, considering that this can be achieved mainly by increasing its military power. It is indicative that during his stay in Washington, Nakasone frankly said that in terms of defense and trade problems Japan must not act under U.S. pressure or influence but be guided by its own interests.

It is no secret that influential Japanese forces would like to see the restoration of imperial policy by strengthening the strategic alliance with

Washington. The ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) and its cabinets invariably emphasize that relations with Washington were and remain the "cornerstone" of Japanese foreign policy.

Monopoly capital or, rather, that part of it which is directly related to the war industry and interested in its expansion, is demanding with increasing persistence the elimination of obstacles on the way to the export of Japanese weapons. This would make the organization of mass arms production possible. The government, reflecting the demands of the monopolies and the right-wing of the LDP, is steadily increasing military expenditures. Japan has been increasing its military expenditures by an average of 8 percent annually over the past 10 years.

This course is being paralleled by increasingly loud demands for a review of the current constitution and its Article 9, which calls for a rejection of the creation of armed forces and the waging of war. Although the organization and strengthening of Japan's self-defense forces and increased military expenditures circumvent the current constitution, it nevertheless constitutes a certain obstacle on the path of militarization. The supporters of a constitutional revision demagogically proclaim it the product of the occupation regime and call for an "independent" draft of a new constitution. For the first time, the resolution adopted at the January 1983 LDP Congress openly called for a constitutional revision.

From time to time, Japan's government leaders issue reassuring statements on their absence of intention to convert the country into a "great military power." Nevertheless, Japan already holds 6th place in the capitalist world in terms of military expenditures, outstripping big NATO members such as Italy and Canada.

Increased military power and expanded military cooperation with the United States lead to Japan's profound involvement in the orbit of American aggressive policy. This reduces the country's possibilities of independent making of decisions which directly pertain to the country's national security. An increased pro-American orientation not only does not eliminate Japan's vulnerability but, conversely, could increase its dependence on the United States in terms of procurements of vitally important resources, including raw materials and food.

In pursuing a course of preparations for nuclear war and increasing the nuclear arms race, the Reagan administration is trying to convert Japan, tied to the United States by a military-political alliance, into a "nuclear hostage." Militarization cannot contribute to the growth of Japanese prestige in the world, particularly in Southeast Asia, where the memory of the crimes committed by Japanese militarism during World War II is still fresh and where the shaping of Japanese foreign policy and military strategy in the 1980s is being followed watchfully and concernedly.

III

The heavy casualties suffered by Japan in World War II as a result of its aggressive militaristic policy led to the development of strong and firm

antiwar feelings among the broad popular masses. The movement against the threat of war and for peace assumed such a widespread nature that the Japanese ruling circles and the American military who, despite many years of persistent efforts have been unable to surmount the "nuclear allergy" of the Japanese people or, in other words, to gain their agreement to put U.S. nuclear weapons on Japanese territory, are forced to take it into consideration. For a number of years the public has opposed violently the docking of American nuclear submarines in Japanese ports.

The statement made by E. Reischauer, former U.S. ambassador to Japan, on the existence of agreements according to which American navy ships and aircraft carrying nuclear weapons are allowed free passage across Japanese territorial waters and air space, triggered a new wave of indignation. High Washington officials, including former President Carter, repeatedly claimed that Japanese territory is used to store American nuclear weapons and that the Japanese authorities are aware of this fact.

Pressured by public opinion, the Japanese government proclaimed the so-called "three non-nuclear principles," according to which Japan will not produce, acquire or introduce such weapons on its territory. A broad movement for the strict observance of the non-nuclear principles and for giving them the power of law developed in the country.

The intention of the American military to deploy new types of medium-range nuclear weapons in the Far East and, in particular, to deploy with the agreement of the Japanese government two squadrons of the latest American F-16 fighter-bombers which are capable of carrying nuclear weapons, at the Misawa Air Force Base, in the northern part of Honshu Island, and Tomahawk cruise missiles with nuclear warheads on ships of the Seventh Fleet, based in Japanese ports, was received in Japan with concern and indignation. It is reported that toward the middle of this year the Seventh Fleet will be reinforced with the nuclear aircraft carrier "Charles Winson" and the battleship "New Jersey."

The Japanese public believes that such actions are the specific implementation of the strategy adopted by the present American administration of waging "limited" nuclear war, according to which the United States itself hopes to avoid a nuclear conflagration and turn the territory of its allies, Japan in this case, into a nuclear battlefield. Objections to Washington's dangerous plans, which are helping to convert Japan into an American nuclear base in the Far East, were voiced by the communist and socialist parties, the trade unions and many mass democratic organizations. M. Akagi, a member of parliament and noted leader of the ruling LDP, pointed out in an article published in the newspaper ASAHI that "as a result of the deployment of tactical nuclear missiles in the Far East the danger of involving Japan in a limited nuclear war is assuming an increasingly realistic nature. If Tokyo, relying on the U.S. 'nuclear umbrella,' would continue to strengthen its alliance with Washington and abandon the 'three non-nuclear principles,' the result would be the doom of the Japanese nation."

The antiwar and antinuclear movement, which has rich traditions in promoting mass campaigns for banning atomic and hydrogen weapons, and the nationwide struggle against a Japanese-American "security treaty," has been noticeably energized in Japan as American imperialism is intensifying international tension and accelerating the arms race. The main slogans of the antiwar movement today are the abrogation of the "security treaty," the evacuation of American forces and military bases from Japanese soil, abandonment of the country's militarization, reduction of military expenditures, pursuit of a truly peaceful foreign policy, prevention of the deployment of new types of nuclear weapons in the Far East, strict observance of the antiwar constitution and the "three non-nuclear principles," banning nuclear weapons, ending the arms race and promoting disarmament.

Opposition to the threat of war and nuclear arms has assumed a mass and comprehensive nature in Japan. More than 80 million people signed petitions calling for the total banning of nuclear weapons and for disarmament in 1982. These documents were presented to the second special disarmament session of the U.S. General Assembly. A mass demonstration of Japanese peace supporters was held in Hiroshima in March 1982. It was abandoned by 200,000 people. It was held under the slogans of preventing a nuclear war, banning nuclear weapons, ending militarization and abrogating the military alliance with the United States. Some 400,000 people attended a similar demonstration in Tokyo, last May, and about half a million were present in Osaka in October.

A characteristic feature of the current stage of the antiwar movement in Japan is the extensive involvement of new population strata and social and political forces. Members of the intelligentsia of different political orientations--writers, painters, musicians, actors and lawyers--are firmly speaking out against the nuclear threat.

The religious organizations, many of which have never before participated in such activities, are very active in the antinuclear movement. Buddhist organizations, rallying millions of members, have become involved in a variety of antiwar measures. Local self-administration organs are increasingly joining the antinuclear movement.

The communist and socialist parties and the mass democratic organizations supporting them, including the largest trade union association in the country--the General Council of Japanese Trade Unions (SOHIO)--with its more than 4.5 million members--are marching in the front ranks of the antiwar movement. The Japanese Communist Party is engaged in an antiwar campaign under the slogan "Let Us Prevent Japan From Becoming a Nuclear Battlefield and Let Us Protect the Rights and Interests of the People!" The 47th Socialist Party Congress, which was held last December, called upon the party membership to launch a widespread movement against the transformation of Japan into a military power, for banning nuclear weapons and for peace.

A tendency to cooperate is increasing among the various organizations, which mostly act by themselves, as the broad masses become involved in the antiwar movement. However, the task of promoting a firm unity of action remains unresolved.

The deployment of Japan's political forces influences the nature and composition of the antiwar movement. For many years, its distinguishing feature was the fact that, on the one hand, the LDP enjoys the majority in both chambers of parliament and the country has a one-party government. On the other, the opposition, with more than one-third of the seats, blocks the efforts of rightwing forces to revise the constitution, including its antiwar article. The struggle for the defense of the constitution, directly related to the antiwar movement, is based on broad mass support: according to public opinion polls some 70 percent of the Japanese consider the preservation of the current constitution necessary.

The positions of the LDP had become noticeably weaker by the end of the 1970s. It enjoyed an insignificant majority in both chambers of parliament and was forced to adopt a cautious position, which applied to the country's militarization as well. However, profiting from the aggravated discord within the opposition, the liberal democrats were able to gain a firm majority in both houses of parliament at the June 1980 elections. This immediately gave the policy of the ruling party an openly "hawkish" nature. Japan's militaristic leaning is a reflection of this new trend.

This line followed by the ruling party also facilitates the further turn to the right of the centrist part of the opposition--the Democratic Socialist Party (DSP) and the Komeito Party--in recent years. The DSP has invariably supported the "security treaty" and the rearming of Japan. Komeito, which began by opposing the Japanese-American military alliance and Japan's militarization, subsequently changed its course on several occasions and, in the final account, pronounced itself in favor of the "security treaty" and the existence of "self-defense forces."

The lack of unity among the opposition parties is reflected in the trade union movement as well. The trade unions account for slightly more than 30 percent of all workers, or 12.4 million people. Two-thirds of them are members of trade unions affiliated with four nationwide trade union movements, while the other 4.6 million are members of independent trade unions. The line pursued by the various trade union groups clearly reflects the division within the trade union movement. Thus, SOHIO is actively involved in antiwar actions, whereas the All-Japanese Labor Confederation (DOMEI) is in favor of increased Japanese military power and the preservation of the military alliance with the United States.

Efforts are currently being made to create a unified trade union association, initiated by the right-wing reformist leadership which does not conceal intention to subordinate the trade union movement to the ideology of class cooperation, to undermine its antimonopoly nature and to lead it to anti-communist positions. Such actions are supported by the reactionary International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the right-wing American AF of L-CIO. However, such intrigues are being opposed by the broad toiling masses which are aware of the need to wage a decisive joint struggle for the preservation of their democratic rights and vital interests.

The internal political struggle cannot fail to hinder the development of the antiwar movement. However, the circumstances today are such that no single major political force can ignore it. Japan has an Association of Parliamentary Deputies for Cooperation in International Disarmament, which includes representatives from all political parties. Even the LDP, in order not to find itself isolated, was forced to proclaim its intention to cooperate in putting an end to the arms race and nuclear disarmament, although at the same time the ruling party is trying to hinder the development and expansion of the Japanese antinuclear movement. All of this proves that the antiwar potential of the Japanese people remains sufficiently high. The peaceloving forces have by far not exhausted their possibilities of waging a successful struggle for their country's peaceful future.

IV

Japan's subordinate status in its military-political alliance with the United States is also reflected in its approach to relations with the Soviet Union. Frequent looks at Washington have characterized this approach, particularly in recent years.

Starting with the 1980s, the progressive development of Soviet-Japanese relations became noticeably hindered. The Japanese side began artificially to hold back and limit relations with the Soviet Union in various areas. This was paralleled by the mounting of a variety of hostile campaigns toward our country in Japan. It is an open secret that the discriminatory measures adopted toward the Soviet Union were imposed on Japan by the United States, as part of its course of increasing international tension.

Relations between Japan and the Soviet Union are being sacrificed to the imperial ambitions and whims of its ally across the ocean. For many years Washington worked to gain a decisive say in defining the level of Japanese-USSR relations; nevertheless, Japan was able to avoid such "allied" aspirations by referring, in particular, to its proclaimed "multilateral diplomacy," which meant a balanced development of relations with all countries regardless of their sociopolitical system.

However, not much has been heard about this so-called multilateral diplomacy in Tokyo in recent years. Under the pretext of extensively proclaimed "Western solidarity," Japan is being increasingly involved in the fairway of Washington's line of confrontation with the socialist world, increased tension and accelerated arms race. In order to calm Japan's public opinion, particularly its business circles, which have expressed their fears in connection with the unnatural restrictions imposed in relations with the USSR, the ridiculous thesis has been proclaimed according to which the development of Soviet-Japanese relations is of greater interest to the Soviet side which, allegedly, is suffering great harm from their spoiling.

History has repeatedly confirmed the groundlessness of views to the effect that the Soviet Union cannot develop its economy without foreign assistance. The mature socialist society, which was created by the Soviet people despite imperialist obstructions and intrigues, is a clear confirmation of this.

Naturally, the USSR was and remains in favor of long-term mutually profitable economic cooperation with countries with different social systems, including Japan. However, Soviet-Japanese relations can be based only on common interest, whether it is a question of political contact, or trade-economic and other relations.

Under the circumstances marked by uninterrupted economic difficulties, the desire to develop trade and economic relations with the Soviet Union is intensifying among Japanese business circles. "Japan's business world is concerned by the fact that it has fallen considerably behind the West in terms of economic relations with the USSR," the newspaper IOMIURI wrote. The Soviet market is becoming increasingly important to Japan while the global capitalist economy is unsuccessfully seeking a solution to its deep economic crisis. The recent trip to Moscow by an economic delegation, the most representative in the entire history of our relations, which included heads of the largest companies, who play a noted role in the country's economy, is a clear reflection of this new situation.

Some Japanese forces are still trying to set as a condition for the development of Soviet-Japanese relations, including relations in the economic area, the meeting of their groundless territorial claims against the Soviet Union. Today's Japanese government is proclaiming its desire for a dialogue with the USSR and the establishment of "stable relations based on mutual understanding." However, the so-called "return of the northern territories" is declared a prerequisite to this effect.

It is entirely obvious that such considerations are groundless. The Soviet side has repeatedly stated that there is no item such as the allegedly unresolved "territorial problem" in Soviet-Japanese relations. "... Statements according to which readiness to normalize relations is linked with the demand for the Soviet Union to pay for this with some kind of preliminary concessions in many areas are not serious, to say the least. This we shall not accept... The Soviet Union favors an agreement which, however, should be reached on the basis of reciprocity and equality," Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, said at the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The continuing campaign on the myth of the "Soviet threat," fabricated abroad and shipped to Japan, is greatly harming the atmosphere of Soviet-Japanese relations. The purposes of this campaign are to instigate in the Japanese people mistrust in the Soviet Union, delete from the minds of the Japanese the positive experience gained in the course of fruitful cooperation with our country, and to justify unfriendly actions toward the Soviet Union, such as the current notorious "Northern Territories Day." The "Soviet threat" is used as justification for increasing military expenditures, while increased military power is presented as a reliable means for backing territorial aspirations.

As we know, to this day no peace treaty has been concluded between the USSR and Japan because of the persistent unwillingness of the Japanese side to accept the reality of the present and its attempt to link the signing of such

a treaty with actually nonexistent problems. The Japanese side has been unwilling even to consider the draft good neighborhood and cooperation treaty, suggested by the Soviet Union 5 years ago, which could have codified the positive results achieved in various fields of Soviet-Japanese relations and the basic principles governing relations between the two countries and created a base for their further development.

Such are the complex circumstances in which the Soviet Union is systematically pursuing toward Japan a course of development of good neighborly relations, cooperation and mutual trust, consistent with the interests of the peoples of both countries and peace in the Far East and throughout the world. As a result of this course, in the quarter of a century which has lapsed following the resumption of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Japan, in October 1956, bilateral relations--trade-economic, scientific and technical, cultural, sports, and so on--have expanded considerably and a good foundation for their further development has been laid.

The USSR invariably tries to organize relations with Japan on a firm contractual base. The Soviet proposal for a good neighborly relation and cooperation treaty was based on the fact that Japan was not ready to initial a peace treaty with the USSR. As N. A. Tikhonov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman, emphasized, in his answers to questions asked by the newspaper ASAHI, the proposal has not been withdrawn. It offers the possibility of drafting a document acceptable to both sides, should Japan be willing to do so.

The Soviet Union, which is in favor of developing good neighborly relations, mutually profitable cooperation and mutual trust with Japan, suggests that mutual fears and concerns be discussed and that measures acceptable to both countries aimed at strengthening the trust be agreed upon, i.e., the initiation of a bilateral movement aimed at implementing the idea formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress on the formulation and adoption of measures of trust in the Far East.

Progress in this direction would have a positive impact not only on Soviet-Japanese relations. The adoption of measures of trust would promote detente in this important strategic area. Unquestionably, this would be consistent with the interests of the peoples of all countries in the region and would open the way to broader measures to reduce tension and strengthen peace in the Far East and the Pacific. Such measures could include, for example, agreements on mutual nonaggression and nonuse of force in the area. As we know, the Mongolian People's Republic has formulated such an initiative.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly proclaimed its readiness to guarantee on a treaty basis the nonuse of nuclear weapons against countries which have no nuclear weapons and neither produce it nor stockpile them on their territory. The USSR sees no obstacles to initiating the exchange of views on this matter with Japan as well. This could be done both within the framework of the proposal of holding talks on measures of trust in the Far East as well as in any other forms acceptable to both countries. Naturally, what matters is the full and reliable implementation of Japan's "three non-nuclear principles," so that no one would doubt their strict observance.

The other peaceful initiatives of the Soviet Union, formulated after the 26th CPSU Congress, also apply most directly to Japan. It is a question above all of a mutual limitation of United States and USSR naval activities and, particularly, of withdrawing nuclear missile-carrying submarines of both sides from the current vast areas of combat patrolling, so that their navigation be limited within agreed-upon boundaries. This includes the proposal of discussing the question of extending measures of trust to seas and oceans, particularly along the most heavily trafficked sea lanes. The implementation of such proposals could transform most of the world's oceans into a zone of peace, which would be of vital importance to Japan considering its extended sea communications and developed shipping.

The extensive program of measures to strengthen good neighborly ties, cooperation and trust relations with Japan and for reducing tension in the areas around it, drafted by the Soviet Union, once again confirms the peaceful nature of our policy toward this country. The development of good neighborly relations with the Soviet Union, including the expansion of mutually profitable economic cooperation, cannot harm Japan or its sovereignty in any way. At the same time, it could eliminate the one-sidedness of Japan's foreign policy, increase the stability of its economy, significantly reduce its vulnerability and, in the final account, contribute to resolving the problem of the country's security in the broadest meaning of the term. The strengthening of good neighborly relations, cooperation and trust with the Soviet Union would offer a far more reliable guarantee for Japan's security than the so-called American "nuclear umbrella."

Naturally, it is up to Japan to decide how to structure its foreign policy, relations with the Soviet Union in particular. However, in making a responsible political choice it should not ignore historical experience which reminds one of the danger of adopting a militaristic course in the country's development both in terms of the Japanese people themselves and the peoples of other Asian countries. The best way in which Japan could contribute to strengthening peace throughout the world is by developing relations of good neighborhood with other countries and truly pursuing a peaceful policy.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

ON TEACHING SCIENTIFIC COMMUNISM IN VUZS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 83 pp 110-114

[Letter to the editors by V. Fetisov, candidate of philosophical sciences, Leningrad]

[Text] Experience in higher school teaching of and student study of scientific communism, a fundamental subject in Marxist-Leninist social science, proves that a number of important problems of method and methodology remain unsolved in this most serious matter on which I would like to express some views.

Unquestionably, the study of scientific communism is among the most important in the ideological and political training of the future specialists. Theoretically summing up the practice of the revolutionary struggle and the building of the new society, this science clearly reveals the social, i.e., the communist nature of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. That is why the extent to which it is mastered profoundly and fully determines the level of the students' mastery of Marxism-Leninism as a whole, their interest in it and the degree of its influence on all their labor and sociopolitical activities. Improving the quality of teaching scientific communism in the VUZ, therefore, is the most important component in upgrading the efficiency of our entire ideological and political-educational work.

The study of students' answers at tests and state examinations indicates that the main shortcoming is the fragmentary and unsystematic nature of their knowledge. Most of them are properly familiar with individual theoretical postulates but, as a rule, are unable to see the links between them, their hierarchical scale, the general structure of the course, etc.

Yet system is one of the typical characteristics of science. If the acquired knowledge is not systematized in the person's mind it is difficult to speak of having mastered a science. Separate and unrelated information has no noticeable effect on individual behavior and activities. In such a case, it is hardly possible to convert knowledge into conviction and into an active life stance. There is nothing amazing in the fact that such knowledge begins to co-exist with political infantilism and naivete easily and peacefully. This kind of knowledge cannot counter hostile ideology and act as a weapon in the struggle of ideas which is becoming increasingly tense and acute today. Is not such knowledge the basis of a superficial comparison between the two worlds, a comparison resting on the level of isolated facts culled from social reality?

In addressing himself to the youth, V. I. Lenin said: "...We must develop the skill of acquiring the sum total of human knowledge in such a way that communism will not be something learned by rote but something you have reasoned out, conclusions inescapable from the viewpoint of modern education" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 306). The mastery of Marxism-Leninism in general and scientific communism in particular is precisely the only true method for acquiring the type of knowledge which reveals comprehensively and specifically the historical accomplishments and advantages of socialism and the legitimate nature of the progress of all mankind toward communism and depicts the role of both individual classes and individuals.

What is the reason for insufficient systematization of the students' knowledge of scientific communism? In my view, it is that we, the teachers, fail to pay proper attention to this aspect of the matter. No special works are to be found in scientific-methodical publications, treating scientific communism as a system and providing pertinent recommendations as to its teaching and mastery. So far our efforts have been focused mainly on the presentation and mastery of new topics. Now we must convert from extensive to intensive development and mastery of scientific communism. The main way to achieve this is to upgrade the level of its systematized presentation. Without this, its teaching as a school subject will not yield the necessary social results to which the social scientists are directed by the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the October 1981 all-union conference of heads of social science chairs and the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Further Improving the System for Upgrading the Skill of Social Science Teachers in Higher Education Institutions."

A training discipline has a number distinct features compared with the related science. They are based on the cognitive possibilities of the students, time limitations and several other factors. Nevertheless, as a VUZ discipline, scientific communism can and must be brought as closely as possible to the contemporary level of that science. This is due to the important fact that the subject is studied in the final courses. Consequently, the students are theoretically and methodologically prepared to master this science as a system.

The current structure of the training course hardly meets this requirement. The new "Curriculum for the Course in Scientific Communism for Higher Educational Institutions" (1982) is a step ahead in this respect, for it introduces previously unstudied important topics. In our view, however, further efforts must be made to improve it. The firm mastery of a science presumes the type of presentation of the material showing the organic ties among various topics, laws and categories, and provides an overall specific concept of the subject.

In this case a specific sequence in teaching socialism as a social and global system and leading revolutionary force of our time is of basic importance. In the course's curriculum it begins with a review of the global socialist system as the main revolutionary force of our time (Section 2, topic 5). However, can this role be depicted profoundly and comprehensively without a previous knowledge of the specific nature of this social system? Teaching practice answers this question negatively. The role of the socialist comity in the world revolutionary process is determined by the foreign and domestic policies of its constituent countries, the power of their example, the new type of relations existing among them, etc. However, a considerable number of such questions are

discussed only at the end of the third section, in the topic "Laws Governing the Development of the World Socialist System." This sequence in the presentation of the subject is wrong theoretically and methodologically.

The structural shortcomings of the course are manifested in a number of other features as well. Thus, for instance, the place of the topic on the scientific management of society presents a great teaching difficulty. It is at the end of the lecture course. According to the logic of the presentation of the subject it appears that the scientific management of society is inherent only at the stage of transition from socialism to communism. In reality, the entire process of building the new system is based on scientific analysis.

How is the comprehensive and specific interpretation of the transitional period and the stage of building a developed socialist society possible without a presentation of this very important aspect of the historical process or expaining the role which the political system and its nucleus -- the communist party -- play in it? Obviously, such an approach would separate the subjective factor from objective conditions and would lead to developing in the students a one-sided abstract concept of the process of development of the new system with all the negative consequences this entails.

The limitations of this letter prevents us from citing other examples proving the need to reorganize the structure of the training course in such a way as to make the mastery of this science as a system possible.

What is the main reason for these and many other similar shortcomings? In our view, it lies in the interpretation of the subject of scientific communism. After years of discussion, the problem remains essentially unresolved, which has an adverse effect on teaching practices.

There is a widespread view today that scientific communism deals with the sociopolitical area of society. However, the study of its content shows something different. Some topics ("Transition: Period from Capitalism to Socialism," "The Developed Socialist Society") apply to the entire society. Others do this differentiatedly, "in parts," so to say. Yet no aspect of social life is excluded from scientific communism (including the material and technical base, the scientific and technical revolution, social relations, etc.).

This fact raises a number of questions in the minds of both students and teachers. Why is it that scientific communism, which is defined in the current curriculum actually only as a science of the sociopolitical laws governing the struggle for the victory and establishment of the new system, in fact goes far beyond the framework of superstructural phenomena? On what basis does its study apply only to the social and political areas? In this science what is the connection among topics dealing with various aspects of social life, etc.?

Generally speaking, the actual content of scientific communism is inconsistent with the definition of its subject as cited. It is significantly richer and broader than the limitations set by the given definition. The principal one is the inability to present this science as a logical system of knowledge. The system-forming principles used in defining the subject become no longer operational in the further presentation of the material. For that reason, each

topic is discussed separately, without close interconnection with another. The result is the fragmentary, one-sided and eclectic perception of the subject. Thus mastered information does not blend with previously acquired knowledge and does not complete it as an integral whole. Consequently, in this case scientific communism does not perform its function as the final part of Marxism-Leninism. However, the main task to which the CPSU Central Committee decree we mentioned pays particular attention is for the students to master Marxism-Leninism as an integral doctrine.

The contradiction between this definition of the subject of scientific communism and its actual content can be resolved either by deleting from this science topics unrelated to the sociopolitical area or adopting a different interpretation of the subject of its study. The second method seems to us to be more accurate for a number of reasons. Let us consider some of them.

To begin with, we can neither ignore the actual meaning of scientific communism nor turn its content into a fetish. Essentially, as we pointed out, it covers the entire society in a specific manner. Even authors who reduce the subject of this science merely to the sociopolitical sphere are forced to admit this, thus contradicting themselves. Clearly, it is no accident that the problems of scientific communism show a clearly manifested trend toward expanding and involving in their orbit increasingly new aspects of social life. What does this prove? Among others, the fact that this definition is one-sided and that we have still not defined the specific nature of scientific communism even after lengthy discussions. Yet who would be daring enough to proclaim that there exists another science which studies the communist system as a whole, in its development, and which combines within itself knowledge of the topic and the laws governing its development? No other such science exists. Therefore, we should perhaps look seriously and define the true specifics of scientific communism which, in our view, clearly do not consist of restricting the "realm of action" but finding an "angle of vision" consistent with objective truth.

Secondly, if scientific communism reveals the laws governing the process of human progress toward communism, which is reflected in its overall structure, it can not be limited to the study of only a few aspects of society in the course of the analysis of the individual stages of the process (transitional period, socialism, etc.).

Thirdly, the Marxian concept to the effect that the essence of the progress of social systems is the growth of their integrity has undergone a certain development in recent scientific publications (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 46, part I, p 229). The development of society represents the kind of change in the course of which the transition from one level of integrity to another takes place. The fullest manifestation of this process is found in the development of the communist system. The practical and theoretical need to study this superior type of social system arises. However, it can be met neither by the individual social sciences, although combined, nor by historical materialism. Scientific communism alone can provide specific knowledge of such a system in its integrity. However, it can accomplish this only when it is not restricted to the study of individual areas but, on the basis of the other sciences, it synthesizes existing knowledge of society.

Fourthly, reducing the problem of scientific communism to the indicated area would mean lowering the role of this science as society advances toward communism. In reality, its significance increases as the new society is created, as the materials of the 25th and 26th CPSU Congresses and other party documents convincingly indicate.

Finally, narrowing the subject of scientific communism to the sociopolitical area means classifying it as a separate science. At that point, however, its correlation with the other sciences also engaged in the study of this area becomes unclear. Hence the inevitable conclusion of their duplication.

To limit the subject of scientific communism to the sociopolitical sphere means to base it on the premise that each structural component of Marxism-Leninism is engaged in the study of a specific feature of social life. However, this concept applies only to political economy. As to philosophy, as we well know, its subject cannot be reduced to a specific social area. Historical materialism deals with the basic problem of philosophy as applicable to society and is the methodology used in its study. That is why it neither sets nor could set itself the task of comprehensively studying not only any given aspect of social life but even an individual system. It is equally wrong to reduce the subject of scientific communism to one or even several areas and thus to interpret this science as a separate one. Such an approach hinders the interpretation of the true nature of scientific communism and its functions. As we saw, it leads to theoretical and methodological contradictions; it creates inconsistencies and eclecticism in the presentation of the topic, as a result of which the social effectiveness of teaching it is reduced.

The study of the statements of the Marxist-Leninist classics proves that they gave a different definition of scientific communism. They considered it the theory of the conscious and purposeful activities of the working class for the revolutionary transformation of society in accordance with their basic requirements and interests. Since the latter can be met only as a result of radical and comprehensive social changes, as a theory of the revolutionary activities of the working class scientific communism cannot be limited to a consideration of its individual aspects. The fact that this social transformation begins in the political area is a different matter. The proletariat, which turns from "a class within itself" into "a class for itself" in the course of the class struggle, and which organizes itself under the guidance of its political party, begins its struggle for power in society, for "the basic economic interest of the proletariat can be met only through political revolution which replaces bourgeois with proletarian dictatorship" (V. I. Lenin, *op.cit.*, vol 6, p 46).

As the main objective of the struggle before the socialist revolution, after its completion the dictatorship of the proletariat turns increasingly into a means for resolving economic, social and cultural problems. Now it is a question of consciously and purposefully changing all aspects of social life. Scientific communism is precisely the direct theory of this change.

In our view, such a concept of scientific communism resolves the contradictions we noted as a result of reducing its subject to the sociopolitical sphere. It enables us, first of all, to coordinate the subject and the content of this science; second of all, to define the specific nature of scientific communism

in terms of historical materialism and the individual sciences; in the third place, to reveal the continuity and qualitative distinctions between scientific communism and utopian socialism, and finally, to show its social functions and increased role in the process of communist construction.

What interests us most at this point is that such an approach to scientific communism enables us to present it as a specific steadily developing system of scientific knowledge and, on this basis, to identify its cognitive and ideological-theoretical and social functions.

The main social function of scientific communism is to study the process of the preparation for, appearance and development of the new system, the identification of the characteristics of its individual stages, the forms of transition from one stage to another, and so on. That is precisely why Lenin defined scientific communism as the "theory and program of the workers movement" (op. cit., vol 26, p 50).

Scientific communism studies the objective conditions and the subjective factor in their organic unity and interaction during each of the stages. Consequently, it provides a comprehensive, an integral idea of society, but on a level different from that of historical materialism and more specific.

We believe that the following changes in the structure of the course in scientific communism would be methodically more accurate:

1. Scientific communism as a structural component of Marxism-Leninism.
2. Establishment and victory of socialism.
3. Developed socialist society and gradual transition to communism.
4. The world socialist system and the laws governing its development.
5. The contemporary epoch and the world revolutionary process.

Such a sequence clarifies the connection among the various processes and more fully identifies problems related to the expansion and intensification of the revolutionary reorganization of the world and the building of socialism and communism.

Naturally, overall changes in the course will necessitate some changes in the structure of the individual sections.

Thus, in accordance with the overall logic of the presentation, it will be necessary to develop the thesis of the historical mission of the working class in greater detail. It would be expedient to begin the second section with the theory of the socialist revolution. In the present curriculum this theory is presented in one place (Section II, topic 4), while the transitional period is described in another (Section III, topic 12). This gap is wrong from all points of view. It adversely affects the understanding and mastery of both topics by the students.

In the structure we propose, the world socialist system and the laws governing its development are covered in a separate, fourth, section. This is based, above all, on the importance and role of the world socialist system in international life and, secondly, the logic of the presentation of mankind's progress toward communism. The emergence of the world socialist system is a qualitatively new step in this respect, a feature not reflected in the current curriculum. Presently, this topic is divided among problems related to similar but nevertheless different topics. Furthermore, by joining the problems of the establishment of socialism as a social system, it violates the logic of its presentation (Section III, topic 16).

Whereas the preceding sections studied the process of establishment and development of the new society as such, the new fourth section considers the interaction among the various socialist countries which are a qualitatively new phenomenon -- the world socialist system. The final part of the course "The Contemporary Age and the World Revolutionary Process" presents the interaction among all revolutionary forces, depicting the main role played among them by the world socialist system, which is becoming the decisive force in mankind's historical development.

A systematic presentation of scientific communism enables us to define the true place and role of each topic in the structure of the discipline. Thus, the topic of the scientific management of society, as we pointed out, should not be presented at the end of the course and be "wedged" in the study of the individual aspects of social life. In accordance with the specifics of scientific communism, it would be more accurate to cover it earlier, together with the overall description of the communist system. The sections on the various stages should describe the systematic development of the purposeful activities of society and the features of scientific management at each one of them. On this level, the study of developed socialism becomes particularly important. The utilization of its opportunities and the solution of actual problems are, as the 26th CPSU Congress emphasized, organically related to improvements on all levels of planned social activities and the improved quality and intensification of each sector of our work.

The concept of scientific communism we described makes its particular approach to the various social areas clearer. This enables us to break the circle which developed in the course of the discussion: the more the subject of scientific communism is defined, the more it contradicts the real meaning of this science. On the other hand, extending the subject to all realms of society leads to the substitution and duplication of other sciences by scientific communism, which triggers justifiable objections. In reality, scientific communism studies all realms of social life but in a specific way.

On this level, let us consider the sociopolitical sphere. Here political institutions must be considered not simply for their own sake but as means for meeting the vital requirements of the toiling classes. Contemporary events show that it is not only important to have but to make proper use of the power of the working class.

Therefore, the attention which scientific communism pays to the sociopolitical sphere is increased rather than reduced. This creates opportunities for its

more comprehensive, specific and profound coverage both as a whole and in specific aspects: the development of socialist democracy and the increased role of the political system and its nuclei, the Marxist-Leninist parties, which represent most completely and consistently the interests of the working people and guide their struggle and construction efforts. This makes understandable the organic combination of theory with practice and science with politics in the activities of these parties. In this connection it appears more expedient to describe the role of the ruling parties in building socialism not at the end of the course but together with the characterization of the new system. It can be depicted more specifically through the study of its individual stages.

The systematic mastery of scientific communism, based on the presentation of the specific features of the subject, will help to enhance the social role of this science and to combine theory with specific practical activities.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

FIGHTING YEAR OF 1918

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 83 pp 115-118

[Review by Yu. Polyakov, USSR academy of sciences corresponding member, of the book "God 1918-y" [The Year 1918] by I. I. Mints. Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 576 pp]

[Text] The Soviet public is well familiar with the extensive basic work by academician I. I. Mints "Istoriya Velikogo Oktyabrya" [History of the Great October], which was awarded the Lenin Prize.

This scientist has now completed a new work: "God 1918-y." This is essentially a continuation of his previous work. The chronological and logical unity between it and the three-volume "Istoriya Velikogo Oktyabrya" is obvious, for the socialist revolution did not end in the least but only began in 1917, and the implementation of most important revolutionary changes in town and country took place in 1918. However, in terms of its topic and problems it covers, this is a separate work for, as it extends and develops the main directions of the radical reconstruction of society, which were earmarked in the great 1917, the year 1918 also opened new ways to the advance of the revolution and exposed new tremendous layers of the historical process.

In terms of saturation with events the year 1918 was tremendous and striking. As we mentally leaf through the pages of history we are unwittingly amazed at the large number of countless military, political and socioeconomic events which crowded these 365 days.

They range from the first nationalized factories to the establishment of a significant socialist economic system which assumed commanding positions; from the first voluntary Red Army detachments, which joined the fight against the German aggressors on the plains of Narva and Pskov, swept by February snow storms, to the numerous regular red-star divisions which won major victories east, west, north and south; from the conclusion under duress of the superharsh Brest Peace Treaty to the etched words of the 13 November 1918 All-Russian Central Executive Committee: "The Brest Litovsk Treaty... is hereby proclaimed null and void as a whole and in all stipulations;" "from the first independent steps of the organization of soviets to their strengthening on a nationwide scale and to the Soviet Constitution" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 37, p 534).

The year 1918 was marked by crucial socioeconomic changes among the peasantry and by most important steps taken in national-state construction, reorganization of public education and creation of a socialist culture.

The multiplicity of events and phenomena made this book particularly difficult to write and the author has been able to cover many but not all areas.

That is why I. I. Mints accurately based the structure of his material on the Leninist principle of selecting the main link and singled out the main such links for 1918. This includes, first of all, the task of consolidating the worker-peasant regime, created by the October Revolution, and the development of the building of socialism; secondly, the task of defending the revolution and repelling the attack of international imperialism.

A great deal of time and effort were needed following the proclamation of the Soviet system on 7 November 1917 before the people's power could be established throughout the country. The process of establishing Soviet power spilled into the first months of 1918. With every passing week, however, increasing priority had to be given to problems of the organization of the new society.

History knows of no other such complex and difficult undertaking. The destruction of the old and the creation of the new took place in a strangely interwoven fabric sometimes full of dramatic conflicts. Everything accomplished in revolutionary Russia was being done for the first time and each step taken by the young state was a step into the unknown.

A creative process of embodiment of Marxist-Leninist theory was under way. Marxism-Leninism was being practically tested and confirmed. Meanwhile, theory was being enriched and developed through practical experience and the revolutionary creativity of the party and the masses.

The foes of communism love to claim that the Marxists are bound by dogmatism and automatically follow theories created long before the revolution. Nothing could be farther from reality. Yes, Marxist-Leninist theory is a reliable compass and guideline which define the basic targets, tasks and directions of the struggle. However, it is not an ossified but steadily enriched and developing doctrine. Before the revolution theory had determined the major and essential lines of the revolutionary transformation of the world and the inevitable expropriation of the exploiters. "This had been determined with scientific accuracy," V. I. Lenin pointed out in May 1918. "...But we could not be aware of either the forms of the reorganization or the speed with which a specific reorganization would be accomplished" (op. cit., vol 36, p 380).

The scientific concepts of the struggle for socialism acquired a specific meaning in the course of the revolution. Theory helped practice while practice enriched theory.

The Soviet state did tremendous work in the search for and elaboration and definition of ways, means and rates of socialist change in all realms of life without exception and in their trying, comparison and practical testing.

I. I. Mints has been able to depict convincingly the new features which revolutionary practice introduced in revolutionary theory. Essentially this applied to all sides of life, for no single aspect of the material and spiritual areas remained unaffected by the whirlwind of revolutionary change.

The creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory, consistent with revolutionary practice, is described in a very concentrated manner in the section on "Lenin's Plan for Laying the Foundations for Socialism." Lenin thoroughly planned and formulated the specific tasks related to the building of socialism, providing outlines, consulting with people's commissars and officials, practical workers and scientists, and drafting articles on individual features and concepts of the plan for building a new society, most brilliantly expressed in the article "The Forthcoming Tasks of the Soviet System."

Lenin's views on the need to resolve the main problem -- the administration of the country -- are convincingly presented. The revolution destroys the old administrative and social relations systems and must create new ones. However, the new socialist relations do not develop within capitalism. That is why, Lenin wrote, the main task is to engage in "positive or constructive work in establishing the new exceptionally complex and delicate network of new organizational relations which encompass the planned production and distribution of commodities needed to maintain the lives of dozens of millions of people" (op. cit., vol 36, p 171).

Lenin brilliantly predicted one of the long-term main difficulties in building socialism. It is precisely because the new system had not appeared earlier, was not "run in," in the course of time and was not practically tested, but was created for the first time by the socialist state that it was accompanied by shortcomings which must be corrected with gaining experience. The proper functioning of the system demands the prevention of the freezing or ossification of some methods which have either been found to be inadequate or obsolete and less expedient. What is obsolete and has failed must be eliminated on time and what grows out of reality and is tested by it must be supported and developed.

To the end of his life, Lenin tirelessly struggled for the establishment and improvement of a system of socialist social relations, mercilessly discarding the unsuitable and lovingly and carefully supporting the viable, sensible and expedient.

The work proves that Lenin ascribed a special role within this system to the organization of a socialist public labor system and strict nationwide accountability and control over the production and distribution of goods.

It is necessary to point out that this problem remained among the most important ones for many years. The rapid and dynamic development of Soviet society offers new conditions which call for improving and amending control and accountability methods. High labor productivity as an indicator of the superiority of the new society, and the development of labor discipline and competition as laws of socialism -- problems which Lenin formulated immediately after the revolution -- remain topical to this day.

Several sections of the book describe the strengthening and development of soviets, centrally and locally. Extensive data are cited, convincingly proving their democratic nature and the manner in which Lenin's task of "raising the lowest of the low to historical creativity.." (op. cit., vol 35, p 189) was implemented.

Using a broad historical background the author describes the drafting and adoption of the 1918 RSFSR Constitution -- the First Soviet Constitution. He emphasizes its radical and essential difference from the constitutions of bourgeois countries. The RSFSR Constitution codified the gains of the October Revolution. For the first time in mankind's history it shifted the center of gravity to guaranteeing proclaimed rights and freedoms.

Great attention has been paid to the problems of the agrarian revolution, the abolition of estate land ownership and the distribution of the land among the peasants, the intensification of the socialist revolution in the countryside, the acute and irreconcilable struggle waged against the kulaks by the rural poor led by the working class, the establishment of a proletarian grain dictatorship, the organization of committees of the poor and changes in the social structure of the peasantry and its raise to a middle class are all problems discussed in the author's description of the party's line of alliance with the bulk of the peasantry, initially with the poor, in neutralizing the middle peasant class, and subsequently with the middle rural class, which had become dominant, with the firm support of the rural poor.

The picture painted by the author of revolutionary changes in industry is no less impressive. The reader will find many interesting parts on the extensive nationalization of large and medium-scale industry, the struggle for strengthening labor discipline and the first concepts of the great projects which were initiated later (electrification, irrigation, etc.).

The author deals with the very important problems of national-state construction. The revolutionary storm broke the chains of national oppression. Russia did not become a nation of ruling and oppressed nations. A tempestuous process of establishing national Soviet republics and oblasts was launched. At the same time, having been given the right to self-determination, including secession, the nations did not scatter in different directions. On the contrary, they aspired toward even greater unity and closest possible unification. The new unity rested on foundations essentially different from the old state unity which had existed in bourgeois-land owning Russia. The unity of old Russia was based on coercion and inequality. The unity born of the October Revolution was one of free and equal peoples, based on common interests, objectives and tasks, rejecting violence and relying on voluntary agreement.

The successes reached in the revolutionary reorganization of Russia were tremendous. Never before had the historical process been so swift and dynamic. Never before had the field of history been plowed so deeply.

It would be naive to assume that revolutionary innovation would not trigger the counteraction of reactionary forces. No obsolete class or social stratum, and no reactionary political group leaves the stage of history voluntarily or parts with its privileges, wealth and power without opposition. Unquestionably,

the socialist revolution in Russia, whose aim was the radical reorganization of society and which had dealt the fiercest possible blows at the exploiters, would trigger fierce opposition on their part, something which indeed took place.

The fast defeat of the initial counterrevolutionary attempts to start a civil war convincingly proved that the Soviet system, which relied on the overwhelming majority of the population, enjoyed immeasurable superiority over the class enemy. The struggle, however, went on, and its scope and intensity rose with each passing day. The reason was that, in addition to the counterrevolutionary forces, external forces entered the stage. The largest capitalist states went to war against the victorious revolution and organized an anti-Soviet and anti-imperialist intervention. This was a many-faceted wide-scale attack mounted by the imperialist countries against the republic of soviets. Its purpose was to wipe off the gains of the October Revolution, dismember Russia and enslave its peoples. The undeclared war and open intervention in the domestic affairs of a sovereign state were no mere groundless and unprovoked aggression. They could be qualified as an open demonstration of international terrorism.

The imperialist anti-Soviet intervention had a clear class nature. It was a model of export of counterrevolution. The exposure of the nature of this intervention and its bourgeois falsehoods is particularly important today when the ruling U. S. circles, as I. I. Mints points out (see p 520), have elevated counterrevolutionary intervention to the rank of state policy.

The year 1918 was a period of massed attack on the land of the soviets by foreign troops. The first invaders were the Austro-German troops. The Soviet government persistently and systematically sought to withdraw from the war against Germany, Austria-Hungary and Turkey and to sue for peace. The happenstances of that struggle are discussed in the work in detail. The Brest talks failed as a result of a tragic interweaving of objective and subjective circumstances.

The objectives of the German 1918 offensive, which threatened the very existence of the Soviet system, objectively coincided with those of the Entente which started its own military operations almost simultaneously. The domestic and foreign enemies mounted their offensive from all sides. It was no accident that precisely in 1918 the talk was of a ring of fire encircling the republic. It was precisely 1918 that was later referred to as "stormy" or "fighting."

Yes, it was a year during which German, followed by British, French, American, Japanese and many other aggressors trampled our land, foreign navy ships dropped anchor in Murmansk, Arkhangelk, Vladivostok, Odessa, Sebastopol and Batumi, railroad tracks were humming under the weight of armored trains, lines of infantrymen attacked and horsemen rode across the grassy steppes. It was then that Lenin told the difficult truth to the people that the country was once again at war with the internal counterrevolution and world imperialism and that the problem of the war became the main problem of the revolution.

By the end of October 1918, summing up the results of the first revolutionary year, Lenin said the now universally familiar words that "A revolution is worth anything only if it is able to defend itself..." (op. cit., vol 37, p 122). The Soviet revolution was able to defend itself and to repel the pressure of its enemies with the force of arms. The Soviet people armed the revolution and

created their own army, a threat to the enemy and a loyal defender of the socialist fatherland. Not only were the first victories won on the battlefields but the foundations for later victories were laid in 1918.

These are the main problems and events discussed in I. I. Mints' monograph. Naturally the work covers many other problems which remain outside the scope of a book review.

We already pointed out that not all problems are discussed with equal thoroughness. For example, the building of the Red Army in the spring and summer of 1918 (see pp 521-527) and the Red Army counteroffensive (see pp 527-535) are described very briefly. Problems of cultural construction are presented rather concisely (see pp 157-179). This is regrettable, for the author has something to say on such matters, judging by some of his other publications.

In the course of more than 6 decades a tremendous amount has been written on the history of the first months of the revolution and the beginning of the struggle waged by the Soviet people against the interventionists and the White Guards. This work, which encompasses the achievements of Soviet historiography, is also in many aspects the product of its author's research, study of archives, conclusions and observations. The specific historical data it offers are huge. For example, the relatively small sections on Soviet construction alone (see pp 129-141 and 395-400) include nine tables, surveys made by 36 chairmen of guberniya executive committees, etc. Most important, I. I. Mints has created a comprehensive work which reflects and summarizes the main features of the life, activities and struggle waged by the Soviet people over a relatively short but exceptionally saturated chronological slice of time. This is the first time that the events of 1918 are presented so completely, in their unity and interconnection and complex and conflicting combination. In painting this broad historical canvass and depicting the originality and uniqueness of events, the author invariably singles out the general lines of the development of the revolution, which are of universal nature and which, as subsequent decades were to prove, were repeated, albeit differently, in the course of the socialist revolutions in other countries.

This work will offer the readers the possibility of experiencing the unique atmosphere of this legendary and by now so distant year. Today 6.5 decades separate us from the fighting 1918, and from this historical height the greatness of the accomplishments of our people, guided by the party, becomes particularly impressive.

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

5003

CSU: 1802/10

ROLE OF THE CPSU IN THE IDEOLOGICAL VICTORY OVER FASCISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 83 pp 118-119

[Review by Prof G. Morekhina, doctor of historical sciences, of the book "Ideologicheskaya Pobeda Nad Fashizmom (1941-1945 Gg.)" [The Ideological Victory Over Fascism (1941-1945)] by N. I. Kondakova. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 176 pp]

[Text] I the Great Patriotic War the Soviet people defended not only the right to life of the first socialist state in the world but the interests of the international proletariat as well. They fought for the freedom and independence of the countries enslaved by fascism. In this class conflict, characterized by the sharpest confrontation between the two sociopolitical systems the victory was won by the socialist system and Marxist-Leninist ideology which proved, once again, its superiority over the man-hating Nazi philosophy.

The study of the communist party's ideological activities during the war is valuable because it makes it possible to determine more clearly the source of strength and invincibility of the Soviet people, our social and state system and our communist outlook. N. I. Kondakova's monograph deals with this important problem.

Methodologically, the work is based on V. I. Lenin's works and the decisions of party congresses and conferences and Central Committee plenums. The thoroughness of the author's work may be judged by the wide range of documentary sources used: the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism Central Party Archives and a number of kray and oblast party archives. Many new interesting facts and data related to party activities during the Great Patriotic war are already in scientific circulation. Naturally, the ideological struggle against fascism and its forms and methods have been described previously as well, but this is a first attempt at a comprehensive analysis of the historical experience based on this struggle undertaken in our historical literature. This is an exceptionally relevant problem today, when the ideological confrontation between socialism and capitalism has become particularly aggravated.

The author was able to bring the study of extensive factual data to the level of theoretical summations of problems such as the basic directions followed in the struggle waged by the communist party against fascist ideology and politics, the role of its Central Committee in guiding ideological activities, the features of ideological-political work among the various population strata, the

ways and means of political and educational work carried out by the local party organizations and its influence on intensifying the sociopolitical activeness of the masses.

The author convincingly proves that from the very beginning superiority in the ideological struggle against fascism was on the side of the Soviet people and the communist party. This was determined by the invincible power of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the nature of socialism as the most humane social system and the just nature of the Great Patriotic War. However, this is not to say that the struggle was easy. We could say with full justification that the Patriotic War was being waged on the ideological front as well, along which many fierce battles were fought.

In analyzing the ideology and politics of fascism, the author does not limit herself to exposing the atrocities, plunders and mass pogroms committed by the aggressors but studies the way in which the Hitlerite command and occupation authorities used all means of disinformation and slander in their efforts to undermine the moral and political unity of Soviet society and to influence the people's minds. Our party's activities are considered in accordance with these two factors, for not only the terrorism mounted by the enemy but the long absence of truthful information on current events and the factual stop put to the educational and cultural growth of the masses and all possible ideological acts of subversion on the part of the occupation forces, in their efforts comprehensively to discredit the Soviet system, the communist party and the socialist system and to divide the Soviet people, adversely affected the moral condition of the population in areas temporarily occupied by the Hitlerites.

In analysing the main lines of the party's ideological struggle against fascism, the author draws attention mainly to exposing the anticommunist slanders used by the fascists and the propaganda of the socialist system as the foundation of the economic, political and military organization of Soviet society. She describes the party's purposeful activities in promoting the patriotic and internationalist education of the Soviet people and extensively discusses the ideological struggle in the socioeconomic and international areas. Each of these areas of confrontation is discussed separately.

The last chapter deals with the transformation of Nazism under contemporary conditions and the continuity between it and the fascism of the 1930s and 1940s. In comparing the content of fascist propaganda diversionary activities during World War II with that of today's anticommunists, the author traces the direct ties linking them, a fact based on their common class nature. That is why knowledge of the historical experience gained in the ideological struggle waged by the Soviet people against against fascism during the war helps the communist and worker movements in their struggle against imperialism today.

As the book convincingly proves, the communist party's ideological activities were a powerful spiritual weapon wielded by our people in the struggle against the Hitlerite aggressors. The fascist plans of enslaving, dividing and annihilating the Soviet people were totally routed. The powerful force of patriotism and the internationalism of the Soviet people rallied around the Leninist party were manifested in their mass heroism at the front and the rear, the nationwide assistance given the Soviet Armed Forces, their total support of the policy of

the VKP (b) and the Soviet state and the international aid they gave to the other peoples in their rescue from fascist oppression. Our victory over fascism was an ideological victory as well.

N. I. Kondakova's monograph, which covers the experience of the party's ideological struggle during the period of mortal clash with the shock forces of imperialism, is politically topical. It will be of unquestionable usefulness in the ideological tempering of the working people, the young generations in particular, through the examples of the heroic history of the CPSU and its dedicated struggle against fascism during the Great Patriotic War and, in postwar times, for communism and peace the world over.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

RUSSIAN LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC THEORY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 83 pp 120-125

[Review by V. Kodukhov, doctor of philosophical sciences and Leningrad State University professor, of the following books: (1) "Russkiy Yazyk. Entsiklopediya" [The Russian Language. Encyclopaedia]. Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, Moscow, 1979, 432 pp with illustrations; F. P. Filin: (2) "Istoki i Sud'by Russkogo Literaturnogo Yazyka" [Origins and Destiny of the Russian Literary Language], Nauka, Moscow, 1981, 325 pp; and (3) "Ocherki po Teorii Yazykoznaniiya" [Essays on the Theory of Linguistics], Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 336 pp]

[Text] The nature of language as the most important means of human communication and expression of abstract and summed-up thinking has always interested mankind. Scientists in various humanities and, partially, the natural sciences have used the works of linguists in solving problems specific to their fields.

As the cultural standard of our country's population rises, the broad readers' circles as well, regardless of their professional interests, are beginning to pay attention to the vital problems of linguistics.

Lenin pointed out to the philosophers the importance of using linguistic data in working on problems of dialectical and historical materialism and scientific communism, particularly in relation to the national liberation struggle and the building of a socialist society. The experience gained in the USSR in linguistic construction is of universal-historical significance. Soviet linguists have done extensive work necessitated by the tremendous requirements of the socialist cultural revolution.

The Russian language -- the language of friendship and cooperation among the peoples of the USSR -- plays the most important role among the languages in our homeland. Mastery of Russian along with the native language contributes to the further strengthening of the political, economic and spiritual unity of the Soviet people. As one of the world languages, the Russian language gives all Soviet and other people access to the spiritual wealth of world civilization. More than 80 percent of the citizens of our country speak fluent Russian and no less than half a billion people on earth know Russian.

Many general and specialized studies have been made of the Russian language, its structure and functions. Various grammars and dictionaries have been written. The publication of the one-volume encyclopaedia (1), of which 150,000

copies were printed, was an event of extensive cultural significance. It was produced by the USSR Academy of Sciences Russian Language Institute as a first experiment of its kind in the history of Russian-language studies. Let us point out that so far no such linguistic encyclopaedias have been published elsewhere abroad on other well-studied languages.

Noteworthy among the many linguistic studies are the works of F. P. Filin, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, his last two books in particular. Whereas the first extends and develops the ideas discussed in previously published fundamental works by the author, describing the origins, establishment and development of the Russian literary language and analyzing problems related to its contemporary development, the second, based on long years of study of the Russian language, covers general problems of linguistics -- gnoseological, sociological, lexicological, lexicographic and dialectological.

In supporting the unity of theory and practice and the substantiation of theory through factual data, the author writes in his preface to (3) that "All linguists are interested linguistic theory to one extent or another. Personally, I developed this interest while still a student. After more than half a century of work in the field of Russian-language and Slavic studies, I never stopped thinking about the nature of language and its common or specific properties and tried to find answers to many of the questions which excited me" (p 16). The books under review are answers to topical questions of modern linguistic theories, provided by a leading Soviet linguist.

The most important methodological question in any modern science is the relationship between a specific theory and special methods and philosophy, i.e., dialectical and historical materialism and, as a whole, Marxism-Leninism, which is the most advanced theory of society and man. This indivisible link between philosophy and the individual sciences, the author points out, is particularly obvious in the humanities, which include linguistics.

"Marx, Engels and Lenin and their followers," he points out, "made a number of statements on the question of language (the time has long come to assemble such statements and to publish them in their entirety), which are of exceptional value in clarifying its nature" (p 5).

Soviet linguistics is characterized by its ties with the practice of building socialism and Marxism-Leninism as the methodological bases of linguistic theory.

The tremendous amount of work which Soviet linguists have been and are doing with a view to meeting the societal requirements is varied and comprehensive. It covers all levels of mass studies of languages, domestic and foreign, and the Russian language as a means of intranational and international communication. This required the training of an entire army of theoretical linguists and language teachers in the country and the publishing of sets of textbooks and training aids.

Applied linguistics involves upgrading speech standards, development of scientific and technical terminology and resolving problems of machine translation and engineering linguistics. As we know, practice is both a source and a

criterion of knowledge. F. P. Filin emphasizes that the practice of linguistic construction is a test of linguistic theory and a source of its development. "...The entire history of domestic and world linguistics clearly proves that the outstanding theoretical linguists have always combined their theoretical studies with studies of specific languages and linguistic phenomena" (p 60).

The levels of abstraction, the author points out, may vary greatly. Whatever their level, however, the linguist remains a linguist only if he does not ignore the real characteristics of the language in their entire complexity and contradictoriness. "The deductive-abstract systems based on structures elaborated by the researchers cannot be considered sources of linguistic knowledge. Any kind of scientific knowledge of a language must be based on actual linguistic facts. Otherwise the new linguistic research methods will fail to yield positive results" (p 32).

The specifically historical study of language as a social phenomenon presumes the study of its external and internal system, functioning and development. Linguistic categories such as national and literary language, dialect, linguistic style, meaning of words, grammar category, declension and conjugation, phonemes, etc., characterize a language, its units and system.

The theory of the internal structure of language and its social nature and functioning have been profoundly and comprehensively developed in Soviet linguistics. Many of F. P. Filin's works, including the works under review, defend the basic principles of truly scientific linguistics, which looks at language as a social phenomenon and linguistics as a social science. "As an active tool for the knowledge and development of culture (material and spiritual)," he writes, "language is inseparably related to society. In all cases it is a social phenomenon in the broad meaning of the term, and the science of language has been and will remain part of the humanities. Its autonomy is relative. Its structure and internal development laws which are born and develop in society and serve the needs of society are also relatively autonomous" (p 12).

Although acknowledging the external and internal factors governing linguistic developments and contradictions within its very nature, on the one hand, and the contradiction between language and developing society and thinking, on the other, using a number of convincing examples F. P. Filin proves the conventionality of the classification of such factors and contradictions, the specific historical development of language and its categories and units. The author emphasizes that Soviet linguistics is asserting "not historicism in general but historical materialism, in which the development of a language is considered dialectically, as a change of the linguistic system as a result of the elimination of contradictions accumulating within it, taking into consideration the various functions of language, inseparably related to the history of society in its Marxist interpretation" (p 83).

* See, for example, F. P. Filin's "Obrazovaniye Yazyka Vostochnykh Slavyan" [Establishment of the Language of the Eastern Slavs]. Moscow-Leningrad, 1962; "Proiskhozhdeniye Russkogo, Ukrainskogo i Belorusskogo Yazykov" [Origins of the Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian Languages]. Leningrad, 1972.

The social theory of language (sociolinguistics) studies the social base of linguistic phenomena and the social functions of language. This presumes a consideration of the following: 1) the functioning of language within the collective which has created it (the role of the native language in society); and 2) the functioning of language outside the collective creating it (the role of the second language in society).

The Soviet linguists, among whom F. P. Filin hold a proper position, deserve credit for laying the scientific foundations of social linguistics. This is justifiably pointed out in the article by R. A. Budagov, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, "We Must Know the History of Soviet Theoretical Linguistics" (VESTNIK MOSKOVSKOGO UNIVERSITETA, Philology Series, No 6, 1982, pp 19-27). Soviet sociolinguistics, which is the cornerstone of the general theory of language, has earned international recognition.

The role of the native language in society its existence in society and the speech behavior of its speakers are the subjects studied by psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. The main question here, in F. P. Filin's view, is the theory of the linguistic norm and the related practice of speech standards, the theory of the choice of linguistic unit variants.

A common language is one of the main characteristics of a nation. Each national language has its ways of development, but all languages are characterized by the existence of a literary language, shared by all population strata and covering vitally important communication areas. The struggle for the dissemination and strengthening of literary standards and literary-linguistic traditions is one of the tasks facing men of culture. "Every society," we read in (2), "develops one way or another concepts regarding model standards, which are frequently violated but toward which we aspire and which are considered a kind of speech standard... Clearly, in the course of our normalizing activities we must combine the study of the contemporary condition of Russian literary speech and its past, above all on the basis of acknowledged models -- the works of the Russian classics, the impact of which on speech practice was quite significant" (p 135).

The role of the second language in society (bilingualism) is a many-faceted problem which encompasses linguistic, philosophical, psychological, pedagogical and other approaches. In our multinational state and in the contemporary world, after the Russian language earned universal recognition, the study of the specific forms in which languages coexist and paying constant attention to practicing their joint use is a matter of prime importance.

The resolution of the national problem, including the problem of bilingualism, requires a specific historical approach. The coexistence of languages is determined by their social functions which, in turn, depend on the historical stage. F. P. Filin relates bilingualism as a sociolinguistic phenomenon to basic social systems and analyses them thoroughly (see pp 163-178).

Harmonious bilingualism has developed in our society, based on the economic, political and social nature of the socialist system which ensures the equality of all nations and languages. This equality combines two interrelated sides: On the one hand, the Soviet nations and nationalities were granted the broadest

possible rights and opportunities to develop their national cultures and native languages; on the other, they obtained the same rights and opportunities to be exposed to the achievements of world culture. This presumes mastery of the Russian language, not to the detriment of their native language but for the sake of the latter's enrichment and development.

As a language for intra- and international communication, the Russian language became a powerful lever of national progress and cultural upsurge. Russian-national bilingualism became a fact of developed socialism. Russian is beginning to spread in a number of socialist countries. The author notes that the further development and strengthening of the unity of the members of the socialist comity creates conditions for the further dissemination of Russian-national bilingualism (see p 175).

The main feature of Soviet linguistics throughout its entire development is its reliance on Marxist-Leninist methodology. "However," F. P. Filin notes, "some of our linguists have begun uncritically to borrow all kinds of idealistic views from West European linguistic methodologists and to promote them as the latest linguistic revelations" (p 42). The development of the Marxist-Leninist foundations of Soviet linguistics and protecting them from revisions based on "fashionable" and "superfashionable" theories constitutes the spirit of the monograph under review. The author formulates his philosophical position on the basis of Engels' concept that whatever stance researchers may assume, they are ruled by philosophy. "The only question is whether or not they are willing to be dominated by some kind of dirty fashionable philosophy or by the type of theoretical thinking based on the study of the history of thinking and its accomplishments" (K. Marx and F. Engels, Soch." [Works], vol 20, p 525).

Language is a complex system which performs a variety of social functions. Therefore, modern linguistics, which resolves a number of problems, is a sum total of many trends and schools, separate theories and methods. However, pluralistic linguistic theories should not lead to pluralistic philosophy and open a gap between individual theories and methods and Marxist-Leninist philosophy and ideology. F. P. Filin repeatedly emphasizes this thought. "Once one method or another is ascribed a general methodological or philosophical significance," we read on p 18, "the peaceful coexistence among different linguistic currents comes to an end; otherwise scientific tolerance, which is extremely necessary in promoting progress, turns into lack of principle. This can only hinder scientific development." We also read on p 66 that "The efforts of some linguists to structure general linguistic concepts suitable to all methodologies are pretentious and sterile... One cannot combine within a single entity (noncontradictory at that) materialism and idealism, and dialectics and mechanism." "The individual theories and research rest on specific characteristics of the studied subject. Basically, however, they always rest (whether we realize it or not) on common philosophical principles" (p 65).

In F. P. Filin's view, the most damaging features in terms of the methodological foundations of linguistics are the "magic of language" and linguistic abstractionism. He describes as the "magic of language" the promotion of language as a system of symbols to an absolute by the structuralists, characteristic of so-called linguistic philosophy as well as various other idealistic currents reflected in linguistic theories.

The systemic-structural approach is a legitimate phenomenon in the development of linguistics. However, we must distinguish between structural (systemic) and structuralistic study: the former, structural (adjective formed from the noun "structure"), is inherent in science in general, including linguistics, in its various development stages; the latter, structural (an adjective formed from the noun "structuralism"), is typical of the supporters of the various structuralist schools and has a false methodological base. "Given its obvious ties with neopositivism, its essential separation of language from objective reality and primacy over its material substance," the author claims, "philosophical structuralism is a current leading science to a dead end" (p 27).

The language system contains both a linguistic substance and a relationship among linguistic units. The primary linguistic substance consists mainly of words the properties of which are determined through their attitude toward each other. The exaggerated role of such relations and a consideration of the substance as merely the material cover of language are the philosophical faults of structuralism, which were manifested with particular clarity in the theory of Copenhagen linguist L. Elmslew.

Such an interpretation of the linguistic system reduces it to the level of the simplest signalling systems. F. P. Filin has the following to say on the strictly linguistic and philosophical erroneousess of this approach: "From the gnoseological point of view, the magic of language is rooted in the exaggerated one-sided concept of the linguistic symbol as something absolute and primary (in the final account, this goes back to the familiar 'at the beginning was the word'). The symbol itself begins to be interpreted too broadly. The symbol represents something which can be replaced in our mind with something else on the basis of some features or properties. Smoke is a symbol of fire; the moon is a symbol of the universe; a crawling worm means movement, etc. Everything which surrounds us and we ourselves are signs, symbols. The entire world consists of symbols but the very nature of symbols remains unknown. The mental content of our knowledge is equated to life itself. Man's thinking is proclaimed to consist of symbols. Such fashionable ideas (which are actually as old as idealism itself) are extensively represented in various semiotic trends. They are also related to the basic equation of the human language as a system of symbols with anything which could be interpreted as a symbol" (p 23).

The supporters of linguistic philosophy identify linguistic content with subjective reality, while structuralism considers language as an abstract system unrelated to it. This is the basis for the appearance of theories described by F. P. Filin as linguistic abstractionism. This is characteristic of structural linguistics, generative grammar and mathematical linguistics. The author analyzes and criticizes in detail the philosophical aspect of these trends. Without belittling isolated specific accomplishments in many new directions, he emphasizes that their scientific significance depends on the substantiveness of their philosophical foundations and the extent to which they are based on the study of specific linguistic materials. As was already pointed out, in this case structuralism as methodology should not be confused with structural means for the study of individual aspects of language, logical-mathematical modelling and engineering linguistics. In particular, in speaking of logical-mathematical modelling of language, F. P. Filin writes that, "...However

important the problems of mathematical linguistics and related theoretical elaborations may be, they do not constitute by themselves, strictly speaking, linguistics, which is the science of the structure and development of natural languages functioning in the complex circumstances of human life. Human society has neither ideal homogenous linguistic groups nor, consequently, ideal 'systemic' and logically noncontradictory natural languages" (p 130).

The complexity of the linguistic phenomenon determines the variety of directions in its study. However, this should not hide the monism in understanding the nature of language. In resolving the numerous problems related to the study of its various aspects, linguistics applies a variety of means and methods. In this connection, the author indicates the existence of a variety of schools without which no scientific development is possible. However, he emphasizes that there can be no pluralistic views on the question of a general understanding of language.

F. P. Filin's general linguistic views and his struggle for the methodological purity of Soviet linguistics are clearly reflected in his works on the history of the Russian language, including (2). This work describes the Russian national language, its literary standard and the origin and development of the Russian literary language during different historical periods.

The Russian literary language -- the language of a great people and of intra- and international communication -- in itself deserves the closest and deepest possible study. The science of the Russian language, as the leading segment in contemporary linguistics, is of considerable interest in linguistic theory. As factual resources and basic theories accumulate, a clash of opinions takes place in the field of Russian-language studies. The struggle is philosophical and ideological, as the work convincingly proves. The author characterizes the contemporary Russian literary language as the main variety of the Russian national language. "All economic, scientific, technological, cultural and other areas of social and individual life," he writes, "are expressed in the written and oral literary language. There is no human thought which cannot be expressed through the means of the Russian literary language" (p 7).

The contemporary Russian language is the extension of Old Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian. They have a common linguistic base. The Russian language has been exposed to many other languages. It has expanded its vocabulary, improved its grammatical structure and broadened its social functions, and increasingly asserted itself in world culture like the Russian people themselves -- the makers and protectors of their language.

Efforts to question the national foundations and originality of the Russian language have been repeatedly made in the course of the study of the language. With the help of a huge volume of data F. P. Filin proves the foundations, antiquity, power and might of the Russian language.

The author categorically opposes the hypothesis of the heterogenous origin of the eastern Slavs as a result of their separation from the peripheral Balts and proves the real existence of the east Slavic (pre-Russian) language and the single east Slav ethnicity which led to the creation of the great ancient Russian culture and literary-written language. The national foundations of

the Russian literary language were preserved subsequently as well, with the appearance of the Russian nation, which preserved and increased the cultures of the Old Russian and Great Russian peoples.

A particularly complex problem in the history of Russian linguistics is that of its interrelationships with the Church Slavonic and West European languages. This problem is comprehensively and extensively considered in the work under review in accordance with the dialectics of linguistic development and cultural-linguistic traditions.

The arguments on the foundations of the Russian literary language and its originality have not only a strictly linguistic but a general cultural meaning. An extremist view on this problem was held by B. O. Unbegaun, the British Russian-language scientist. In his view, the business language (legal and administrative) could not be considered literary. He accused A. A. Shakhmatov of inconsistency in speaking of the Church Slavonic elements in the Russian literary language, for he should have spoken of the Church Slavonic foundation of the Russian literary language and the Russian elements within it since, in Unbegaun's view, the Russian literary language is the Russified Church Slavonic literary language which developed uninterruptedly from the 11th on.

F. P. Filin cites general cultural and linguistic considerations regarding the national foundation of the literary language of the Russian nation. This concept is confirmed with particular clarity through factual data -- all Church Slavonic features of the Russian language (phonetic, lexicological, grammatical); a study has been made of the 17-volume "Dictionary of the Contemporary Russian Literary Language," which explains 120,000 words -- a complex and difficult project.

We shall cite a single example: words with nonpleophonous root forms or prefixes (vrata, predolet', bezbrezhnyy, chrezmernyy, and so on). The dictionary lists 2,324 such forms, as compared with 4,825 pleophonous forms (vorota, peredelat', etc.), i.e., more than twice as many. Over the last 200 years a number of written words have become archaic while new words are being created on a folk-linguistic basis.

The work also analyzes the other Church Slavonic and West European elements in the vocabulary of the Russian literary language. The author's conclusion is both convincing and significant: "The formal-genetic Church Slavonicisms (let us not forget that most of them appeared on Russian soil) in the contemporary Russian literary language amount to some 10 percent, while Greco-Latin and West European borrowings (including words created by the Russians themselves and all Russian derivatives of foreign origin) account for about 13 percent. A certain percent (all-in-all insignificant) has been borrowed from all other languages (non-Slavic, Turkic, Finno-Ugric, Caucasian, etc.). Gallicisms account for no more than 4 percent. More than three quarters of the vocabulary structure of our contemporary literary language are originally Russian" (pp 85-86).

The author justly fights for a high scientific level of the formulated hypotheses, the more so since not all hypotheses in the social sciences are politically innocuous. Thus, for instance, he sharply criticizes (see (3), pp 193-217) the attempt to present the Russian language as made of "scraps," as a

heterogenous formation (based on the proverbial saying of "chosen at random") (see G. A. Khaburgayev, "Etonimiya 'Povesti Vremennykh Let' v Svyazi s Zadachami Rekonstruktsii Vostochnoslavianskogo Glottogeneza" [Ethnonimy of the 'Tale of Chronicles' in Relation to the Task of Reconstructing the East Slav Glottogenesis]. Izdatel'stvo MGU, 1979). Incidentally, the groundlessness of this view was clearly proved also in the article by A. G. Kuz'min ("Historian's Notes on a Linguistic Monograph." VOPROSY YAZYKOZNAIYA, No 4, 1980, pp 51-59). Unfortunately the criticism did not trigger the necessary reaction. Furthermore, we are puzzled by the fact that the criticized work is described in VESTNIK MOSKOVSKOGO UNIVERSITETA (No 6, 1982, p 33) as...one of the achievements in Russian-language studies at Moscow University in Soviet times.

F. P. Filin's works discuss a number of other problems important in terms of general, Slavic and Russian linguistics. The new books by this outstanding Soviet scientist, who died recently at the peak of his creative forces, give us the right to speak of the successes achieved by Soviet linguistics. "F. P. Filin's works on linguistics," notes Academician B. A. Rybakov, "are of considerable value not to linguists alone. They are greatly needed by writers, literary experts, historians and cultural historians. The broad chronological range from the ethnogenesis of the Slavs to the present allows historians in different fields to turn to Fedot Petrovich's works with equal usefulness to their specialized area" (LITERATURNIYA GAZETA, 2 June 1982).

F. P. Filin's studies have played an important role in the establishment and development of Soviet linguistics. His last monographs convincingly prove, yet once again, the importance of the principle of theory and practice in science and the fact that achievements in the individual linguistic disciplines depend both on the progress of general linguistics and direct ties with the philosophical, ideological and political problems of our time.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

POLICY OF AGGRESSION AND PIRACY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 83 pp 125-127

[Review by V. Ignatovskiy of the book "Krovavyye Sledy Amerikanskogo Imperializma" [The Blood-Stained Tracks of American Imperialism]. Mysl', Moscow, 1982, 303 pp]

[Text] Political adventurism and readiness to gamble with the vital interests of mankind for the sake of their imperial hegemonistic purposes began to appear with particular clarity in the foreign policy course of the most reactionary imperialist circles toward the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s. Terrorism is being increasingly used by imperialism in the struggle not only against the socialist countries but all national liberation movements for the sake of subverting the sovereignty and independence of the young countries.

Soviet journalists have written many articles on such problems, covering the main aspects of imperialism's contemporary policy and its actions toward peoples which took the path of independent development only recently or are still waging a hard national liberation struggle. Journalistic testimony on the line followed by imperialism, which is trying to stop at all cost the development of world events detrimental to it, collected in a book published by Izdatel'stvo Mysl', offers a convincing documentary proof of the aggressiveness of imperialist policy which faces mankind with a moral danger. The unanimous conclusion reached by Soviet correspondents and publicists, who are covering American imperialism variously and from different sides, is that its anti-national and antihumane policy is in a state of increasingly obvious contradiction with basic leading contemporary trends.

The materials in the work paint a convincing picture of the crimes committed by U. S. imperialism in various parts of the world against the peoples of the young countries and the national liberation movements. These materials raise the false curtain of demagogy and disinformation with the help of which bourgeois propaganda is vainly trying to conceal the crimes committed by the aggressive imperialist forces. They are a stern indictment of the bloody crimes committed against peace and mankind.

Lebanon. Today the entire world knows that it was precisely the indulgence and direct complicity of the administration in Washington that allowed the Israeli aggressor to commit with impunity the crime of genocide in this Arab country in 1982. The years may pass but the peoples will not forget the atrocities

committed by the Israeli aggressors in West Beirut where, with the help of American weapons, the systematic and planned destruction of Palestinians and Lebanese civilian population took place. The Lebanese cities of Tyre, Sayda and Nabatiya were razed. Dozens of villages and Palestinian refugee camps were totally destroyed. The southern and southeastern suburbs of Beirut were transformed into a dead scorched-earth zone. The most barbaric methods of the imperialist bloody industry were used on the population, such as phosphorus, ball-bearing and cluster bombs. Ten percent of all shells lobbed on Beirut could be classified as a chemical weapon. Nerve gas was also used. Hospitals and schools were targeted. The world heard once again about fascist-type concentration camps. The occupation forces detained and jailed even 12-13-year old adolescents.

Beirut Airport. Houses in ruins. Here was Sabra, a camp for Palestinian exiles. Thousands of bombs, rockets and shells were lobbed on it -- phosphorus, cumulative, cluster and fragmentation. And all this for the sake of killing as many people as possible, for the main target was the Palestinian, the person, the living being, regardless of age or sex. Many villages and Palestinian camps which had been refugee shelters were burned down by the aggressor and levelled off with bulldozers. The bloody crimes of the Israeli military are justifiably compared the world over with Hitlerite atrocities.

On this occasion the Israeli throat cutters were assigned the entire "dirty work" of securing the interests of American imperialism in the Middle East, performed by the Americans themselves in Indochina. The direct consequence of this was that, after Vietnam's My Lay, the names of Sabra and Shatila were entered in blood in the history of mankind. The world shuddered when it learned of the bloody bacchanal staged by the Israeli military in the two Palestinian camps...

Afghanistan. Under the cover of demagogic and slanderous propaganda campaigns, from the very first months following the victory of the April revolution the United States began to supply weapons to the gangs of Afghan counterrevolutionaries. They were supplied not only with submachine guns, machine guns and antitank grenade launchers but anti-aircraft systems and heat-seeking missiles. With the help of military aid the Afghan bandits terrorize the local population and try to frighten the backward strata and break the will of the people for revolutionary change. In the wake of military aid to the bandits came mercenary instructors specializing in so-called modern "guerilla warfare."

"Terrorists trained by the imperialists blow up Afghan schools and bridges, and shoot down mothers whose sons are actively defending the achievements of the April revolution and teachers who teach the children to read and write. The bandits, who have lost all conscience and humanity, tear off the hands of school children and skin alive activists who fall in their hands" (p 132). Such is the practical implementation of a policy aimed at "defending vital U. S. interests."

The South African racists as well have adopted the policy of international gangsterism and terrorism with Washington's active support. The book describes the U. S. role in the criminal policy of military provocations and blackmail pursued by south Africa against the neighboring African countries of

Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Lesotho and Zambia. The South African racists are zealously learning from Washington the bloody methods of terror and violence. They have also shown "concern" for the "theoretical substantiation" of their policy of force. This includes the doctrine of "preventive strike" against neighboring countries supporting the national liberation struggle, which has gained popularity among the South African ruling circles.

The bloody tracks of imperialism take us to other areas as well, where the peoples are taking up the struggle for freedom and social renewal.

United States policy toward many Latin American countries is turning into one of terrorism, plunder and violence. For example, the U. S. government answered the upsurge of the anti-imperialist movement in the Caribbean and Central American countries with a sharp increase in military pressure. For decades the U. S. intelligence services have been setting up "death squads" and other similar terrorist organizations to deal with people who think differently and to increase the atmosphere of fear in Latin American countries. Today such organizations operate in Uruguay, Peru, Chile, Argentina, the Dominican Republic, Colombia, Guatemala and El Salvador. They consist of police, military and fascist-leaning thugs and various declassed and criminal elements, secret service agents and similar riff-raff.

The book also exposes the methods of the secret war waged by Washington against peoples who have dared to oppose the hegemonistic aspirations of American imperialism and have won their just struggle. Thus, the CIA formulated a destabilization plan which calls for "support of and conduct of political and paramilitary operations" against Nicaragua and "similar structures throughout Central America." This plan, now making the rounds in the various Washington headquarters, is, in the admission of officials, only "part of a broader program with the help of which the administration is hoping to achieve long-term stability in Central America" (p 172). And, as is always the case in such situations, the authors of this criminal plan hypocritically hide behind "concern" for human values.

El Salvador. Here is the way a French journalist describes his impressions from a visit to that country: "...No one among the visiting journalists or the members of the voluntary organization 'Physicians for Peace' had ever seen such a horrifying picture... The stench of death can be felt throughout the entire country..." (p 176).

It is entirely obvious that without Washington's support with weapons, money and direct participation of so-called "military advisers" the anti-people's regime in El Salvador would have collapsed under the pressure of the country's patriotic forces. The United States gave this regime an "aid" of \$200 million in 1981 alone. This exceeds the combined aid given to all other countries in the area. The Salvadoran junta is using against its people a variety of modern weapons, including chemical and bacteriological.

During the past 2 years alone the junta has killed more than 30,000 unarmed civilians in its own country. American servicemen and mercenaries from other countries are taking part in operations mounted against the civilian population. The bloody actions of the Salvadoran fascist junta are meeting with the

"understanding" of other Latin American countries with dictatorial and reactionary regimes, such as Chile, Paraguay, Haiti and some others, whose rulers are well paid by U. S. imperialism.

According to Thomas Anders, U. S. assistant secretary of state for Inter-American affairs, "Today a decisive battle for Central America is being fought in El Salvador" (p 200). The nature of this "battle" is confirmed by U. S. Congressman G. Studds: "Today's reality in El Salvador is one of scandalous cruelty and violence which take the lives of totally innocent people. Entire villages are razed and the civilian population is being killed at the slightest suspicion of cooperating with the partisans" (p 202).

The book exposes the continuous subversive activities of the U. S. government against Cuba, the first socialist state in the Western Hemisphere. This has included the use of biological weapons. The civilian population, children above all, has been the victim of this biological warfare. Thus, according to Cuban sources, an epidemic caused by the Denghe-2 virus alone affected 350,000 people. More than 9,000 children were affected by the virulent form of the disease and more serious consequences were avoided only thanks to the energetic steps which were taken.

According to the facts cited by the journalists, U. S. imperialism and its most aggressive militaristic circles are continuing to formulate new plans for aggressive wars on the peoples of the liberated countries. This includes plans for space warfare, widening the range of chemical and bacteriological weapons, which are the most dangerous and barbaric mass destruction weapons, etc. To this effect the fly-wheel of the military machine is running at a mad rpm rate, accelerating the unprecedented escalation of the threat to the peace, freedom and independence of all nations.

One of the most important tasks of the progressive forces of our time is to stop the promoters of new military adventures aimed at enslaving the peoples who have gained their national independence and are defending today their rights to independence and political, economic and social progress. It is fully consistent with the struggle of the peoples for the prevention of a new world war. In this case the socialist and the young liberated states have common objectives and tasks. The interests of the peoples who favor national liberation are getting increasingly closer to the tasks of the struggle against the policy of imperialist militaristic forces aimed at nuclear war.

The collection under review is a useful aid to those who deem it their duty to expose the man-hating nature of contemporary imperialism.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

ANNOUNCEMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 4, Mar 83 p 128

[Regular Enrollment of Students in Republic and Interoblast Higher Party Schools]

[Text] The regular enrollment of students in republic and interoblast higher party schools is hereby announced. Enrollment in VPSH [Higher Party Schools] will be based on the recommendations of central committees of communist parties of union republics and party kraykoms and obkoms.

The higher party schools will accept party, soviet, Komsomol and ideological workers, CPSU members, with no less than 3 years party membership as follows:

Two-year course and 3-year correspondence course -- higher school graduates under 40 years of age;

Four-year course and 5-year correspondence course -- secondary school graduates under 35 years of age.

By no later than 1 May of this year the central committees of communist parties of union republics and party kraykoms and obkoms must submit to the higher party schools copies of the bureau decree, character reference and the required documents of personnel recommended for enrollment.

Candidates recommended for the 2-year course and 3-year correspondence course will be interviewed at the VPSH, while candidates recommended for the 4-year course and the 5-year correspondence course will take their examinations on foundations of Marxism-Leninism Russian language (composition) and USSR history (secondary school level) between 20 May and 10 June 1983.

Recommended applicants will be given 2 weeks paid leave to prepare for and take the examinations.

Classes at the higher party schools will begin on 1 September 1983.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/10

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

MAY 23, 1983