

075047

JPRS-UKO-84-002

11 January 1984

# USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 14, September 1983

Reproduced From  
Best Available Copy

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
Approved for Public Release  
Distribution Unlimited

**DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED**

19990916 102

**FBI**

**FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE**

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

12  
164  
A08

#### NOTE

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

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

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

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

COPYRIGHT LAWS AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING OWNERSHIP OF  
MATERIALS REPRODUCED HEREIN REQUIRE THAT DISSEMINATION  
OF THIS PUBLICATION BE RESTRICTED FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY.

11 January 1984

USSR REPORT  
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 14, September 1983

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

CONTENTS

Labor Collective and Discipline .....	1
To a Group of Social Democratic Deputies of the FRG Bundestag (Yu. V. Andropov) .....	12
Karl Marx and the Contemporary Revolutionary Movement (Gus Hall) .....	15
Theoretical Problems of the Economic Mechanism (L. Abalkin) .....	30
Socialist Production Efficiency: A Variant of Political Economic Analysis (Yu. Ivanov) .....	42
G. V. Plekhanov's Ideological-Theoretical Activities and the Emancipation of Labor Group (M. Iovchuk) .....	54
Spirited Assistant of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party (Ye. Bavrin and A. Taksabayev) .....	68
There Is No More Important Task Than That of Preventing War (P. Fedoseyev) .....	76
Global Problems and the Developing World (N. Shmelev) .....	93
For the Sake of a Bountiful Harvest (S. Radchenko) .....	106

Controlling the Competition Process (O. Kosenko) .....	112
"Biological and Social Inheritance" .....	118
"Light and Grain" .....	131
Working Class in the Struggle for Building Socialism and Elimination of the Fascist Threat (S. Tikhvinskiy) .....	143
Communist Party and People's Sovereignty (I. Rozhko) .....	149
Short Book Review .....	156
Bookshelf .....	158
Obituary .....	159

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 14  
September 1983

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : September 1982

Signed to press : 21 Sep 1983

Copies : 835,000

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

## LABOR COLLECTIVE AND DISCIPLINE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 1983)  
pp 3-12

[Text] Essentially, the labor collective is a primary cell of both our economic and political organism. The material and spiritual values and the economic power of the homeland--the very foundation of social progress--are created within it; it is precisely here that our plans are translated into the language of daily practice, planned assignments are carried out and the valuable feeling of socialist collectivism is asserted in the minds and behavior of the people. That is why the party and the state ascribe great importance to the steady improvement of the activities of labor collectives, so that they may become increasingly saturated and comprehensive and their influence on the solution of economic-political and educational tasks steadily strengthened, while the Leninist stipulation to the effect that every working person must feel himself the master of his enterprise and the representative of his country be comprehensively and systematically implemented.

Any kind of joint labor follows a common procedure. During the feudal age serfdom discipline was established through naked violence over the individual. In the epoch of capitalism the discipline of the stock was replaced by the discipline of hunger, which forced man to submit to the order of things by the fear of unemployment. Communist discipline, "the first step of which is socialism, is based and will be increasingly based on the free and conscious discipline of the working people themselves...." (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 39, p 14).

Socialist labor discipline means not only the strict observance of the rules of internal working order in production but a conscious creative attitude toward one's work, ensuring its high quality, the rational and productive utilization of working time, funds, and materials. It rejects blind and thoughtless obedience. It presumes the daring and knowledgeable making of technically and organizationally substantiated and socially significant decisions. "We need," emphasizes Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, "conscious labor discipline, the type of discipline which will advance production. We must fill the struggle for discipline with greater meaning and relate it directly to the implementation of production assignments...."

The democratic nature of socialist labor discipline is obvious. It predetermines the democratic means for strengthening it, based on the norms codified

in the Soviet Constitution. The principal among them is the tried method of persuasion, the efficiency and effectiveness of which have been repeatedly confirmed in practice. However, as long as labor has not yet become the prime vital need of everyone and as long as everyone has not learned to work for society to the full extent of his forces and capabilities, the need remains to combine educational and explanatory work, with an individual approach to every person, with measures of social and administrative-disciplinary influence. This as well is a manifestation of socialist humanism and democracy, expressed in the assertion of the will of the majority into interest of the entire society.

Need we point out that the attitude of man toward his obligations will become conscious sooner and his work conscientious, creative and productive if the efforts of the party, trade union and Komsomol organizations and the managers of all subunits of enterprises or establishments have led to the establishment and maintenance in the collectives of a good moral and psychological climate, a proper organization of production and labor and socialist competition, the operation of a planned system of material and moral incentives, the manifestation of concern for improving the working and living conditions of the people, and the doing of everything necessary and possible for the comprehensive implementation of plans for economic and social development. All of these problems, as practical experience indicates, are resolved more completely and better wherever the toiling masses extensively and energetically participate in production and social affairs.

The entire system of true popular rule in socialist society is directly aimed at the maximal involvement of the Soviet people in the management of governmental affairs, the economy above all. No single state plan for the development of the national economy or major legislative act is passed without a nationwide discussion. The truly nationwide discussion of the draft USSR Law on Labor Collectives is a recent vivid example of this fact. It reconfirmed that the Soviet people consider the national interest an expression of their will and thoughts and their profoundly personal matter. The law, which was passed at the USSR Supreme Soviet 8th Session, 10th Convocation, reflects the policy of the party and the government aimed at the further broadening and strengthening of socialist democracy and the systematic implementation of Lenin's stipulation on the participation of the working people in management. The law codified the rights of labor collectives, strengthened the guarantees for their observance and laid a foundation for further expanding the possibilities of the working man in production, the development of his capabilities and the enhancement of his activeness.

In granting collectives and individual citizens increasingly broad rights, society also imposes upon them increasing obligations. The correlation here is direct and immediate: greater democratic freedom means greater civic responsibility.

It is indicative that the largest number of suggestions submitted in the course of the discussion of the draft USSR Law on Labor Collectives pertained, one way or another, to problems of strengthening discipline and upgrading the responsibility on the part of managers and subordinates for its

observance, for maintaining the necessary order and organization of the work in production, transportation, trade, communal economy and consumer services. The discussion proved that the honest Soviet working people are sickened by disorderliness, negligence, irresponsibility and the occasional cases of total forgiveness of those who misuse the trust of the collective, who work indifferently, who allow waste and who try to extract from society more and give it less.

These views were taken into consideration in the final draft of the law and were concretized in the decrees of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU on matters of strengthening labor discipline. Now, with great rights at their disposal, the collectives can more energetically influence the individual working person. They can morally and materially encourage those who are conscientious, help those who have strayed and be intolerant of malicious violators of discipline, forcing them to fulfill their duty to society and not with the help of educational measures alone.

The first order of the Soviet citizen-worker is to care for every minute of working time, for the waste of a single minute means, on a national scale, the loss of the results of the daily work of 200,000 workers. Absenteeism, lateness for work, leaving before the end of the shift and endless smoking breaks inevitably create, in addition to everything else, the idling of machines, equipment and transport facilities in related sectors and, frequently, in other shops. As we know, production "arrhythmia" painfully "strikes" every honest worker, weakens the working mood and noticeably affects earnings. It not only lowers labor results but adversely affects the moral-psychological climate in the collective.

Under the conditions of a contemporary, highly mechanized large-scale economic management technological discipline is as important as labor discipline, to which it is related in every job. It consists of the strict observance of the stipulated technology and work regimen of the equipment, production schedules, and observance of labor and technical safety regulations and largely depends on the skill and degree of consciousness of every member of the collective. No controller can stand by the plowman in the field or the construction worker at the building site. Therefore, it is not always immediately possible to determine the point at which they started turning out pot-boilers, striving for quantity to the detriment of quality. Subsequently, however, it is painful to look at destroyed crops or overlooked areas or poor transplants, or else see the digging up of already plastered or white-washed walls or the tearing off of wallpaper in order to repair the faults of those who "forgot" to lay a wire or who made a poor connection.

A liberal attitude toward such facts corrupts above all unprincipled people, people without firm moral foundations, those who love to say, "Well, do I have to do more than others?" Life has proved that impunity can lead to a chain reaction of irresponsibility in a collective. That is precisely why there should be no leniency toward truants and wastemakers, above all not on the part of the administration but of "one's own" worker collective, for as we know, a common condemnation and general hostility toward violators of discipline and order are sometimes more effective than the reprimand or order



of an administrator. A healthy nucleus of honest and conscientious workers may be found in any collective. It is this nucleus that must be rallied and lead in the struggle for truly socialist labor. Above all, it is necessary to enhance the responsibility of the party members for the organization and success of this struggle. The role of the primary party organizations, party groups and individual party members must be increased in resolving such problems. However, is the party's influence always consistent with current requirements?

The collective of the Stankostroitel'nyy Zavod imeni Sergo Ordzhonikidze Association, one of the initiators of the patriotic movement for strengthening production discipline, included the following in its pledges: "To care for each working minute is our primary obligation." Here each violation of labor and technological discipline is considered publicly; the reasons and consequences of an action, the moral feature of the violator and his behavior are considered, and not only at work but also at home, in the family; the "sum total" of the harm he has caused to his fellow workers and the enterprise as a whole is determined. The specific situation and nature of the production disorganizer are considered, after which he is fully or partially deprived of his bonus, payments based on annual work results, and so on. By influencing in this manner those who are impervious to persuasion and feel no shame if blamed by their comrades, the collective intends to achieve a reduction in cases of absenteeism, lateness for work, and cadre turnover and, on this basis, increase its 1983 labor productivity above the preplanned figure by no less than 3 percent.

The skillful Leninist labor competition, organized on the basis of the utilization of the best experience, and the example set by its leaders, those who lead the others by setting the example of performance and concerned and creative attitude toward their assignments, acting conscientiously and with high civic-mindedness, is a reliable means for strengthening discipline and order. The example of the best becomes an even more powerful force if the initiative of the people is backed by the daily mobilizing work of party organs and organizations which politically ensure high efficiency of labor competition and are concerned with the strengthening of its educational impact. Naturally, success is found above all wherever problems of improving the competition, formulating socialist pledges, summing up results and awarding bonuses are not resolved formally, and where such work is most closely related to the solution of all other problems of enhancing production efficiency and shaping the new man. It is important, therefore, not only to make a thorough study and to sum up production experience but to polish the collective ability positively to influence one's fellow workers and encourage in everyone the desire to emulate the best examples.

In many cases it would be expedient and necessary to submit to a comrade court cases of malicious violators of labor and technological discipline. The main feature of their work is to prevent violations of the law on the part of insufficiently socially mature people. The very process of the trial, in which everyone is allowed to express his viewpoint, is democratic and can have a profound educational impact on the delinquent and the collective as a whole and, therefore, can directly influence the strengthening

of discipline. Unfortunately, the role of comrade courts is occasionally underestimated. For example, for years on end judges at the Borisov Bread Combine in Minsk Oblast, the Stolinsk Baking Plant, a number of organizations in Pruzhanskiy Rayon, Brest Oblast, and some other enterprises and organizations have not tried a single case. One of the reasons for this phenomenon is that sometimes the members of the administrations prefer not to send to the court cases of absenteeism, drunkenness or other discipline violations in order not to publicize matters which would make their subunits suddenly worse than others.

An end must be put to connivance with violators and to concealing the true state of affairs. As we know, the responsibility of heads of enterprises, organizations, establishments and their subunits for the state of labor discipline and cadre turnover has been substantially increased. The respective managers may be deprived of their bonuses for basic labor results and results of the socialist competition and held liable from the disciplinary or any other legal viewpoint for failure to take the necessary measures or for providing an inaccurate report of working time losses.

The USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU decree "On Additional Measures To Strengthen Labor Discipline" makes it incumbent upon managers of associations, enterprises, organizations, sovkhoses and kolkhoses to apply more extensively the newly granted benefits and advantages to leading production workers and innovators and to individuals who have acquired long labor seniority in enterprises and organizations; at the same time, the decree strengthens disciplinary measures of influence on absenteeists, drifters and wastemakers. However, when applying them it is important for the manager to feel the "pulse beat" of the collective, to work in close touch with the party and trade union organizations and to see to it that any decision is substantiated and made public, and considered by the people as legitimate and just.

The USSR Law on Labor Collectives stipulates that they can raise the question of asking absenteeists and wastemakers to compensate for the material damage they have caused; the USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU decree specifies the procedure for such restoration. In order for this disciplinary measure to be actively "useful" every manager must think, above all, how to eliminate the anonymity in the course of which people are frequently shifted from one sector, construction project or field to another without any particular need from the work viewpoint, and to organize strict accounting of all types of daily and intra-shift working time losses, and accurately to determine the material harm caused by specific careless workers.

The leader of each subunit in an enterprise, organization or establishment assumes great responsibility for the actions of many people, not only for the organization of their work or for maintaining an efficient production rhythm but also for the education of the members of the collective, above all through his personal example. The law calls for enhancing the role of labor collectives in the appointment of managers at enterprises, establishments and organizations. Henceforth, the opinion of the collective will be sought in appointing or relieving them of their position. This is quite timely, for

consulting with the people is a proper guarantee for the promotion of politically mature and competent comrades, and a reliable protection against those who are ignorant, have no initiative, are unable to work with subordinates and are arrogant and rude.

In this connection, it would be useful to look at the experience of the head enterprise at the Kommutator Production Association in Riga. Here, starting with 1974, all positions of foremen or shop and section chief are periodically proclaimed vacant and filled on a competitive basis. The individual enterprise worker can submit in writing specific suggestions to the personnel department, which prepares an official presentation on the professional and moral-political qualities of the applicant. Such materials are considered by the administration and the party and trade union committees or bureaus; all other requirements being equal, preference is given to the candidate nominated by the collective itself. The lists of candidates thus drawn up must be confirmed by joint decisions of the enterprise's "triangle." General meetings are then held in shops and sectors where everyone can express himself "for" or "against," bring forth corresponding arguments or submit the name of another candidate. The decision to approve the thus refined lists is taken on the basis of open vote, after which the best applicants for each vacancy are selected. Those who have garnered no less than 75 percent of the votes are considered elected.

It is clear that the use of this method calls for a thoughtful approach. It could be recommended as one of the forms of personnel work in a united and mature collective. However, its essence--public assessment of the work of all officials and their practical and moral-political qualities--is applicable in any enterprise, organization and establishment. This makes it possible to bring forth the true leaders, i.e., those who enjoy real authority in the collective. "...The mass," V. I. Lenin wrote in discussing leaders, "must have the right to know and check even the most minor step taken by the managers" (op. cit., vol 36, p 157).

It is important for the labor collective comprehensively to assess everyone's activities, from the worker to the subunit commander, skillfully combining educational work with administrative measures aimed at strengthening labor, technological and plan discipline.

However, we must always remember that in the course of the struggle for discipline it is easy to shift emphases and to consider superficial phenomena as their cause rather than the consequence. In his meeting with party veterans Comrade Yu. V. Andropov noted that "in some places the call for strengthening discipline was interpreted only in terms of maintaining tireless administrative control over the presence of everyone at his workplace "from" and "to." Naturally, this "to" must be taken into consideration and absenteists must be punished. However, we must think of something else as well: what the person will do at his workplace "from" and "to," what his load is, how he copes with his assignments, and whether he has been provided with the necessary conditions for productive toil...." Actually, if a worker has been idle a few hours or even a full day because of lack of necessary semifinished products, materials or tools, and not he alone but along with the entire shift

or sector, in such a case any appeal to work with full dedication or care for the lost time would be unconvincing while administrative measures would trigger a negative reaction. It is precisely where people are doomed to hours of idling, after which they are forced to rush, that confidence in the need for steady organization and discipline is lost and interest in the work declines. The result is a situation of nervousness and irresponsibility and discipline violations become to some a norm of behavior.

At the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said that the main thing is to accelerate the efforts to improve the entire area of economic management and to create conditions which would encourage qualitative and productive labor, initiative and enterprise. At his meeting with party veterans, noting that the full dedication of the individual workers at their jobs largely depends on properly organized ideological and political-educational work, he reemphasized that "this work, however, must mandatorily rely on a modern organization of labor, sensible placing of people, efficient material and technical support, and improved variety of ways and means of moral and material incentive. In a word, it is only the combination I mentioned of spiritual, material and organizational factors that can lead to high labor standards, which is the most reliable guarantee for order and discipline at work."

This is confirmed by the practical experience of many enterprises in which the administration, the party and the other public organizations are persistently engaged in ideological and political-educational work, promoting the use of everything progressive and consistent with the interests of society, the production process and the working people themselves, purposefully asserting a spirit of comradeship and innovation. This fully applies to the famous ZIL. Here the party committee has drafted a comprehensive plan for ideological and educational work (such plans have been drafted by the shop party organizations as well). Some 8,000 rationalizers are engaged in a creative search. The party organization makes extensive and tangible use of its right to control administrative activities. It hears reports submitted by managers, which makes it possible to shed more light on unresolved problems and to focus on them the attention of the party members. The idea of documenting the jobs was born at one of the party committee sessions. A detailed study was made of all sectors, individual functions were clearly defined, thought was given to what should be done to help the people to work better, to increase their output and improve production quality. This improved the organization of the work and its productivity; it became possible to transfer more than 500 people to other operations.

The collective forms of labor organization and incentive which, in accordance with the resolutions of the 26th Party Congress, will become basic this five-year plan, offer favorable conditions for strengthening the discipline. Experience convincingly proves that a well-organized brigade meets contemporary requirements regarding production and the need for higher general educational and cultural standards; it contributes to the enhancement of the creative initiative of the workers and the development of their high moral qualities. It contributes also to the development of democratic management principles: within the range of its competence, such a brigade undertakes increasingly

active tasks related to labor planning and norming, cadre placement, allocation of jobs among members of the collective, and control over the quantity and quality of labor; the council--its collective organ--determines the bonuses and earnings of the individual workers on the basis of joint results; it nominates workers for supplements and additional payments for professional skills and issues recommendations on grade promotions.

The new work method substantially influences interrelationships within the brigade. In such a collective, united by a single objective and common tasks and interests, slackness is not tolerated and those who work indifferently and violate our moral norms are opposed. At the same time, however, the successes achieved by the individual worker are acknowledged and he is helped in developing his potential. True collectivism is being developed here.

According to a study made by the USSR Central Statistical Administration, working time losses in such brigades are lower by a factor of 2-2.5 and cadre turnover by 1.3 compared to the individual organization of labor. During the first 2 years of the five-year plan another 300,000 brigades were set up in our industry. As a result of the increased labor productivity of the workers within these brigades, manpower requirements were reduced by more than 100,000 people. Today nearly 60 percent of all workers in industry are brigade members. So far only 32 percent of the personnel of construction ministries and departments work in brigades at construction sites. Naturally, the task is not only to increase the number of brigades but to eliminate existing hindrances which prevent working with highest returns, while at the same time abandoning unjustified haste and a formalistic approach to such an important project.

Cost-effectiveness is a mandatory condition for the efficient activity of brigade collectives. At the present time, however, most brigades do not have even long-term plans; assignments are frequently changed. This discredits the very essence of the method and causes the people to no longer take a long-range view. Successful brigade cost-effectiveness largely depends also on the effectiveness of contractual relations between the administration and the brigade. Unfortunately, liability, material liability included, is assumed as a rule only by the latter. A chief of shop section and even a foreman (not to speak of a procurement worker), who has violated contractual conditions, is virtually never punished. This artificially reduces the rights of the brigade and undermines not only the economic but the moral foundations of the brigade method.

Sometimes the administration literally imposes a manager on the brigade or takes him under its wing after he has failed to justify the trust of the people. Article 18 of the USSR Law on Labor Collectives clearly defines the rights of such primary production units and gives them additional rights in resolving such problems.

The concern of the party and the other social organizations is to make a comprehensive study of the actual clashes occurring at enterprises and establishments and to find means for their flexible and active elimination. The main thing is to promote improvements in the organization of labor, making

the participation of the working people in management even more widespread and active, strengthen the feeling of true collectivism and comradeship and enhance the responsibility of the individual for his contribution to the common project.

Effective control, on the part of the collectives as well, over labor norming and wages is a major lever in strengthening socialist discipline. Both society and the individual working person are by far not indifferent to whether or not the wage was honestly earned or simply "derived" if not by padding at least as a result of depersonalized labor. It frequently happens that a person goes to work like the others on time, is not late after lunch but works, unlike the majority, without enthusiasm. This is sometimes helped by the guaranteed wage, a system which is still applied at many enterprises. Cost-accounting brigades frequently fail precisely because they drastically improve work results and their earnings do not fit the wage fund of the given subunit, for everyone in the other units, even the loafers, are already the "beneficiaries" of the average wage.

The June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum noted that in order to achieve the immediate objectives in economic development we must above all bring order to what we already have. Work and work alone, its quantity, quality and real results, rather than someone's subjective desire or good or ill will, should determine the level of well-being of the individual Soviet citizen.

The socialist society is not simply interested in the fullest possible use of working time but in working on the basis of normal scientifically substantiated intensiveness. This is achieved through labor norming. An accurately computed norm develops the habit of doing properly stressed, steady work and strengthens conscious discipline. That is why the timely revision of obsolete norms is so important. This responsible economic step is being taken today with increasing frequency with the direct participation of the labor collectives.

Thus, the work on improving labor norms at the Zaporozhtransformator Association involves the participation not only of norming workers, foremen, designers and technologists, but the workers as well. The first announcement on norm reviews was made by them 8 years ago. To date more than 5,000 such announcements have been made. The initiative of the working people helped to reduce labor intensiveness by nearly half a million norm/hours. Currently the share of the technically substantiated norms at the association account for 89 percent of the total. The economists have estimated that if nine-tenths of the workers at all enterprises were to meet such norms, 750,000 people could be released during the five-year period!

No one better than the workers themselves knows the capabilities of the equipment they use. No one else can reach more completely the full potential of a given machine or mechanism or extensively apply the best possible work methods. That is precisely why as experience is acquired and skills are improved it would be expedient to involve the production workers more actively in labor norming. Naturally, effective material incentive systems should be developed at the same time, so that the workers would not "conceal" some

possibilities known to them alone. The main way to increase labor productivity is not simply to revise norms but to establish new, scientifically based ones which take into consideration changes in technology and labor and production organization.

Encouraging work of different quality and intensity is closely related to norming. It is important to develop in all collectives the type of wage correlations which would always make it advantageous to work well and inevitably to earn less for substandard work. The systematic implementation and strict observance of this principle will make all members of society personally interested, materially and morally, in increasing the public wealth and strengthening conscious discipline.

Let us take that same brigade contracting method as an example. Its application immeasurably increases the role of engineers, technicians and specialists in plant services. After concluding a contract with the brigade, the administration becomes obligated to supply it accurately and on time with the necessary documentation, equipment, materials and complementing items. The responsibility of engineering and technical personnel for the efficient organization of this work must be strictly enhanced. If necessary, administrative measures of influence must be taken. However, the greatest results come from the proper combination of such measures with material incentive. In some enterprises, such as the Metallurgical Equipment Plant in Dnepropetrovsk, engineering and technical personnel bonuses are directly tied to the work results of brigades and sections under their control. The extent to which the machines are used, output per unit of area, and outlays of metal, energy and cutting tools are all taken into consideration in summing up their monthly labor results.

The Shchekino method offers great opportunity for stimulating direct labor outlays and end labor results. This has been unquestionably confirmed by practical experience. The main reason for the fact that so far this method has not become sufficiently widespread is that one of the basic principles according to which the wage fund norms must be stable is systematically violated on all management levels. Even when such norms are issued to an enterprise, they are subsequently frequently revised. Even at the Azot Production Association in Shchekino, over the past few years the wage fund was reduced by approximately 3 million rubles (as a result of appropriating the saved and unused share), and a partial amount was restored only following the intervention of the ministerial collegium.

Furthermore, material incentive for combining skills and increasing the volume of output should be based on the objective law of distribution according to labor, according to which, on the one hand, as the volume of work increases so does the wage and, on the other, equal wages for equally stressed labor are ensured. Yet a situation frequently develops in which workers in some sections and shops have already virtually exhausted their reserves for increasing labor productivity and are working quite intensively but cannot be given additional bonuses because no further wage fund savings are possible.

It was proper that an addition was made on the suggestion of the working people to Article 11 of the law to the effect that labor collectives "participate in resolving problems related to the use of the legitimately achieved

wage fund savings as a result of reducing the size of the personnel, paid as bonuses to workers doing more work compared with existing norms (assignments)." Another important stipulation in the law is that material incentive funds cannot be appropriated without the agreement of the labor collective. Naturally, this will have a positive impact on the development of the Shchekino method, particularly in terms of the results of the work of brigades operating on the basis of a single contract, for the accelerated growth of labor productivity here is achieved above all through the extensive combination of skills and operations, interchangeability, enriched content of labor and, on this basis, its increased attractiveness.

As long as demand for manpower will exceed supply, the enterprises will continue to "attract" people from each other also through arbitrarily increasing wages with the help of the notorious "deduction" or other tricks. The inevitable consequence of this is a drop in labor discipline and labor productivity. The conscientious working people oppose such a faulty practice. That is why they must become more extensively involved in control activities and collective opinion must be mandatorily considered in the formulation of new wage and bonus systems. If every worker clearly realizes the need for such measures and understands their nature, this would have a direct effect on labor results. It would strengthen conscious discipline and improve the sociopsychological atmosphere of comradely cooperation, mutual aid and responsibility.

It would be difficult to overestimate the sociopolitical significance of the decisions of the November 1982 and June 1983 Central Committee plenums and the decrees passed by the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU on problems of strengthening labor discipline and the USSR Law on Labor Collectives. They have affected the deep levels of organizational and ideological-educational work conducted by the party and its economic and social policy. They have defined the ways and means for the solution of an entire set of problems in the interest of improving developed socialism and for the good of the entire Soviet people.

The further strengthening of the democratic principles of management, enhancing the rights of the labor collective and increasing its responsibility for the ideological-political, labor and moral upbringing of the individual and the steady implementation of state plans, the application of progressive ways and means of labor organization, norming and wages and strengthening conscious discipline offer new opportunities for the even more efficient application of the creative strength, knowledge and experience of the working people. The state is strong through the consciousness of the masses. It is strong when, as Lenin said, the masses know everything, can judge everything and undertake everything consciously. There neither is nor could there be a higher task than that of further developing initiative on the basis of the tried principle of democratic centralism, strengthening the unity and organization of the Soviet people and developing active and consistent fighters for the ideals of communism and economic and social progress.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2



TO A GROUP OF SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC DEPUTIES OF THE FRG BUNDESTAG

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83) pp 13-14

[Statement by Yu. V. Andropov; PRAVDA, 21 September 1983]

[Text] Gentlemen deputies:

The USSR Supreme Soviet deputies, like all Soviet people, share the concern expressed in your address on the subject of the growing arms race and the lack of progress at the talks the purpose of which is not only to stop this race but to take matters further to a reduction of armaments, nuclear above all.

It is our profound conviction that what is currently taking place is in direct conflict with the basic interests and aspirations of the peoples of Europe and the world over. The blame can be put on those who count on the destabilization of international relations and achieving military superiority over the socialist countries and, in addition, over all other countries.

History has repeatedly refuted such plans and aspirations. We are convinced that such will be the case this time as well. However, this requires most energetic and decisive actions to stop such a dangerous course of events, relieve mankind from the nuclear threat and achieve a turn in the disarmament talks under way.

The world does not need an increase in the arsenals of deadly armaments. It needs their radical reduction and the use of the thus-released funds to meet urgent economic and social development needs.

Such is the firm conviction of the Soviet Union and such is the viewpoint of all Warsaw Pact members. Such is also the answer to the main question raised in your letter. The Soviet Union is doing everything possible to stop the slipping toward nuclear catastrophe. It is ready to engage in broad cooperation with all countries on this problem of key importance to the future of mankind.

You are turning to us with the appeal to stop all nuclear armaments, freeze all nuclear weapon potentials and reduce the number of Soviet SS-20 missiles if the United States would abandon the deployment of Cruise and Pershing II missiles in Europe.

While fully sharing and supporting these demands, the Soviet Union is ready to go considerably further. We suggest a quantitative and qualitative freeze of all nuclear weapons, i.e., ending the quantitative growth of all components of nuclear arsenals and the nondeployment of new kinds and types of nuclear armaments, imposing a moratorium on all nuclear weapon tests and on the testing of new types and kinds of nuclear weapon deliveries. Our proposal that Europe be freed from nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical, also remains valid.

All of these are not pious wishes. We favor the immediate translation of this program into the language of contractual obligations and its full implementation, step by step. The beginning may be laid by the USSR and the United States, bearing in mind that the other nuclear powers as well would act similarly.

As to the Soviet SS-20 missiles, the Soviet Union is prepared to retain, after the reductions in Europe, the same number of medium-range missiles as that of Britain and France.

We recently took a new major step toward reaching agreement by agreeing to destroy all missiles removed from the European part of the country, naturally providing that a mutually acceptable agreement on the problem of nuclear armaments for Europe as a whole has been reached, including the agreement on the part of the United States to abandon the deployment of its new missiles and correspondingly to reduce its medium-range air force. This good will step we have taken means that we would not redeploy in the Asian part of the USSR the medium-range missiles removed from Europe. This would eliminate the fear expressed by the FRG to the effect that such missiles could be redeployed in their previous positions at any time.

Therefore, the Soviet Union favors the drastic reduction of nuclear arsenals of medium-range weapons in Europe by a factor of 3 and not the deployment here of new models of such armaments. It does not ask for a single missile or airplane more than NATO's. It agrees to major physical reduction of its armaments. The question is, what else is needed to reach an honest and just agreement? And also, do the United States and the other NATO countries want such an agreement at all?

At the beginning of the 1970s the USSR and the FRG stood together at the cradle of detente. The peoples of our countries are familiar with the horrors of war and the price of peace. They are firmly opposed to recurrences of the cold war. They cannot look indifferently at the efforts made for the sake of interests alien to Europe to eliminate everything positive which was created through the joint efforts of Eastern and Western countries in Europe for the sake of the peaceful future of our continent.

Also characteristic in this respect is the fact that, as your letter indicates, 72 percent of the FRG population are against the deployment of new American missiles and for the continuation of the talks and reaching an agreement in Geneva. You do not want the threat of war to stem from your country's territory, a war which would bring hell to all mankind. Nor do we.

Everything possible should be done to prevent this. This is within our possibilities and in the interest of our and all other European peoples.

I hope that the deputies at the FRG Bundestag--the country's supreme governmental organ--will act with a deep awareness of their duty and responsibility. It is still possible to prevent the world from sliding into a new round in the arms race.

Respectfully yours,

Yu. V. Andropov

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## KARL MARX AND THE CONTEMPORARY REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83) pp 15-27

[Article by Gus Hall, U.S. Communist Party secretary general; based on his speech at the theoretical conference on the 165th anniversary of the birth and centennial of the death of Karl Marx, delivered in New York on 19 March 1983]

[Text] The United States is a capitalist country which is proving on a daily basis, more than all others, the justice of Karl Marx's theory today.

Had Marx been with us today, he would have been amazed by much of what is happening in the United States. Thus, for example, a dangerous and malicious lout is the country's president. He is broadcasting throughout the world that when one is against the nuclear arms race one is not only against Reagan but against God and, furthermore, that anyone who opposes the nuclear arms race is an agent of the devil himself.

Marx would have been startled and amazed to hear in the 20th century a president claiming that the capitalist world can cope with the problems of today "only if it believes in God as impassionately as the communists believe in man." Marx would only laugh hearing this indirect compliment paid to the communists.

Seriously speaking, Marx would have presented to Reagan his credo as follows: I believe in man in general. However, I believe particularly strongly in the working class, the revolutionary class which has created a truly humane society, a society which, actually, let us interject, has no place for fanatics such as Reagan.

Marx was a truly universal person, whose greatest passion was to serve the working class; he possessed an unquenchable thirst for knowledge and truth. This fruitful combination helped him to develop a new outlook which shook up the world to its very foundations.

Marxism-Leninism is a theory and method of socialist revolution, and revolution is the locomotive of history. It has already become a law of social development that the farther mankind leaves Marx's age behind, the closer it comes to Marxism-Leninism.

Today no single country in the world remains without an active communist movement.

Yes, the "spectre of communism" roams throughout the entire capitalist world. We can say this with greater justification today than in the past.

At the time of Karl Marx's death, Friedrich Engels, his closest fellow worker and best friend, wrote a very fine epitaph: "Mankind was shortened by one head, the most important of all of them in our time" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 35, p 386). With a profound dialectical understanding of the influence of Marx's death on the class struggle, he wrote that "the final victory has been secured, but the circuitous ways, and the temporary and partial wanderings--inevitable as it were--will now be much more numerous" (ibid.).

Engels' prediction was accurate. As we know, there have been both "temporary" as well as "individual" "wanderings." In order to illustrate the profound impact which Marx's death made in 1883, I shall cite several typical examples of the reaction to it. The New York Central Council of Trade Unions passed the following resolution: "The world of the working people has lost one of its greatest teachers, one of its best friends. Karl Marx was a person who, more than 30 years ago, called upon the working people of all countries to unite and organize in the struggle for the triumph of justice on earth. Let all of us unite and thus honor his memory." Today's heads of the New York Central Council of Trade Unions would not err by looking closely at what their "greatest teacher and best friend" supported.

The leading Boston daily noted in an editorial that "Karl Marx was one of the most outstanding people of our time, a great scientist and exceptional organizer." One hundred years later, we should add to this "outstanding for all time."

One week after Marx's death, Jose Marti, the great Cuban revolutionary, wrote that "Marx showed a deep understanding of the reasons for the suffering of mankind. He was a person motivated by the warm desire to do good. He believed in everything that was part of his character: a rebellious spirit, noble ideals and aspiration toward struggle."

Fifty years later, Ohio Bishop Montgomery Brown noted that "although Marx is dead his words are alive. After his death his voice is heard more loudly and convincingly than during his lifetime."

And fifty years after that we can add that "Marx's voice can be heard even more loudly and convincingly." Such has been the case all along: throughout the world he was honored and praised. Entire volumes of such speeches could be compiled.

Only one person would have objected to such praises and honors: Karl Marx himself. He would have modestly said something like "thank you, dear comrades, naturally I value your gratitude. You must remember, however, that we must evaluate the contribution of individuals, including myself, in the light of the development of real life. We must assess the contribution of every individual in the light of his attitude toward the true maker of history--the people." He would have also added the profound thought that, I have possibly

influenced history. However, I did not make it. I did not invent the class struggle. I merely explained its role as the main motive force of history. Not only from personal modesty but for other reasons as well Marx would have believed that honoring and praising individuals could set a bad example. Indeed, this might seem contradictory, for one of his greatest contributions to the treasury of human thought is his theory of the role of the individual and of ideas in history.

Marx proved the following: In the past the popular view was that the main reason for all historical changes should be sought in changes of ideas. This meant that individuals--monarchs, feudal lords, state leaders, philosophers, thinkers and political personalities somehow create ideas and then implement them themselves.

In other words, it was believed that the great people, motivated by ambition, love for God and their country, and so on, accomplish great deeds and thus make and change history.

As we know, Marx was the first scientifically to refute the concept that history is the consequence of the whims of individuals. He considered ideas and thoughts as reflections of the real world and the essence of real living conditions, rather than vice versa. He said that, on the contrary, an idea is nothing but the material world as reflected in the human mind and as embodied in a thought. This very important new postulate became the cornerstone of Marx's philosophical doctrine.

Marx pointed out that the material world had existed long before the human mind, with its ability to reflect it, appeared.

Before Marx all life and the entire world and its history were considered a disorderly compilation of events, a random course of circumstances with no pattern whatsoever. Advance took place but no sensible interpretation of such events existed.

Marx explained the meaning of human society and history. He pointed out the streamlined effective principles which determine change. He discovered the inner laws governing the development of society and history and proved that social life is governed by objective laws and that the people can understand and make use of such laws in developing society in their own interest. It was particularly important that Marx proved that history irreversibly moves in a certain direction and that, knowing the laws of this movement, through their actions the people can influence it and hasten the historical process.

This was the great contribution which Karl Marx made to the cause of the working class. Marxism is a scientific, a theoretical substantiation of the vitally important interests of the working class. Armed with Marxism-Leninism, the working class is influencing and accelerating the course of history. Marxism is a manual for action which sets the course of the working class and the peoples the world over.

Putting Marx's concept of society in history to practical use, Lenin wrote that "the chaos and arbitrariness which had prevailed until then in the views on history and politics were replaced by a strikingly purposeful and streamlined scientific theory which proved the way one system of social life develops as a result of the growth of production forces into another, a higher one. For example, capitalism grows out of serfdom" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 23, p 44).

Naturally, the capitalist class rejects all concepts of natural processes, for they expose the cruel and inhuman nature of capitalism and prove precisely that in the same way that "capitalism grew out of serfdom" now it must leave the stage of history, yielding to "another, higher system," socialism.

Therefore, Marx's cautioning against extravagant praise of individuals stems directly from his doctrine. Marx would have said that however brilliant his thoughts and works may have been, they were not the consequence of his intuition, instinct, thoughtfulness or revelation. They were firm scientific conclusions based on persistent and comprehensive scientific work and close study of life and society and the knowledge acquired by all mankind. His theory, concepts and conclusions were based on the study of laws--of the internal objective processes inherent in all phenomena.

Marx developed a new method for the study of problems, a new approach to their solution and a new method of research. He proved why it is always necessary to penetrate into the essence of one fact or phenomenon or another instead of accepting its external manifestation as its essence.

In precisely the way we cannot judge a book by its cover, we cannot determine the nature of social and economic processes on the way they appear to the naked eye. Marx said that there would be no need for science had the appearance of an object coincided with its inner nature. In other words, if the inner nature and the appearance were the same, it would suffice to look at one object or another closely or to photograph it. This is important, for in the majority of cases the external appearance is not only different from the essence but can even mislead.

For example, many people in our country believe that the A&P supermarkets exist for the sake of feeding the people, that General Motors would like everyone to have a new car and that Reagan and the Pentagon would like to help the people of El Salvador. The nature of their true aspirations, however, do not coincide with the external impressions they make.

In order to establish the nature of a society we must trace the class and economic interests standing behind all activities, political struggle, principles, institutions and policies.

It is at this point that Marxism leads us to the main question: In order to determine the nature of objects in depth and in width we must be familiar with the laws of dynamics. In simple terms, this means that we must study the laws governing the nature of objects. Since in reality everything is in a state of constant motion, continually changing in accordance with specific

laws, this means that we must study not probable or improbable events but the process of steady development.

The study of the essence, the nature of the basic properties of objects means the study of laws, the study of how and why all processes develop and change. This is necessary, for no one can truly understand the nature of one phenomenon or another without a concept of its internal laws. To know the laws means to know the present. Even more important, however, is the fact that the only way leading to the knowledge of what will happen in the future goes through the knowledge of the laws which govern all change. This enables us to make scientific predictions.

More than a century ago, based on his knowledge of the laws governing the development of capitalism, Marx predicted the inevitable development of big monopolies. If we know in advance what we have to do and what our opponent intends to do we will enjoy a great advantage. Today, for example, on the basis of the internal laws of imperialism and the monopolies derived by Lenin, we know how American capitalism must act. We know that it is inevitably and periodically threatened by crises, that it will inevitably try to extract maximal profits and that, in the final account, it will inevitably yield to socialism. Consequently, we also know the role of the class which will make the revolutionary transition to socialism, and we have in our hands the means to develop the tactics for the accomplishment of this inevitable transition. All this knowledge is based on our understanding of the laws of motion and social development.

Furthermore, there are specific laws which explain their own actions. They too can help us to clarify the nature of phenomena.

Here is an example:

The law operates with no exception from the general rule;

The law operates objectively, i.e., regardless of what people may think or want.

For example, regardless of how classes and class relations may change in the capitalist society, as long as exploiters and exploited exist, they will always be engaged in a class struggle. This is a law. It is important for the working class to understand why and how this law operates.

Here is another example. As long as imperialist countries exist and so do imperialist exploitation and plunder, as is the case in Asia, Africa and Central and South America, an anti-imperialist struggle will always be waged against them. This too is a law.

Marx's outstanding contribution was that he not only called for determining the essence of objects but emphasized that knowledge must be used for the sake of change, i.e., not simply for its own sake, as many people before him had done.



In explaining the role of the working class, the class struggle and the laws of social development, Marx opened to the working people the entire world of their own philosophy and science. He put in their hands a powerful weapon which is leading our class to victory throughout the earth.

Having conquered the masses, Marxism-Leninism is becoming a material force and the essence of the global revolutionary process.

As Marx would have said today, Engels, Lenin and he himself were able to influence the course of history thanks to their ability to discover the objective laws governing social and economic processes. They were able to penetrate into the essence of social systems.

Motivated by the great desire to do good and to fight injustice and exploitation, Marx, Engels and Lenin focused their main attention in their study on the capitalist society. Marx's "Das Kapital" and Lenin's works bring to light the inner inviolable laws of capitalism and its distorted nature.

"Das Kapital" is a sharp exposure of the inhuman and cruel social system based on the exploitation of the working class. It is a decisive exposure of the law of the desire of private corporations for maximal profits.

The three volumes of "Das Kapital" are a comprehensive manual in the struggle against an inhuman and unjust system which is exclusively motivated by the greed of an insignificant minority. It is Marx's and Engels' greatest gift and legacy to the working people the world over. A close study should be made of the law of added value or of corporate profits, for knowledge of this law is absolutely required of the working class. This law reveals the sources of corporate profits. Thousands of books have been written with a view to complicate, distort or confuse this law.

After Marx proved that nothing is added as a commodity is purchased and sold so that, consequently, it cannot be the source of profit, the question immediately arose: What then is the source of corporate profits?

The exploiting ruling class will never forgive Marx for exposing its most sacred secret: the source of its dishonestly acquired wealth. Marx scientifically proved that capitalist profits are exclusively the result of the fruit of the efforts of the workers they hire at their factories and plants.

The law of added value operates quite simply. The corporation pays the worker as much as he requires in order to be able to exist and to work. Workers never become rich. Their savings are small. However, they produce a value far in excess of their wages. This precisely is the source of all profit. That is how the rich become richer and the workers poorer.

The workers produce the entire wealth while the capitalists become richer. Let us assume that a worker must work 4 hours to produce everything he needs for his life and work. In the majority of cases, however, the workers work 8 hours a day. This means that the capitalist uses the labor of the worker for the full 8 hours and that, consequently, his net profit is the result of

4 hours of the worker's labor. We see, therefore, how important this law is, if we convert the hours into dollars in order to determine the added value or profit. Therefore, added value is the net profit of the capitalist class. It is a profit earned before it is split among stockholders, banks, land-owners and corporate managers.

It is extremely necessary to understand this basic law which explains the source of corporate profit, for the American monopolists have outstripped all remaining exploiting classes in history in increasing the level of added value by cruelly intensifying the exploitation of the working people. What is the current situation in this respect?

Today, with an 8-hour work day, the average worker works 2 hours and 9 minutes for himself and 5 hours and 51 minutes for the boss. In other words, starting with the month of March, for the balance of the year the working class, i.e., the working people, will be working exclusively for paying their taxes and earning profits for the corporations. As Marx said, manpower is a commodity which is "the source of value, which is greater than its own" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 205).

The capitalists know perfectly well that their profits are based on added value. This is even thoroughly emphasized in advertising aimed at industrialists. For example, the state of New York boasts that New York industrial workers produce through their labor value in excess of their wage of \$4.25 per wage dollar. In other words, the value they produce is quadruple that of their wage.

A state which has outstripped New York is Texas. Here the created value exceeds the value of the wage on the basis of \$5 per wage dollar; in other words, the added value equals 400 percent.

In order to expose superexploitation and superprofits as the results of racism, let me emphasize that in Puerto Rico the value per unit of output exceeds the value of the wage by an average of \$5.58, whereas the average for the United States is \$3.72. In other words, in Puerto Rico for the same wage the volume of output is 50 percent higher than the U.S. average. The headlong growth of added value in the United States and in countries plundered by American imperialism is the main reason for the drop in the real wage and the declining living standard among the mass of American workers and workers living in the hell of American imperialism.

All of these facts are a living example of the justice of Marx's statement regarding the irreconcilability between the interests of capital and labor, and the law according to which profits grow to the extent to which wages are reduced while profits declined to the extent to which wages increase. All bourgeois propaganda arguments to the effect that capital and labor are one big happy family and that "what is good for General Motors is good for the country," and that labor and capital are not natural partners operating on the basis of class operation are nothing other than an attempt to hide the truth discovered by Marx.

In discovering the law of added value, Marx also helped to discover the law of the class struggle between capitalists and workers, which totally obliterates all concepts of class cooperation.

It is precisely the absolute truth contained in these laws that enabled Marx and Engels to develop the theory of scientific socialism. They proved that socialism is by far not utopia or fantasy but the natural outcome of the development of capitalist society. They proved that capitalism is digging its own grave and brought to light the epoch-making historical role of the working class. They drew the logical conclusion that the path to the new society goes through the overthrow of capitalism.

A great deal is known and has been written about the laws of economic and social development and about scientific socialism. Far less known is the manner in which Marx and Engels developed our understanding of the laws of nature--the natural sciences.

The natural scientists are discovering that the more they study the laws of nature the more they learn about the laws of dialectics, which define and explain all phenomena in nature, society and consciousness.

As Engels frequently pointed out, the process of discovery of the laws of movement in nature is in itself the proof of one of the laws of dialectics: an evolutionary process takes place in the knowledge and gathering of scientific data, followed by periods of tempestuous revolutionary leaps.

We are currently experiencing one such revolutionary period in scientific development in many respects. We call it the scientific and technical revolution. Today, for example, the scientists have sufficient knowledge of the laws governing living organisms, including genes, in order to split genes with a view to creating new forms and varieties of living matter. Furthermore, the new facilities for splitting the atom today are sufficiently powerful to lead to the discovery of new particles.

Possibly science is coming closer to the discovery of a law which may prove to be basic--the law of the unity of basic forces of nature--the forces of gravity, electromagnetism and nuclear forces. This will provide an even greater understanding of the essence of nature. The laws of dialectics, however, remain valid.

The reason for which the hatred of Marx by the ruling class has never abated becomes clear. The ruling class is indignant, puzzled and disappointed by the fact that after so many years and after the wasting of such great resources in ideological warfare Marxism remains alive, and that after campaigns and "crusades" for its destruction, which were mounted in the course of decades, the influence, prestige and popularity of Marxism continued to grow.

Why is Marxism eternal?

Why is it that the voice of Marx, who died 100 years ago, is still heard?

Why is it that more than half the people on earth are either building socialism or have charted a course of building socialism, led and inspired by the theory of Marxism-Leninism or by political parties and movements based on this doctrine?

Why is Marxism-Leninism the basic ideological trend influencing the course of development of human society?

All of these are very topical questions. Naturally, the answer does not lie in the fact that Marx called upon the proletariat of all countries to unite, although this slogan is an expression of proletarian internationalism, as it was in the past.

As we know, the annals of history contain many social and economic theories, concepts, ideas and philosophical trends. All of them, however, are only being covered with dust with the exception of one great doctrine--the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism.

In order to provide a true answer to the question of why Marx remains alive today we should turn to the basic idea that Marxism-Leninism is a science which covers the laws pertaining to all life processes--social, economic and natural. The inner laws of capitalism, which Marx discovered such a long time ago, have remained essentially unchanged to this day.

Conversely, with the aggravation of the contradictions within the capitalist system which, itself, is wearing down, and as it becomes increasingly obsolete, many of these laws are operating more openly, more directly and, consequently, it becomes far easier to note and understand them.

Today 30 million Americans are either unemployed or have partial work and are hungry and homeless. They are the immediate victims of the law of the capitalist economy.

On the basis of the laws of the capitalist economy, 120 years ago Marx drew the conclusion that the basic reason for all real economic crises is without exception the poverty and limited purchasing power of the masses along with the opposite trend of capitalist production. This trend consists of the development of production forces as though oriented toward absolute and unlimited consumption by the entire society.

The law of pursuit after maximal profit leads to contradictions and periodical economic crises. It mercilessly leads all corporations steadily to increase their output without setting any limits, without plan, on an absolutely random fashion, without knowledge of the market. At the same time, however, it motivates them to pay the workers a smaller and smaller share of the value of their output.

In principle demand for consumer goods can be equal only to the sum total of worker wages. The workers are consumers and consumer demand is based not on worker whims or tastes but on purchasing power, i.e., on wages. Therefore, if a corporation continues to increase its output while actually restricting

the market by reducing wages, it is entirely natural that an economic breakdown would take place and that crises would appear and recur endlessly.

For example, the lowering of wages in the metallurgical and automobile industries was reflected in the agencies of the car dealers: the workers cannot afford automobiles. This is all very simple.

The corporation ideologues like to describe this as "overproduction." Indeed, the impression is created as though too many goods have been dumped on the market. This is a case in which an external impression is misleading. In other words, they claim that the volume of output exceeds consumer need or demand, whereas in fact all that takes place is an accumulation of unsold goods resulting from insufficiently high wages.

This basic law of the capitalist economy has not changed. Furthermore, workers in the metallurgical, automobile and electrical engineering industries, the miners and most other workers face a series of capitalist exploitation laws.

At this point we come across the hidden law of added value, the law according to which the interests of the working and the capitalist class will always remain irreconcilable and antagonistic, until the very end of the age of capitalism.

More than 100 years ago Karl Marx proved that the capitalist always tries to earn maximal profits, i.e., that he wants to lower wages to their physical minimum and extend the working day to its physical maximum. In reality, however, wages and the length of the working day are the result of the continuing struggle between labor and capital. This problem leads to the problem of the relative strength of the opposite parties.

More than 100 years ago Marx made the rather fine remark to the effect that "the work of the whites cannot be liberated wherever the work of the blacks bears the seal of shame" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 309). Today this remark has become a law in the struggle against racist oppression. This truth remains one of the basic preliminary conditions both of class unity and the creation of a nationwide front of struggle against Reaganism.

Paradoxically, Reagan himself is convincing proof of Karl Marx's brilliance. Through his daily actions and policies he is proving the accuracy of Marx's theory. One hundred and twenty years ago Marx reached the conclusion that in the course of time the capitalist economy will reach a limit beyond which the production process will no longer be able to continue without increasing the participation and intervention of the state and the government.

In other words, the governmental machinery and the state institutions (essentially controlled by the monopolies) will be gradually playing an increasingly direct role, guaranteeing the corporations the opportunity to continue their pursuit of maximal profits.

The tax laws and loopholes, capital amortization depreciations and the strike-breaking activities of the government are all clear examples of the role of the state and the government. They represent state-monopoly capitalism.

Some people describe this as "Reaganomics." Others call it the military-industrial complex. Engels wrote that the official representative of the capitalist society--the state--will, in the final account, be forced to take over production management. Lenin said that capitalism has become monopolistic and that monopoly capitalism is developing into state-monopoly capitalism. Reagan is proving the accuracy of these statements every day, with every step.

As a science and theory of the laws governing the development of capitalism, Marxism made it possible to predict the growth of the monopolies and the increased role of the government. In the final account, this brought about the appearance of state-monopoly capitalism.

Reagan's policy, which shifts the tax burden to the workers and the non-monopoly population strata, a policy which enables the corporations to write off the cost of new equipment in 5 years, is precisely what Marx had in mind when he wrote that through the state capital shifts the burden of expenditures to the people.

The military budget of \$1 trillion is also shifted to the people. The militarization of the economy not only increases economic oppression but greatly increases the threat of nuclear war.

The defenders of capitalism are worried most of all by Marx's discovery of the objective laws governing the development of history.

This is the funeral march of capitalism. Its days are numbered. The course of history, determined by the laws, clearly proves that your time to leave has come, your outrageous system has become obsolete and cannot march in step with the times.

The bourgeois ideologues are particularly frightened by the fact that Marx proved the way throughout the history of mankind socioeconomic systems have appeared in the historical arena and yielded to new systems as time went on. They are frightened by the occurrence of a legitimate historical process which is rejecting capitalism and that capitalism is today sliding downwards. They are trying to conceal all this, particularly from the people. They would like the people to believe that capitalism will remain forever.

They also dislike the future which awaits them. They do not like the new socialist society which has already appeared. This is understandable, for the new system deprives them of their special privileges and sources of private wealth. As Marx wrote, when a socialist revolution takes place the expropriators become expropriated, and the laws of capitalism become invalid.

Today the socioeconomic laws, the laws of capitalist development in particular, are of tremendous political importance, for once we begin to understand

them we reach an understanding of the central role of the class struggle in an exploiting society.

By mastering the laws of economics we inevitably reach the conclusion that the working class is the only truly revolutionary class. At that point we begin to realize that the laws of exploitation under capitalism educate the working class and inevitably convert it into the main gravedigger of capitalism.

By virtue of a legitimate process the working class has become the main force of social change. Failure to see the leading role of the working class means failure to see the trend of historical development, progress and social change.

It is entirely natural that the ruling class reject the social laws, for all objective laws prove that it is holding back social progress, that history is leaving it behind and that capitalism is old and is being replaced by socialism, which brings with it everything that is new, including a new set of social and economic laws.

Some communists and revolutionary parties have sometimes deviated from the path of class struggle. This was mentioned by Engels. In every single case they either ignored or revised the basic laws of capitalist development. These two grave errors were also the consequence of ignoring or distorting the laws of socialist development.

In the past, some of the leaders of the U.S. Communist Party had decided that the laws discovered by Karl Marx were applicable to capitalism as a whole, but that American capitalism was the exception to the rule. They developed a concept according to which American capitalism was too powerful and inventive, for which reason it was not subject to the inner contradictions based on its development laws. Specifically, they said that American capitalism is capable of avoiding the cyclical economic crises to which the other capitalist countries are subjected. The theories of "American exclusivity" collapsed in 1929, when the stock market crisis broke out. The law of economic crises, Marx asserted, operates with iron inevitability.

Later, Earl Browder, one of these leaders, also decided that American capitalism was distinguished from the capitalism of other countries. Consequently, he claimed, the laws of added value and the class struggle are inapplicable to it and could be rejected and ignored. He thought that as a result of the establishment of the antifascist alliance in World War II the entire world had changed and that American monopoly capitalism would draw a lesson from this.

He claimed that in the interest of universal cooperation and peace and for the sake of its own national interests, the United States would forsake some of its greedy capitalist class interests.

Any opportunistic policy is always proclaimed in the name of the application of Marxism-Leninism under "new and exceptional" circumstances. Browder claimed that his opportunism constituted the further development of Marxism-Leninism in the "new circumstances" which had appeared in the United States.

He tried to refute the laws of capitalist development and bypass Marxism-Leninism by saying that "they are inapplicable. This is the first time that we are facing and resolving problems for which there is no precedent in history and for which the classics provide no formulas or laws to give as an answer." Finally, Browder went so far as to reject the class struggle. "We, Americans, who are proud to consider ourselves the students of Lenin, are in practice cooperating with capital and firmly condemn those who promote a class war against capital in the United States," he said. However, Truman declared the cold war, which immediately shattered this illusion. As was to be expected, the law of corporate pursuit after maximal profit and the law of the class struggle proved their effectiveness. Naturally, all serious movements, including the political parties of the working class, should operate on the basis of real circumstances, taking into consideration the level of awareness of the masses and reflecting the development of natural processes.

In order for policies, tactics and strategic concepts to have any real meaning and significance, they cannot be based on subjective evaluations. They must be directed toward the use of the laws and their activities in order to influence the consciousness of the masses.

Opportunism, both on the right and on the left, is essentially a negation of the Marxism concept of the legitimate development of social processes.

Opportunism is a denial of the objective laws which confirm the central role of the class struggle, the role which it will play as long as capitalism exists. Opportunism is also a negation of the leading role of the working class.

It is a negation of the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism.

It is a negation of the leading role of the working class and the aspiration to replace it with concepts of class cooperation and class partnership.

As we know, Marxism-Leninism is not a dogma. It is a developing science. However, there are objective truths which are discovered through the application of this science. These truths reflect the laws of the real world and no one can question them. They cannot be changed or made to fit someone's arbitrary ideas or concepts of reality.

Objective truths exist concerning the capitalist system, based on objective laws which are permanent, stable and fixed. That is why any effort to avoid or ignore the objective truth that the class struggle is the internal essence, the basic essence of capitalism, or any retreat from this objective truth means taking the path of opportunism. Opportunism is, essentially, nothing but an attempt to put an end, one way or another, to the class struggle. It is a dead-end street. It is a violation of objective laws. However, it is also a betrayal of the working class.

Any effort to weaken the particular role which the laws of social and economic development assign the working class or to push it into the background means to ignore reality and follow the path of opportunism and class treason.



It follows from this that failure to see the working class as a unified class based on its position in the production system means failure to grasp the concept of the existence of classes in general.

The fact that the working class is the only revolutionary class is objective truth. The working class is the decisive power in all realms of struggle. Thanks to its critically important role in the production process, it is the key element in the struggle for democracy and against monopoly oppression.

As it begins increasingly to realize its role and position as a class, i.e., as its class self-awareness increases, it becomes the most important force in the struggle against all bourgeois ideological trends.

In the United States and in countries where racism is a tool for extracting superprofits, the working class is one of the most important forces. As Marxists-Leninists we believe in the working class, we believe in the fact that it can win in the struggle against racism. Our faith in the working class is neither romantic nor fatalistic. It is determined by our fundamental understanding of capitalist laws and processes.

As a result of this growth, the development of class self-awareness is a critically important element in surmounting all ideological trends aimed at supporting any kind of exploitation and oppression. Since this class self-awareness is based on true class interests, as a rule it can surmount all alien class ideological influences. Therefore, any underestimating or ignoring of the most important role of the working class means not only a manifestation of opportunism but a weakening of the struggle in all areas.

These are objective truths. They exist not only officially, not only for purposes of speeches, articles or resolutions; they constitute the firm and unbreakable framework of Marxism-Leninism, within which all problems, tactics, policies and strategic concepts must fit.

There are those who, in a spirit of opportunism, draw away from these objective truths by rejecting the word "Leninism." Others reject both Marxism and Leninism. However, there also are those who reject these basic truths allegedly in the name of Marxism-Leninism, the class struggle and the working class.

Once again this leads us to the concepts and laws of the visible and the extant. For example, one may pretend to support these laws while in fact betraying or ignoring them, while repeating high-faluting phrases and cliches about the class struggle and the working class, whereas in practice pursuing an antilabor petit bourgeois nationalistic policy of class cooperation.

In the world arena at large opportunism leads to the concept of the so-called "two superpowers" and to a campaign of deliberate lies. In blaming the threat of war or nuclear catastrophe equally on the "two superpowers," the participants in such campaigns try to conceal the true nature of imperialism by slandering the Soviet Union.

This is an attempt to conceal the basic law of the inevitable pursuit of maximal profit by the corporations, which results in a policy of imperialist aggression and war. It is also a malicious slander of the radically different laws on which the socialist system is based and which are aimed at pursuing a policy of peace and support of national liberation movements and social progress.

No shortcuts to victory are possible by bypassing Marxism-Leninism. Opportunism may create the appearance of a sober approach, making it appear as though it is acting on the basis of reality. In fact, however, it denies the class struggle and rejects it and, with it, reality itself.

Marxism-Leninism is the philosophy and outlook of the working class, for it is a philosophy of social progress. That is why it is inevitably related to the force which is the main motive force of social progress, i.e., the working class.

The working class is the only social class which can and must essentially inspire, organize and carry out a social revolution and a transition to socialism which will put forever an end to exploitation.

The process of revolutionary change is inevitable and infinite. However, the pace of development of this process is determined by the people, the working class, their consciousness and their readiness for action. The actions of the people, in turn, are determined by the extent to which they understand the meaning of the laws of development. The understanding of these laws by the people, in turn, is determined by the help they can obtain and the type of leadership they have.

All of this, naturally, brings us back to the theory of Marxism-Leninism--the theory of the working class. Marxism-Leninism, in turn, leads us to the fact that the communist party has long become a historical necessity and an irreplaceable factor in this process.

Such were precisely the conclusions reached by Marx during his lifetime, conclusions which he did not simply think out and present but on the basis of which he acted.

Therefore, we can say that the absolute law of Marxism-Leninism is to learn, to recognize the new, to acquire knowledge in order to become a more efficient fighter and better leader. The transition from idea to action takes place not without effort. To find out, to learn, to master a number of things without applying them in practice and in action means to waste one's efforts.

To master knowledge and to be like Karl Marx means to be a person who thinks and, as it is said, can "work for mankind" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 40, p 7).

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2

29

## THEORETICAL PROBLEMS OF THE ECONOMIC MECHANISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83) pp 28-38

[Article by Dr of Economic Sciences L. Abalkin]

[Text] At its initial stage, developed socialism already significantly widens the opportunity to resolve large-scale economic and social problems. The mastery of these opportunities, the rational utilization of the created potential and the multiplication of the results of collective toil require as a necessary and mandatory condition a well-organized economic mechanism. This is particularly relevant today, for "our work, which is aimed at improving and restructuring the economic mechanism and the forms and methods of management," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov wrote in the article "Karl Marx's Theory and Some Problems of Socialist Construction in the USSR," "has fallen behind the requirements of the level reached in the material and technical, social and spiritual development of Soviet society."

1

The shaping and organization of an efficiently functioning economic mechanism is not a local, strictly economic matter. As was pointed out at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, it is a structural component of the overall process of the perfecting of our social system. The reorganization of this mechanism plays an exceptionally important role in terms of the profound qualitative changes in production forces and, particularly, the corresponding improvement in production relations.

The practical solution of the problems arising in this area presumes a clear understanding of the place which the economic mechanism holds in social life, its role and its functions. In turn, this is inconceivable without addressing ourselves to the fundamental stipulations of Marxist-Leninist theory.

For a long time the problem of the economic mechanism was shunted aside in the seemingly good and thorough study of the theoretical legacy of the creators of scientific communism. This could not fail to affect the solution of practical problems. Yet, as early as in the first volume of "Das Kapital," K. Marx not only introduced the category of "economic mechanism" but explained the basic foundations of the type of "social mechanism" through which "competition imposes upon the individual capitalist the immanent laws of the capitalist production method as external mandatory laws" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 23, pp 606, 641).

Marx undertook the detailed study of this mechanism in the third volume of "Das Kapital," explaining its content with the help of specific forms of production relations or economic forms such as intrasectorial and intersectorial rivalry, capital outflow, formation of market value and production price, interest rates and commercial profit, and so on. It is precisely here that he identified the specific forms of capital dynamics serving the process of economic realization of capitalist private ownership. "The metamorphoses of capital, as we developed them in this book," Marx wrote, "thus approach, step by step, the form in which they operate on the surface of society, in the influence of the various types of capital on each other, in competition and in the ordinary awareness of the agents of the production process themselves" (op. cit., vol 25, part I, p 29).

Lenin's analysis of the economic mechanism of socialist society is based on these fundamental concepts. This time in terms of the level of production socialization reached under the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism, V. I. Lenin wrote about the "mechanism of social management" and about the "technically equipped mechanism" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 33, p 50). He invariably related the economic mechanism of the socialist society to the "actual" socialization of production, the establishment of a widespread system of new organizational relations, planned organization of the production process and governmental economic activities. In his report to the 7th Party Congress, Lenin spoke of the conversion of the entire "state economic mechanism into a single large machine, an economic organism operating in such a way that hundreds of millions of people are guided by a single plan...." (op. cit., vol 36, p 7). Somewhat later, in the initial draft of the article "The Forthcoming Tasks of the Soviet System," he pointed out the "imposition of strict responsibility" and "voluntary execution of stipulations and orders needed in order for the economic mechanism to function truly like clockwork" (ibid., p 156).

The study of the classical theoretical legacy enables us to draw a number of important and basic conclusions. It is clear, above all, that each historically determined production method has its specific economic mechanism. Its purposes and methods for regulating economic life are determined by the dominating relations of ownership of productive capital.

However, although retaining throughout one production method or another its common generic features, in the course of its development the economic mechanism experiences quite a substantial modification.

Theoretical analysis enables us to determine the complex and dialectically conflicting unity of stability and variability in the development of economic systems. The most flexible are the specific relations and forms which characterize the economic management method and the mechanism for the economic realization of ownership of productive capital. On the basis of these starting concepts in Marxist-Leninist theory, and summing up the historical experience in building socialism, we can draw the conclusion that in the conversion from one stage of socialist maturity to another a significant, sometimes quite substantial, modification in the economic management mechanism takes place. Naturally, this does not negate the general principles of its elaboration and functioning.

Therefore, there can be no identical forms of production and management organization, plan indicators and economic levers and incentives applicable "in all cases in life." That which was suitable yesterday and which yielded adequate results may today (in the new stage) become obsolete and a hindrance in economic development. This is the basis of socialist economic management.

The economic mechanism itself is a rather complex and many-faceted phenomenon. It includes the sum total of forms and methods through which the organization of societal economic life is accomplished, economic processes are controlled and productive capital ownership is realized. Therefore, the economic mechanism is not only a complex but, to a certain extent, a collective concept which reflects both base and superstructural relations and institutions. This makes it a topic of research in a number of scientific fields ranging from political economy to law.

The political-economic analysis of the economic mechanism is related to the characterization of production relations in two aspects: as a means of appropriation and of economic management. The means of appropriation, or the appropriation (ownership) relation is characterized by the direction followed in production development, its objective and the social structure of society, and is determined by the content of all social relations. The economic management method, or the economic management relation, is determined by the mechanism of organization of public production through which a specific type of appropriation is economically applied.

Marx clearly distinguishes between these aspects, particularly in his study of the monopoly of private land ownership and of land monopoly as an object of economic management, in the study of differences between capital as possession and capital as function, in the distinction between the two sides of capitalist management, which is a separate function triggered by the social labor process and as a function of exploitation, and so on. Lenin also distinguishes between relations of appropriation (ownership) and economic relations which develop in the course of production socialization and organization. It is precisely in the study of production socialization that he determines that as capitalism develops "the production method enters into an irreconcilable contradiction with the form of appropriation...." (op. cit., vol 1, p 178). Subsequently, in his study of imperialism, Lenin proves that "private economic and private ownership relations" are merely the cover and that their essence is found in the "changing social production relations" (op. cit., vol 27, p 425).

Repeated efforts have been made in Soviet economic literature to apply this approach in the study of socialist production relations. Thus as early as the beginning of the 1930s N. A. Voznesenskiy wrote that "within the structure of socialist production relations we must distinguish between production relations which express the process of labor socialization and production relations which characterize relations of productive capital ownership" (N. A. Voznesenskiy, "Izbr. Proizv. 1931-1947" [Selected Works 1931-1947], Moscow, 1979, p 102). Similar attempts were made subsequently as well, although these efforts were not followed up.

The economic mechanism plays an important role in ensuring the consistency between the specific forms of production relations on the achieved level and the trends of development of production forces. Therefore, its analysis is a mandatory prerequisite for the profound study of the interaction between the two most important aspects of the production method. The poor theoretical development of problems related to the economic mechanism is one of the main reasons for which so far we have been unable to determine to a suitable extent and concreteness the means and methods for maintaining a dynamic correlation between production relations and the level of development of production forces under socialist conditions.

The clarification of the role of the economic mechanism in this interaction calls for a clear demarcation between the consistency of production relations, on the one hand, and the nature of production forces on the other, and their development level. The nature of production forces expresses their most general qualitative condition. It reveals the social aspect of production forces within a historically defined production method. When Marx writes of the social nature of production forces in capitalist society he considers them precisely in that quality.

The level of production forces expresses the specific condition of the individual and material production factors regardless of the social form of the production process. It identifies production forces from their technical aspect and characterizes the development of manpower from the viewpoint of its preparedness to master existing labor tools and technological processes. This level changes steadily. It grows while the nature of production forces remains relatively stable within a specific means of production.

The nature of production forces is directly related to the social form of appropriation or type of ownership of productive capital. The clash between the changed nature of production forces and the form of appropriation is resolved in the course of the social revolution, through the establishment of a new type of ownership.

In establishing the social ownership of productive capital, the socialist revolution thus resolves the main capitalist contradiction between the social nature of production and private capitalist form of appropriation. As a result, the type or method of appropriation becomes consistent (total, in this sense) with the nature of contemporary production forces. This consistency is the greatest advantage of the socialist system and a powerful booster of economic and social progress.

However, this is merely one aspect of the problem. The other is that the level of production forces in socialist society rises steadily. Under certain conditions quantitative changes in their development level become qualitative, which should be consistent with some changes in production relations as well. Otherwise, the latter begin to hold back, to hinder the further growth of output and its increased efficiency.

Such changes in production relations do not affect the type or method of appropriation, which remains social and socialist although, naturally, its

maturity increases. The reorganization (more or less significant depending on the scale of changes in the level of production forces) affects the sum total of production relations through which the public ownership of productive capital is economically realized.

If the appropriation method is made consistent with the nature of production forces in the course of the socialist revolution, the question is how and in what way do we achieve a consistency between the specific forms of production relations and the nature and level of the development of production forces? The entire historical experience in building socialism irrefutably proves that it cannot be achieved spontaneously, by itself.

The dynamic consistency between the specific forms of production relations and the steadily growing level of production forces in socialist society is maintained by restructuring the ways and means of socialist economic management. Therefore, improvements in the economic mechanism is the socialist method used in obeying the law of the consistency between production relations and the nature and level of development of production forces.

2

The profound and truly scientific study of the nature of the economic mechanism and its place and role in the life of the socialist society is the starting point in resolving contemporary problems. Theoretical nihilism inevitably leads to the fact that the search for ways to improve the economic mechanism becomes empirical, applying the quite irrational method of trial and error.

The economic mechanism of socialist society is a means for planned economic management with its specific relations and means of influencing the development of production and involving the people in labor. It includes specific forms of organization of public production, a system of organizational-economic relations and economic ties and ways and means of planned management. It is precisely through it that society masters the objective economic laws and uses them consciously.

The economic mechanism plays the main, the leading role among the means for the implementation of the objectives and tasks of the party's economic policy. Economic policy influences the development of material production forces, the direction and pace of scientific and technical progress and, largely, the motivation and activeness of the production activities of the people on the levels of the organization and discipline of economic policy not directly but through the various links in the economic mechanism.

The efficiency of its functioning depends to a decisive extent on its adequacy, i.e., on the consistency, first of all, between basic principles of socialism and the nature of social ownership and, secondly, the characteristics of the country's economic development at one stage or another. Violations of adequacy requirements, expressed in a retreat from the socialist principles of its organization or the preservation under the changed circumstances of obsolete specific management methods, prevents us from making proper use of the advantages and the potential of the socialist economic system.

The economic situation which developed in our country at the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s is characterized by the fact that despite unquestionable and major successes a substantial slowdown in the pace of economic growth took place. Labor productivity, the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum noted, is growing at an unsatisfactory rate. The latest achievements of science and technology--the main reserve for the growth of labor productivity and economic intensification--are being applied too slowly. Compared with the best total indicators, we use more raw materials and energy per unit of national income; many models of machines and equipment have a high material intensiveness. In recent years the already existing disproportions in the national economy have been aggravated and new major ones have appeared. Cases of nonfulfillment of plans have become more frequent and labor and performing discipline has weakened.

The negative phenomena in the development of the Soviet economy have triggered a variety of "theories" in the West on its alleged crisis, the roots of which are seen by the most zealous supporters of the capitalist order in public ownership and planned economic management. Such explanations are totally false and groundless. The entire period of modern history which began with the October Revolution has convincingly proved the economic and social efficiency of planned economic management based on public ownership. A crisis-free development, full employment, free education and medical aid, elimination of exploiting classes and national hostility, the assertion of the principles of collectivism and social optimism became possible and real only under socialist conditions.

Total understanding should exist in this matter and with even greater firmness and responsibility and the use of Marxist-Leninist methodology we must answer the question of the reasons which cause very serious negative phenomena in our economic life.

There is a rather widespread opinion according to which resource shortages are the reason for existing difficulties. However, references to resource shortages do not explain in the least the high material-intensiveness of output, the lower pace of scientific and technical progress or even less so the weakening of plan discipline and responsibility.

As to the expanded reproduction resources themselves--manpower, raw materials, fuel and energy, and capital investments--as we know, they are continuing to grow although more slowly than before. However, if we take into consideration the current amounts of such resources and the tremendous losses, there cannot even be a question of any shortage.

Furthermore, we cannot reduce the reasons for existing negative phenomena to a drop in consciousness, mental inertia, insufficient realization of social duty, and so on. However important and increasingly significant such factors may be, from the viewpoint of Marxist methodology they are not the final reasons but are themselves the result of conditions under which the economic activities of the people actually take place. In order to restructure consciousness and make it consistent with contemporary requirements man must be put in different circumstances. We must see to it that technical conservatism is not encouraged but penalized and that losses and low quality become



unprofitable to those who cause them, and that labor results really determine the well-being of the worker and his social reputation.

In analyzing the reasons which hold back progress in the development of production forces, Marxist-Leninist theory turns above all to the condition of production relations. It is precisely this approach that leads to the conclusion that the profound base of the negative processes and phenomena we mentioned is the appeared and gradually worsening contradiction between the qualitatively new level of production forces on the one hand, and the specific forms of production relations, on the other.

The solution of this contradiction and, thereby, the elimination of anything which holds back economic growth and hinders the utilization of the new, very rich opportunities for economic and social progress, calls for raising the economic mechanism to a qualitatively new level and for its profound restructuring. It is a question of making it adequate to the new, substantially changed conditions under which public production functions.

The current economic mechanism essentially developed at the stage which preceded the building of developed socialism. Although it experienced certain changes over the past 15-20 years, it retained a great many features inherent in the initial stage of socialist society. It is precisely this which determines its inconsistency with the new contemporary conditions and the fact that it holds back and hinders the further development of production forces.

In more specific terms, what is the nature of this inconsistency? Above all, the existing economic mechanism was oriented in its time (entirely correctly) toward creating--frequently from scratch--a powerful production potential and restoring the potential which had been destroyed by the war. This was the purpose of planning indicators, economic incentives and the organization of socialist competition. At that time the quantitative growth of output--steel, cement, tractors, fabrics and shoes--characterized the extent of our success quite accurately.

Today the tasks have changed radically. The country has a highly developed economic and scientific and technical potential. We have outstripped the United States in steel smelting, cement production and tractor manufacturing (in terms of overall motor power) and lead considerably in per capita production of leather shoes. Our country has the largest pool in the world of metal-processing machine tools, a tremendous body of engineers and one quarter of all scientific workers on earth. Hence the need to reorient the economic mechanism toward the better and most efficient utilization of what is available and toward quality economic growth and high end national economic results. Naturally, this requires a profound restructuring.

Furthermore, the existing economic mechanism developed under conditions when the economic upsurge was accomplished to a decisive extent by involving in the production process additional manpower and material and financial resources. This was not a purely extensive growth, as is sometimes claimed. Nevertheless, it was an entirely different type of economic growth compared to the one to which we are converting today.

The conversion of the economy to intensive development or to a consistently intensive form of expanded socialist reproduction is a profound qualitative change. It is natural, therefore, that this form of economic growth is consistent with an economic mechanism substantially different from the current one.

Finally, the role of science in the development of public production, as it becomes a directly productive force, has changed radically. We frequently repeat this formula but do not always realize that the acknowledgment of this fact presumes a new approach to the solution of a number of problems involving planning, the organization of cost-accounting, economic incentive and the financial-credit mechanism. This is particularly topical today in connection with the task set at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum of mastering the achievements of the latest stage in the scientific and technical revolution, which promises a technological revolution in a number of production areas.

Unfortunately, the current economic mechanism is not only not aimed at the acceleration of scientific and technical progress but even occasionally develops "antistimuli" along its way. This leads to the appearance of a situation mentioned at the plenum: the economic manager who has taken a "risk," installing new equipment at his enterprise and used or produced new equipment frequently loses, while a manager who avoids innovation loses nothing. "We must develop the type of system of organizational, economic and moral measures," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said, "which would interest managers and workers and, naturally, scientists and designers in renovating the equipment and would make it unprofitable to work as in the past. This is our task."

As practical experience has indicated, a mechanism primarily aimed at resolving current production problems and improving indicators compared with last year's level, is essentially not adapted to the management of scientific and technical development and the implementation of a structural reorganization of the production process. Insignificant and nonessential technical improvements alone can provide immediate although rather minor returns.

The reaching of qualitatively new levels in equipment, technology and production organization requires time and a firm perspective. This is the only way to ensure a radical reorganization of production such as to multiply its efficiency. Therefore, the profound changes which have taken place in the economy and its development trends urgently require the formulation and implementation of a set of measures aimed at the qualitative improvement of the existing economic mechanism.

3

The theoretical analysis of the necessary measures should be concentrated not on individual aspects (replacing one plan indicator with another, changing the procedure for the formation of incentive funds, and so on), but on the consideration of the most general, the most essential directions of future work. Incidentally, at that point we will also acquire a reliable criterion for the expedient choice of one indicator and economic lever or another.

Before undertaking the consideration of the main directions leading to improvements in the economic mechanism, we should refine a number of starting positions. This makes entirely clear the need for an entire set of inter-coordinated and complementary measures which would ensure the raising of this mechanism to an entirely new level. Partial measures affecting one unit of the economic mechanism or another cannot ensure any radical improvement in the national economy. That is why all research and planning-organizational work must be directed toward the elaboration and application of a long-term, gradually implemented system of measures aimed at developing an economic mechanism consistent with the initial period of developed socialism. The first major step along this way is the 12th Five-Year Plan, together with the development of which we must formulate the initial steps leading to the reorganization of the economic mechanism.

We must bear in mind that improving the economic mechanism involves making a real change in the system of production relations in their specific forms within which the various social production units function. Although such improvement presumes the drafting of corresponding normative documents, it is not reduced to that alone in the least. Such documents formulate only the normative requirements related to the economic mechanism. The actually functioning mechanism could be quite different from the normative for one reason or another.

The arising disparity results in quite negative consequences. Such was the case, in particular, with the familiar decrees on improving the economic mechanism, which were passed in July 1979. Their implementation violated the requirement of comprehensiveness, for we were unable to accomplish the main thing: to formulate a fully balanced and stable five-year plan on the scale of the national economy, the sector, the association and the enterprise. This made the application of other measures, including long-term economic norms, impossible.

Because of this and because of poor organizational work, the actual mechanism is substantially different from the normative mechanism as stipulated in said decrees. Thus, enterprises and associations are issued on a directive basis a significantly higher number of plan indicators than were stipulated; the practice of amending the plan or, rather, adapting it to the actually developing pace, is continuing; the requirement of planning and assessing plan fulfillments on the basis of incremental results is violated; no stable economic norms exist, and so on.

It is exceptionally important to resolve the following interrelated problems on the practical level. First, to ensure the elaboration of theoretical models or concepts of an economic mechanism consistent with contemporary conditions and targets of the party's economic policy. Second, to embody such basic theoretical stipulations in corresponding laws. Finally, to see to it that the formulated measures are fully and promptly implemented in actual socialist management practices.

All of this gives priority to the organizational factor in the broadest meaning of the term. Under contemporary conditions the highest possible

level of organization, which includes efficiency, responsibility and discipline, becomes the link which, if grabbed firmly, will enable us to pull the entire chain of accumulated problems.

If we consider the question merely within the framework of a discussion of the theoretical concept of the economic mechanism, several main directions leading to its improvement may be singled out. First among them is the need for decisively strengthening the primacy of the national economic approach. This presumes, above all, changes in many features of the existing planning procedure. Today the national economic plan is frequently drafted as the combination and correction of sectorial economic development plans. However, given the current scale of production socialization and the global national economic proportions, this is not a secondary value and the result of local relations, but a primary, an initial correlation. It is only on its basis that all other proportions, including sectorial and territorial, can be established.

Changes in the criteria for the evaluation of the activities of ministries and territorial management organs, specifically the assessment of the quality of such activities, based on their contribution to the achievement of high end national economic results, should also contribute to strengthening the primacy of the national economic approach. The instruction of the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum to the effect that the main criterion on the basis of which the work of ministries and departments should be assessed should be the extent to which the sector satisfies the steadily increasing social requirements, is of basic significance in this connection.

An orientation toward basic national economic results demands working for the consumer. In the "producer-consumer" interrelationship (the consumer is not only an individual but an enterprise engaged in production and services), it is precisely the latter who expresses, who represents, the national economic interests. This substantially changes the role and significance of economic contracts. Contracts and the portfolio of orders based on them become the starting point in drafting the production program and their implementation becomes the main indicator of the quality of economic activities.

The reorganization of the economic mechanism is inconceivable without strengthening the prestige and organizing role of the state plan, which have been substantially weakened for a variety of reasons of late. The faulty practice of plan corrections undermined the plan's authority and reduced the attention paid to the formulation of realistic and entirely balanced planning assignments. The existing orientation toward plan overfulfillments played a no less negative, although not so obvious, role.

A conversion to planning commodity deliveries based on contracts with consumers creates an essentially new situation. The point is that this basic quality indicator in economic activities cannot be overfulfilled. It cannot be overfulfilled because plan fulfillments consider only output in terms of volume, variety and quality as determined by the contract with the consumer. The full, unconditional and prompt implementation of contractual obligations is the main criterion of successful work by the labor collective as a whole

and the production manager. It is supplemented by the need to conserve raw materials and fuel and energy resources and to increase output with fewer workers. Above-plan economy is the contemporary form of plan "overfulfillment."

The contemporary scale of output, the level reached in its socialization and the greatly increased complexity of economic relations on this basis face planning and management with new requirements. Understandably, under these circumstances the importance of their proper organization and stability rises sharply.

This problem can be resolved through the creation of a widespread and flexible system of plan reserves, including spare production capacities. The need for them is also dictated by the increased so-called uncertainty factor. This has its objective roots: the high pace of scientific and technical change, and the mobility of the structure of social and personal requirements. A scientifically substantiated development of a system of planned reserves, based on strict economic computations, is an important prerequisite for efficient economic management. It is also a mandatory prerequisite in balancing the economy, ensuring the high efficiency of economic levers and incentives and developing initiative and independence.

Increasing the organizing role of the plan at the present stage also presumes a substantial restructuring and, in a certain sense, reorientation of the concept of planning activities themselves. Efficiency control becomes the main direction. This substantially enhances the importance of the system of norms and regulations which must become the basic levers through which a planned economy can influence the level of resource utilization. Management based on a system of norms and regulations will enable us to ensure the full and efficient balancing of plans and will systematically direct them toward achieving high end results. This is a necessary and a mandatory prerequisite in converting to an intensive form of expanded socialist reproduction.

The final purpose of the effort to improve the economic mechanism is to create better and most favorable conditions for the successful activities of the basic units in the national economy--production associations and enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhozes. It is precisely here and here only that the entire wealth and variety of consumer values, the needed and added product and the national income are created. It is only here that the labor collectives--the primary cells of all social life--function.

The urgent need to substantially increase their initiative and autonomy and upgrade their responsibility arose under contemporary conditions, as was repeatedly mentioned in recent CPSU Central Committee plenums. In accordance with these stipulations, the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers recently passed a decree in which, along with a stipulation for a consistent and persistent application of suitable ways and means of management, call for the implementation of a system of additional measures aimed at expanding the rights of production associations (enterprises) in industry in planning economic activities and ensuring their true economic interest in achieving high production efficiency and increased responsibility for work results.

Any increase in the rights of the basic economic units in planning and economic activities and their increased responsibility for work results will be realized only with the further strengthening of cost-accounting and the elimination of its formal elements. Its systematic development, together with improved planning, is one of the main directions in improving the mechanism of the economic realization of public ownership.

The feeling that a person is master of the country and the production process is developed on the basis of the development and strengthening of cost-accounting and intensifying the unity between the measure of labor and consumption in the worker. At the same time, this eliminates the attitude toward national productive capital as belonging to the "government" and public ownership as being "no one's."

This also fully applies to the question of strengthening the discipline, which is a mandatory prerequisite for the efficient functioning of the economic mechanism. Even the firmest and most reliable discipline is a personal discipline, expressed in the attitude of the person toward productive capital, labor and its results, considered as one's own, in the safeguarding and multiplication of which the person is profoundly interested. Such discipline can be developed only by bringing the economic mechanism for the realization of social ownership closer to the daily activities of the individual labor collective and worker in socialist production.

A similar line is followed in the steps aimed at the further development of democratic principles in economic management. Such steps should be considered not as an "addition" to the economic mechanism existing independently of them but as a substantive part of this mechanism--as a mandatory principle of its socialist functioning.

The June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum considered a broad range of problems related to expanding socialist democracy. In his speech, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov discussed the possibility of further democratization of the decision-making procedure applied to major problems of governmental and social life. Greater publicity and regular accountability of leading workers to the population will help to bring closer the party and state organs to the needs and interests of the people.

The Law on Labor Collectives, which was passed in June, was an act of major political and socioeconomic importance. It concretizes the constitutional rights of labor collectives in enterprises, organizations and establishments in the areas of planning and management. The law was adopted after a thorough and truly nationwide discussion. The point now is to implement it in life fully.

The democratization of production management is an important and a necessary link in the mechanism of the economic realization of socialist ownership. At the same time, the level of development of democratic principles in management is a reliable indicator of the maturity of social ownership relations themselves.

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

## SOCIALIST PRODUCTION EFFICIENCY: A VARIANT OF POLITICAL ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83) pp 39-49

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences Yu. Ivanov; published as a basis for discussion]

[Text] In formulating the economic strategy for the stage of developed socialism, the party defined the steady upsurge of the well-being of the Soviet people as a long-term objective, and the intensification and increased efficiency of public production as the main means to achieve it. The 1970s confirmed the accuracy of the economic strategy formulated at the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses, for which reason the 26th Party Congress focused attention on its practical implementation. The party and the Soviet people must follow the charted course to its fullest extent during the 1980s.

### Two Approaches to Socialist Production Efficiency

Usually economic publications and practice define efficiency as the ratio between production results and outlays, while an increase of this ratio is equated to increased production efficiency. This approach to production efficiency has its positive sides: universal criteria and indicators and simplicity and accessibility of their use. However, it suffers from substantial shortcomings as well. The overall economic approach is limited to a consideration of the inherent feature of all production, i.e., the material aspect of the production process and the product itself regardless of specifics (social form and production relations). Efficiency is presented as a general economic category, as production efficiency in general, by virtue of which this approach does not take into consideration the effect of economic laws of socialism, its basic law above all.

Consequently, the production activities of the socialist enterprise are considered to be the physical volume of output and all indicators (labor productivity, production cost, capital returns, material intensiveness, etc.) are computed on the basis of units of output. However, frequently increasing the consumer value of output (upgrading its quality) requires additional labor and material outlays which increase the actual cost, lower labor productivity and capital returns per unit of physical volume of output and make quality increases economically unprofitable to the enterprise. That is why a general economic approach is precisely general. This does not specify or define the content of production results. In this connection an extreme variety of opinions on this matter have been expressed in economic publications. Some have suggested that the overall social product be considered as

the result of socialist production; others have called for the use of part of it (the end social product, national income or net product or else the integral consumption fund); others again have emphasized the level of satisfaction of social requirements, and so on.

Political economy considers efficiency as a socialist production category. In other words, it proceeds from the specific nature of output (its social form), socialist production relations and their inherent economic laws. In other words, in this case the political economic approach begins with the formulation of the following question: what should we consider the result of a specific production? It presumes the qualitative definition of production results and the definition of their social nature. The maximizing of results means that they are related to the objective of the production process in society and, subsequently, to their basic economic law.

The identification and particular study of production results enable us to determine the boundaries and differences between the concepts of "production effect" and "production efficiency." The production effect is its result, i.e., a specific product. Production efficiency is not the result itself, but its relation to outlays. As the production result, the effect is its objective and, as such, it expresses the nature of the basic economic law of socialism. Socialist production efficiency expresses not the objective itself but the extent to which it is achieved. It indicates how and to what extent the objective of socialist production is achieved.

#### Results as the Direct Objective of Socialist Production

Current economic works use two formulations in describing the objective of socialist production: "the fullest possible satisfaction of the growing material and spiritual needs of the people" and "ensuring the full well-being and free and comprehensive development of all members of society." The second formulation is borrowed from V. I. Lenin's remarks pertaining to the second draft of Plekhanov's program (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 6, p 232). It coincides with what K. Marx wrote in "Das Kapital" about socialism as a higher social form "the basic principle of which is the full and free development of every individual" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 23, p 605). In both formulations the objectives of socialist production are used interchangeably. We believe, however, that this is by far not accurate. The question then arises: what is the real meaning of each one of them?

Before we answer this question, let us turn to Marx, who distinguished between two production objectives: the end, inherent in any type of production, and the immediate, inherent in a historically determined production method. In the final account, the purpose of production is always to satisfy human requirements. At each historical stage and formation, it is directly subordinate to a specific objective, the reaching of which ensures the fulfillment of its official role in society, which is a specific function in the reproduction and development of production forces. Consequently, within a society the production process not only meets the needs of the people but also serves the purpose of reproduction and development of production forces.



Therefore, the immediate objective of the production process in society may differ from its end objective and even clash with it. Thus, in a capitalist society production is subordinated to obtaining the highest possible amount of added value for the development of production forces through capital accumulations (for the development and accumulation of productive capital), which is different from the requirement of meeting the needs of the working people and which assumes a form of antagonistic conflict with them. In a socialist society, the direct and final objectives of the production process agree without coinciding. In order to understand the connection between them, we must make a special study of the immediate objective of the production process in society in performing its official role in the development of production forces. This calls for a consideration of the interrelationship between the production of a product and the reproduction of production forces, and a more detailed identification of the content of initial categories such as production and reproduction, expanded production and expanded reproduction, and their correlation. In this case we cannot ignore the essential difference between production and reproduction, which is expressed in the fact that we produce a product but reproduce the production forces of society. The renovation of production presumes replacing all that which was used in the manufacturing of a product (productive capital and manpower), i.e., the reproduction of production forces. In order to be a continuing one, the production process must not only consume but create and reproduce the elements of its dynamics. It is this which determines the official role of production: it steadily reproduces production forces and the social form within which it operates. In the dynamics of production as a closed system, man himself operates as its component, as the main productive force, while man's personal consumption operates as the reproduction of manpower. However, the production process has another function as well: in the final account, the purpose of all production is to meet the needs of the entire human society and its reproduction and development.

Production forces and products are the two opposites of the production process, while the production of a product and the reproduction of production forces are two phases in its dynamics, organically interrelated. Their unity and interaction ensure the continuity of production dynamics and form the inner source of its self-dynamics and development: production forces produce a product which serves the reproduction of production forces. These are two aspects of the single process of production dynamics and development. However, they are not equivalent: it is the production forces which determine not only the size of the product but also the structure and nature of its consumption which play a determining role in their interaction. The expanded reproduction of production forces is accompanied by changes which directly affect the production of a product, i.e., an internal relation and dependence exists between them: the quantitative growth of production forces determines the extensive method for production expansion, while qualitative changes in production forces determine its intensive method. Within the framework of a historically defined production method the unity and interaction between these two processes (production of a product and reproduction of production forces) assume the form of unification and interaction between its two aspects: those consistent with the method for the production of a product and the method for the development of production forces.

In "Das Kapital" Marx studied the dynamics and development of the capitalist production method as a dialectical unity and interaction between two processes: the process of expansion of capitalist production, as a process of increasing the mass of added value, and the process of capitalist expanded reproduction, as a process of capital accumulation. Their interaction consists of the fact that the production of added value is the source of capital accumulations, while capital accumulations ensure the increased mass of added value. These two processes, however, are not equivalent: production is subordinated to obtaining added value, for the reason that it is a specifically capitalist method for the development of production forces through capital accumulations.

The separation between the two phases and the study of their interaction in the dynamics of socialist production is of even greater significance, both theoretical and practical. A one-sided approach to it, merely as the production of a product, leads to the fact that its other aspect--the reproduction and development of production forces--is shunted aside. The mixing and blending of the process of socialist expanded reproduction as a new method of development of production forces with the process of expanded socialist reproduction as a new method for the manufacturing of a product leads in practice to replacing the direct objective of socialist production with the function which it must perform in the development of the production forces of society, i.e., ensuring the free and comprehensive development of the producer as an individual. The accepted definition of the basic economic law of socialism indicates that under socialism the product is created for its sake: for the fuller satisfaction of the needs of the people, and the free all-round development of all members of society. However, no specific answer is given to the question of what should be produced under socialism in order to ensure the satisfaction of the needs of all members of society and the development of each individual. In terms of the capitalist production method Marx resolves the problem as follows: under capitalism the production process produces added value for the accumulation of capital, i.e., capitalism subordinates to production the obtaining of added value for the sake of ensuring the development of production forces through capital accumulations.

This means that the first formulation (the satisfaction of human requirements) expresses the end objective of any, including socialist, production, while the second (the free all-round development of all members of society) indicates the official role performed by the production process under socialism in the development of the main productive force of society. However, the definition of the basic economic law of socialism does not include the main feature which expresses its nature: the immediate objective of the production process under socialism if it is to ensure the satisfaction of the needs and the individual development of all members of society.

#### Results as the Basic Indicator of the Plan of the Socialist Enterprise

Viewing the results of socialist production as its direct objective leads to the following question: what properties should this objective have for the production process to be able to perform its new function in the development of production forces--ensuring the development of the personality of the producers themselves? Above all, this objective should be unified both in terms

of social production as a whole as well as each individual enterprise separately. Capitalism could not develop production forces through capital accumulation had social production as a whole and each capitalist enterprise separately not obeyed the same objective--obtaining the greatest amount of added value as a source of capital accumulations. Public production as a whole cannot achieve its objective if no one specifically (no single enterprise in society) would subordinate his production activities to it. Consequently, socialism can successfully fulfill its historical vocation in the development of production forces only if the immediate objective of its social production is also the objective of the individual enterprise.

Of late it is being increasingly acknowledged that results must express the objective of socialist production and have a single "correlating" criterion on all economic management levels. It is a positive phenomenon that it is not the needs of society that are considered as the objective of socialist production but the product which satisfies such needs. This shifts the objective from the consumption to the production area and makes it possible to include it in the planned assignments of enterprises.

One problem remains unresolved: what should be accepted as the single result of socialist production? According to most economists this would be the national income, which is created at each enterprise and is easy to determine in its specific case and in its totality. That is why it has now been accepted as the basic plan indicator in terms of its normative net output, an indicator which is issued to the individual enterprise.

The following question in theoretical and economic practice is being increasingly asked following the introduction of the new basic indicator in the plan: what does the normative net output express and toward what aim does it direct the enterprise? The normative net output is part of the wholesale price of the enterprise, which includes wages (with payments for social security) and profits. Its first component is part of the production cost and constitutes some of the enterprise's outlays, for which reason the profit is the "net" result of its production activities.

The main shortcoming of the new plan indicator, which prevents it from becoming the result of socialist production, is its value nature. The net product is part of the value of the product--a new value created through abstract labor. This indicator expresses not production results but outlays, labor outlays. The true result of socialist production is a qualitative defined product, a consumer value created through specific labor and meeting a qualitatively defined social need. The decisive factor in the implementation of the objective and enhancing the efficiency of socialist production is the growth of labor productivity, which is achieved not through abstract labor, which creates value, but through specific labor which creates a consumer value.

The conclusion, therefore, is that the new basic indicator of the enterprise plan expresses only indirectly the objective of socialist production, indirectly orienting the enterprise toward the manufacturing of commodities needed by society and improving their quality, but by far not directly ensuring the

full satisfaction of social requirements in reducing overall labor outlays. For that reason it must be supplemented by another indicator, which is the plan for procurements based on a specific nomenclature in accordance with concluded contracts. However, even from this viewpoint the enterprise's production activities are assessed in terms of the physical volume of output, regardless of consumer value, i.e., regardless of the manner in which the goods produced by the enterprise will meet social requirements.

The inability of the net product as a new value to play the role of result of socialist production has led to new suggestions. Currently an increasing number of economists hold that the net product should be considered not as a new value but as a physical volume--"the net product of society in its physical manifestation." Some go even further and call for considering the result the "mass of produced consumer values." This expresses the result of the entire process of knowledge of the result as the immediate objective of socialist production and a single specification could be added to it. If we convert from the value to the consumer value of a product we must consider not part but the entire product. The actual result of the activities of the individual enterprise and of social production as a whole is not the net but the gross product which, however, is considered not in terms of a physical volume but as the mass of consumer values.

#### Consumer Value as the Result and Immediate Objective of Socialist Production

As indicated by economic practice, the true production result under socialism is not the value or the physical volume of output but its consumer value, i.e., its ability to meet social requirements. This conclusion requires theoretical substantiation. Socialist political economy must provide an explanation as to why precisely the consumer value is the result (and immediate objective) of socialist production.

To this effect, in applying Marx's methodology to socialist production, we must consider its dynamics and development from two sides.

The study of socialist production presumes, first of all, resolving the problem of how socialism reproduces socialist production forces and what does it develop within them and how? Capitalism primarily developed a single element in the production forces, productive capital, by restricting the development of the other element--the personality of the producer. Based on the productive capital created by capitalism and continuing its further development, communism ensures the full development of the main productive force in society--the working person. Consequently, socialist expanded reproduction, as a new method in the development of production forces is, in terms of its social nature, above all a process of development of the personality of the producers themselves.

Secondly, in the course of our study we must determine what the production process should create under socialism, what its specific product should be which, as the result of the direct subordination of the production process to its manufacturing, would ensure the implementation of its new function in the development of production forces--developing the personality of the producer.

The specific product (and immediate objective) of socialist production is not the product itself but its social form. For example, when we single out in a product a common feature inherent in different production methods (grain growing, steel smelting, etc.), we draw away from the social form inherent in a product, regardless of the system, and thus consider our production not as socialist but as production in general. This approach does not bring to light the specifics and the essence of the new production method. The capitalist countries also grow grain and smelt steel. However, the social form and nature of capitalist production are expressed not in the production of grain or steel but in the production of added value. "The product of the capitalist production process," Marx writes, "is not a simple product (consumer value) or a simple commodity, i.e., a product with a barter value. Added value is its specific product" (op. cit., vol 49, p 57). The social form of the product as the direct objective of the production process is universal (applicable to all products in society), for which reason it is the same in terms of public production as a whole and in the production of the individual enterprise.

Therefore, what should the production process under socialism produce, and what social form should be assumed by this product in order to ensure the fuller satisfaction of the needs of all members of society? Material goods are the source of satisfaction of human needs. However, the need is satisfied not by the goods (objectives) themselves but by their useful properties which they acquire through specific toil. In other words, in order for a product to meet one requirement or another it must have a consumer value. Consequently, in order for production under socialism to be able to meet the needs of the members of society, the consumer value must become the social form of its product. In criticizing Ricardo for his lack of understanding of the social form of the product of capitalist production, Marx wrote on the subject of future communist production that "... Actually, matters should be precisely so that if production were merely a means for the satisfaction of the needs of the producers, a type of production in which consumer value alone would be dominant" (op. cit., vol 26, part III, p 50).

The immediate-social consumer value is the overall form of the product of communist production which, in the final account, is a noncommodity production. Subordinating the production process to obtaining the greatest volume of consumer values ensures the implementation of its final objective--meeting the needs of the people. It is in this form that the communist production method in its lower stage is established and begins to develop under socialism. However, from the very beginning, the qualitative changes in the use of the overall form of the product (subordinating the production process to the fuller satisfaction and the development of the needs of all members of society--ensuring the steady growth of the well-being of the working people) assume its qualitative definition as a form of the product of communist production. For the first time after the long existence of a class society, in which production directly developed in the interest of the ruling class, it begins to serve the producers themselves, all members of society. This forms the general grounds for its development as communist production.

However, there is nothing specifically communist in subordinating the production process to obtaining consumer values needed to satisfy the needs of the

people. "In urban industry," Marx writes, "although it essentially rests on trade and the creation of barter values, the immediate, the main objective of said production is to ensure the existence of the artisan, of the craftsman, of consumer value.... Therefore, everywhere production is subordinate to consumption...." (op. cit., vol 46, part I, p 504). The specific nature of the communist production method is determined by its official role in the development of social production forces--the purpose of ensuring the "full and free development of every individual" (K. Marx), or "the free and comprehensive development of all members of society" (V. I. Lenin). In order for the production process to perform this role the satisfaction of the material needs of all members of society and the growth of their well-being are insufficient.

Therefore, the further development of socialist production at the stage of its economic maturity should concretize the overall form of the product (consumer value) and give it the type of content which would make it a specific category expressing the nature of the communist production method. The specific social form of the product of mature communist production, as Marx predicted, will be the leisure time as the higher stage in the development of its general form--consumer value. This conclusion is based on the following: the individual is the main wealth of the communist society. The process of accumulation of specific communist wealth is a process of development of the personality of all members of society. The development of the personality is based on the amount of time which a person can allocate and spend for its development, i.e., leisure time. "At that point the measure of wealth," Marx writes, "will no longer be the amount of working time but of leisure time" (op. cit., vol 46, part II, p 217).

Of all human requirements in a communist society the need for leisure time for the development of the personality is the highest and most essential. Its satisfaction becomes a possible and a priority task only at the higher stage of development of material production in society, at the stage of the economically mature communism, when the material needs of the people have been substantially satisfied. Whereas the main feature which expresses the nature of capitalist production was to reduce the necessary and to increase the added labor for purposes of capital accumulation, the main feature expressing the nature of communist production will be the reduction of the working and increased leisure time for the development of the personality of all members of society.

#### Form of Manifestation and Methods for Measuring Consumer Value

Having acknowledged that consumer value is the result and immediate objective of socialist production, we must resolve the problem of the form of its manifestation and means of determination. The practice of socialist economic management has acquired substantial experience in measuring consumer value of productive capital and consumer goods. For example, the content of useful substance in many agricultural products is computed quite precisely. We also determine the consumer value of capital goods. In each specific case, economic practice empirically searches and finds means of expression and determination of the consumer value of products.

This is no longer sufficient at the present stage of developed socialism. Ensuring the steady growth of the well-being of the Soviet people while comprehensively enhancing socialist production efficiency calls for the comprehensive consideration and determination of the consumer value of all products produced by the socialist society and, consequently, the theoretical solution of the problem.

Long before the revolution the classics of Marxism-Leninism predicted the withering away of commodity production based on value and the fact that consumer value alone will be retained in a future communist society. F. Engels noted that "...weighing the useful effect in labor outlays in resolving the question of production will be the only thing which will be retained in the communist society from value as a concept of political economy..." (op. cit., vol 20, p 321).

It is not a question of abandoning value and value categories as of now. On the contrary, they must be used more efficiently. It is a question of something else: we must not be limited to value categories alone and ignore and, consequently, not determine the consumer value of the products of the socialist production method. More than 100 years ago Engels, predicting that future society will face this problem, indicated the means for its practical solution. In discussing the plan of the communist society he wrote that "this plan will be defined in the final account, by weighing and comparing among useful effects of different consumption goods with each other and with the necessary amounts of labor needed for their production" (ibid.).

The practical solution of this problem is hindered by two factors: inertia in economic thinking and absence of available forms for expressing and measuring the consumer value of products. The former is supported by tradition and the habit of doing everything in accordance with an already developed method, whereas life goes forth and calls for change. The latter forces us to support the old forms which are increasingly less consistent with the new requirements but have already been established and applied in practical work.

The question is, could this be an argument aimed against the consideration and determination of the consumer value of the output of socialist enterprises? Has the value of the commodity immediately acquired contemporary form of expression and measurement through the price and is the price the ideal method for determining the value of a commodity? As a rule, not only qualitatively (gold is qualitatively different from all commodities the value of which is measured with it) as well as quantitatively the price does not coincide with the value of the commodity. However, society has accepted and is using this relative (in terms of its relationship to another commodity) means of expressing and measuring value, for no better way exists. It is only through practical experience, through trial and error, that a mechanism for the expression and measuring consumer value may be found and improved further.

Inertia in thinking is manifested in both practice and theory. Naturally, this is expressed in identifying consumer value with the object, inherited from the old society in which quantitative relations among objects express

their value, while consumer value as a nonessential aspect of the commodity is not singled out but coincides with the object as the material carrier of value.

Consumer value plays a different role in socialist society, where the purpose of production is to meet the needs of the people and where it becomes an essential aspect of the product and, therefore, should be singled out with a view to its independent expression and measurement. The correlation between the consumer value (useful property) and objects which have this property and are its material carriers (the physical volume of output) becomes an essential economic correlation--a form of manifestation of the results of production activities by the socialist enterprise. Its essence is that it is thus that the socialist society takes into consideration not only the quantity of the output produced by the individual enterprise but the overall volume, the mass of the consumer value contained in it, and its ability to meet one social requirement or another.

Inertia in thinking is manifested also in the approach to determining the consumer value of products: we try to find a criterion applicable to all qualitatively different products by analogy. However, consumer value does not have a universal value and in this case what is measured is not the labor invested in the production of objects but their useful characteristics, their ability to meet a qualitatively defined social need. Therefore, the consumer value of a product may be expressed and measured quantitatively (in terms of proportion) either in terms of physical volume or in terms of other products which satisfy the same social requirement, for which reason they have the same (more or less) consumer value. This expresses two practically accessible means of expression and determination of the consumer value of products: the absolute and the relative.

The absolute consumer value of the product is expressed in the quantitative ratio to its physical volume. The relative consumer value of the product is expressed in the ratio between its quantity and the physical volume of other products with the same useful properties but to different extents. Since two or several products may be different in terms of the size of their consumer value, their comparison makes them noncomparable in terms of physical volume, for which reason the quantitative ratio (proportion) between their volumes expresses the amount of their consumer value. The second method for measuring the consumer value is identical to the expression of the value of the commodity in terms of barter value (quantitative ratio among physical volumes) or else their price.

Something else as well is important in measuring consumer value: the determination of its mass or total amount. The mass of the consumer value of the product can be expressed through a total of two values: the physical volume of the product and the consumer value per unit of physical volume. The mass of consumer value as the product of the physical volume of output times its consumer value quantitatively expresses the actual result of production activities of the socialist enterprise--the amount of output computed on the basis of the consumer value it contains.



The connection between the mass of the consumer value as the result of socialist production and the means for increasing it expresses the mechanism for the implementation of the objective. The consumer value is created by specific labor. The mass of consumer values is determined by the overall mass of the specific amount of labor outlays and productivity. In turn, the overall mass of specific labor invested is the result of two values--the labor spent by the individual worker and the number of production workers. Of these factors involved in increasing the mass of consumer value the last two are extensive while labor productivity is intensive. They ensure to the greatest extent the realization of the objective of the method, for which reason its place and role in the mechanism of action of the basic economic law rise steadily and become decisive at the stage of developed socialism.

The ratio between the mass of consumer value and outlays and resources with the help of which it was obtained expresses the mechanism of increased efficiency of socialist output, essentially consisting of the fact that the less overall (present and past) labor is invested by society per unit of consumer value, the greater the mass of consumer values it will obtain with the same overall labor outlays, and the better it will be able to satisfy its needs. The production of a product involves labor means, labor objects and manpower, for which reason the specific indicators of the efficiency with which each resource is used are the capital-material- and labor-intensiveness of output. The increased efficiency of socialist production presumes a conversion to a primarily intensive method for its expansion.

Finally, let us consider the ratio between consumer value and production quality. The difference between the two is not always considered in practical work. The quality of the product is its external form through which its consumer value is displayed. The consumer value is the essential aspect, the essential feature defining each product, its ability to meet social requirements. The correlation between consumer value and production quality is one between essence and phenomenon. Therefore, like any phenomenon, the quality of the product is a concept which is more specific and richer compared with its consumer value, for which reason it is not identical to it. The quality of the product is determined and measured not through one but several, sometimes numerous parameters (criteria) which, along with the objective characteristics inherent in the product, subjective features may exist determined by the consumer alone (such as fashion). However, this difference (if not ignored) does not exclude the use of the term "quality" rather than "consumer value" in the turnover area, in the same way that profit in the turnover area in capitalist society is the external manifestation of added value. The question of the correlation between consumer value and the quality of output is of great practical interest today as a result of the comprehensive quality control systems developed by many enterprises and production associations. We have singled out only one of the many aspects of this problem.

From the viewpoint of achieving the objective of socialist production, upgrading production quality (enhancing its consumer value) is the equivalent of increasing its quantity (physical volume) of the previous quality and should be considered as an intensive means of increasing production specific in socialism. In other words, with the same physical volume of output,

improved quality increases the mass of the consumer value and better satisfies social requirements. This leads to substantial economy of material and manpower for society in the course of the satisfaction of its needs. The corresponding increase in the physical volume of output of the old quality must be considered an extensive method in expanding production, for the fuller satisfaction of social requirements is achieved here through quantitative means.

Socialist production can be expanded (the mass of consumer values can be increased) both through the quantitative growth of production forces (manpower and productive capital) or the extensive growth of output, or else through qualitative changes in production forces, which increase their returns, or else through intensive growth. The conversion to a primarily intensive development in the 1980s will ensure the systematic increase in socialist production efficiency and the successful implementation of the program earmarked at the 26th CPSU Congress of steadily improving the well-being and standards of the Soviet people.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2

G. V. PLEKHANOV'S IDEOLOGICAL-THEORETICAL ACTIVITIES AND THE EMANCIPATION OF LABOR GROUP

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83) pp 50-61

[Article by M. Iovchuk, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member]

[Text] The date 25 September 1983 marks the centennial of the founding of the first Marxist organization in Russia--the Emancipation of Labor Group. The group was created in Geneva by G. V. Plekhanov. It consisted of political emigres, who were members of the Chernyy Peredel populist organization; in addition to Plekhanov, it included V. I. Zasluch, P. B. Aksel'rod, L. G. Deych and V. N. Ignatov.

The Emancipation of Labor Group lasted 20 years, until July 1903, when it disbanded itself following the creation of the party, at the Second RSDWP Congress.

V. I. Lenin and the communist party highly appreciated the role of the ideological-theoretical activities of the group in the Russian revolutionary movement and the importance of Plekhanov's works in the dissemination and defense of the Marxist ideas and the theoretical training of the Russian social democratic movement. Lenin pointed out that "Russian Marxism was born at the beginning of the 1880s, in the works of a group of emigres (the Emancipation of Labor Group)" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 17, p 405), and that "the literary works of this group, printed without censorship abroad, were the first to present systematically and with all the necessary practical conclusions the ideas of Marxism which, as global experience proved, were the only ones accurately to express the nature of the labor movement and its tasks" (op. cit., vol 25, p 95).

The CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 80th Anniversary of the Second RSDWP Congress" notes that the Emancipation of Labor Group played a noted role in the intensive process of dissemination of Marxism in Russia.

The dissemination of Marxism--the international scientific-socialist methodology of the revolutionary proletariat--was preceded in Russia by an entire historical period during which, starting with the 1840s, the leaders of the Russian liberation movement and other progressive people were seeking a scientific theory which could point the true way to the liberation of the peoples in the country from social oppression. "As the only accurate revolutionary theory," Lenin wrote, "it was truly experienced by Russia in the

course of 50 years of unparalleled pain and sacrifice, unheard-of revolutionary heroism and incredible energy, dedication in the search, learning, practical trials, disappointments, testing and comparisons with the European experience" (op. cit., vol 41, p 8). Lenin further noted that "in the second half of the 19th century revolutionary Russia had such a wealth of international relations and superb information concerning the worldwide forms and theories of the revolutionary movement unparalleled anywhere else" (ibid.).

The growing interest in Marxism shown by the leading personalities and scientists in Russia, representing the different social forces and political trends, particularly during the second half of the 19th century, when Russia was becoming a capitalist country, was triggered by their desire to develop their own approach to the solution of the specific problems of the liberation movement in the country which at that time (until the mid-1890s) had reached the Raznochintsy-democratic stage of development, a time when the Russian proletariat had not as yet begun to act as an autonomous revolutionary force.

In noting the positive role of the best traditions of the Russian revolutionary thinkers of the 19th century, including the revolutionary-populists, and their contributions to the Russian liberation movement and passionate search for an accurate revolutionary theory, Marxist-Leninist science nevertheless emphasizes the essential qualitative distinction among the populist, enlightener and other non-Marxist interpretations of the theories of K. Marx and F. Engels, and their role in acquainting the Russian readers with one Marxist stipulation or another and the process of the actual dissemination of Marxist ideology in Russia in its integrity and consistency.

A qualitative turn in Russian revolutionary thinking toward Marxism occurred at the beginning of the 1880s following the publication of Marx's and Engels' "Communist Party Manifesto," the Russian translation of which was made by Plekhanov, in 1882, in which the authors expressed in the preface their belief that "Russia is the advanced detachment of the revolutionary movement in Europe" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 19, p 305). Plekhanov added to the "Communist Party Manifesto" translation his own preface which was of a programmatic nature in terms of the new development in theoretical thinking in revolutionary Russia--scientific socialism--in which he wrote that "together with their other works, the authors of the 'Manifesto' open a new era in the history of socialist and economic literature--the era of merciless criticism of contemporary relations between labor and capital and a scientific substantiation of socialism alien to any utopias."

With full justification Plekhanov could say about himself and the other initial Russian Marxists who came from the midst of revolutionary populism: "Like Ariadne's thread, Marx's theory led us out of the labyrinth of contradictions which confused us under Bakunin's influence.... The development of Russian capitalism itself, which could not fail to excite the Bakuninists, for it meant the destruction of the community, now acquired to us the importance of a new guarantee for the success of the revolutionary movement, for it marked the qualitative growth of the proletariat and the development of its class consciousness."

The historical contribution of the Emancipation of Labor Group, that of Plekhanov and Zasulich in particular, to the Russian liberation movement and the country's working class was not only that they discovered in Marxism the accurate theory which revolutionary Russia had been seeking for half a century, but also that they engaged in energetic ideological and political activities, tried to make the progressive Russian workers and the revolutionary intelligentsia aware of the great truth of Marx's doctrine and set as their objective the creation of a revolutionary social democratic party of the working class in Russia.

When Plekhanov addressed the Constituent Congress of the Second International on behalf of the then-few Russian social democrats, in 1889, Plekhanov could justifiably announce that "revolutionary Russia...must not only not remain aside from the latest socialist movement in Europe but...conversely, realize that the present rapprochement with it will be of great use to the cause of the world proletariat." In expressing the aspiration of the Russian social democrats to master the ideas of contemporary scientific socialism, to spread them among the workers and, with the help of the workers, conquer the fortress of autocracy, Plekhanov said that "the revolutionary movement in Russia can triumph only as a revolutionary movement of the workers. No other solution exists or could exist for us!" This marked the entry of Russia's revolutionary Marxists in the arena of the struggle of the international proletariat.

Although the Emancipation of Labor Group "only theoretically founded the social democratic movement and took a first step toward the worker movement" (V. I. Lenin, *op. cit.*, vol 25, p 132), its historical contributions cannot be forgotten.

The work of the Emancipation of Labor Group between 1883 and 1903 followed three interrelated directions.

First, the translation into Russian of the works of Marx and Engels, their publication abroad and their dissemination in Russia through various channels, mainly clandestine.

Second, the writing of a number of Marxist works which propagandized scientific socialism and Marx's philosophy and economic theory, and which applied his theory and method to the knowledge and interpretation of social processes in Russia and the role of the working class in the Russian and international revolutionary movements. This was the purpose of the theoretical works by Plekhanov, Zasulich and other Marxists, published either abroad or by circumventing the tsarist censorship in Russia.

Finally, the most important task of the group was an uncompromising criticism from Marx's positions of the reactionary and bourgeois-liberal views and petit-bourgeois utopian views of the populists and the extremist, anarchist and Blanquist concepts, and the idealistic philosophical trends which were being reanimated in the West and in Russia (Kantianism in particular, with its subjectivism and agnosticism), which hindered the shaping of a scientific outlook among the revolutionaries and, by penetrating among the workers, hindered the creation of a Marxist revolutionary party of the Russian proletariat.

Soon after Plekhanov's translation of the "Communist Party Manifesto," which was published in Geneva, and his translation of the "Bylaws of the International Association of Workers," followed by the translation of Marx's book "Hired Labor and Capital" (by Deych), the Emancipation of Labor Group published in a new series it started the "Library of Contemporary Socialism" (from 1883 to 1900), which carried translations into Russian of Marx's "Poverty of Philosophy," Engels' "Development of Socialism From Utopia to Science" and "Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy," excerpts from their joint work "The Holy Family," Marx's first volume of "Das Kapital," his "Civil War in France" and "On the Critique of Political Economy," Engels' "Anti-Duhring," and "On the Social Problem in Russia," and other works among the Marxist classics. All of them were translated into Russian by Plekhanov or Zasulich.

As though miraculously, through police blockades and censorship, the books published by the Emancipation of Labor Group, like others of its publications (SOTSIAL-DEMOKRAT, a literary-political review, and others) made their way into Russia and became available to the first Russian social democrats. It would be hard to overestimate these systematic and purposeful ideological-theoretical and propaganda efforts on the part of Plekhanov and his group.

Plekhanov, Zasulich and Deych did not limit themselves to translating the works of the founders of Marxism and organizing a dangerous and, at that time, most difficult project of disseminating such classical literature in Russia. Between 1883 and 1894 they wrote a number of theoretical works to prove that the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels was perfectly applicable to Russia and described the true way of the Russian revolutionary movement. Plekhanov was also the author of outstanding talented works which enriched international Marxist literature, such as "Socialism and Political Struggle" (1883), "Our Differences" (1884-1885), "New Defender of Autocracy or Woe Unto Mr Tikhomirov" (1889), "The Russian Worker in the Revolutionary Movement" (1892) and "Anarchism and Socialism" (1894), historical-philosophical works such as the book on N. G. Chernyshevskiy (1894), the article "On the 60th Anniversary of Hegel's Death" (1891), the classical work "On the Development of a Monistic View of History" (1895) and others. Plekhanov's works of that period extensively and clearly reveal a militant spirit of aggressive materialism and the author's encyclopedic knowledge, strict philosophical analysis, a rare talent for polemics, passionate internationalism and the historical optimism of the Marxist pioneers in Russia.

Zasulich's role in the Russian revolutionary movement is frequently erroneously related only to her selfless act--her shooting of Trepov, the town governor of Petersburg, as a protest against the abuse of political prisoners, and her acquittal by a court jury. It is frequently forgotten that soon after that Zasulich not only became disenchanted with the populist tactics of individual terrorism but convincingly criticized terrorism in her works. In reality, Zasulich entered the history of the revolutionary worker movement in 19th-century Russia as a noted propagandist of Marxist theory, a talented publicist, a historian of the labor movement and public thinking and a literary critic. Between 1883 and 1894 she wrote a number of theoretical works, such as "Our Literary Contradictions," a polemical article against populism, books about

Voltaire and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, an "Outline of the History of the International Society of Workers" (unfinished and suffering from one-sidedness), "Varlin in Correctional Justice," articles on the works and outlook of outstanding Russian democratic writers and other truly Marxist works.

With a view to the ideological-theoretical preparations for the creation of a social democratic party in Russia, Plekhanov wrote two draft programs for the Emancipation of Labor Group (in 1883 and 1885--the latter in two variants). The author entitled the second variant "Draft Program of the Russian Social Democrats." The draft program of the group proclaimed the main objective of Marxism--a communist revolution which would bring about the total emancipation of labor from the oppression of capital and the conversion of all production means and objects to public ownership. In defining the immediate task of the Marxists in Russia, i.e., their "minimum program," Plekhanov wrote that "the Russian democrats consider the organization of a revolutionary worker party as their first and most important obligation.... The purpose of the struggle waged by the worker party against absolutism is to gain a democratic constitution...." The draft program of the Emancipation of Labor Group was not free of some shortcomings: it included unclear and controversial views on replacing "the system of political representation" with a "popular representation," the inclusion of Lassallian ideas on "state aid to production associations," the one-sided idea that in the countryside only the poorest peasantry could become the ally of the proletariat in the democratic revolution, and other erroneous features. Essentially, however, the draft programs as written by Plekhanov were of positive importance and contributed to the ideological preparations for the creation of a social democratic worker party in Russia. In noting the abstract nature of Plekhanov's draft program and the lack of specific views on the subject, which made the draft "a most general Marxist declaration," Lenin nevertheless wrote that "...it would be stupid to blame the drafters of the program for this error, as they were the first to present certain principles long before the organization of a worker party" (op. cit., vol 16, p 232). As a whole, in discussing Plekhanov's 1885 draft, Lenin assessed it positively. He believed that "the Russian social democrats can and must...base the program of the Russian social democratic workers party precisely on the draft of the Emancipation of Labor Group" (op. cit., vol 4, p 217).

Starting with 1883, Plekhanov and the Emancipation of Labor Group, during the very first period of its existence, tried to establish ideological and political ties with the scattered social democratic groups and circles which were being organized in Russia and which still lacked a clear Marxist orientation. This included the group headed by D. Blagoev and others. However, at that time Plekhanov's group was unable to attain its objective. Having taken a step toward the Russian worker movement on the ideological-theoretical level, bearing in mind the spontaneous nature of the movement, the lack of coordination among social democratic circles and its separation from Russia, it was unable to resolve the problem of promoting the idea of scientific socialism among them.

Under those circumstances, scientific and theoretical activities became the main project pursued by Plekhanov and his fellow workers, a project which was

important and relevant to the Russian and the international labor movements of the period.

In defending in his works the scientific content and revolutionary principles of Marx's and Engels' doctrine and their philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism, Plekhanov subjected to sharp and convincing criticism the falsifiers and distorters of Marxism. In exposing the groundless and false interpretations of Marxism, he brought to light the profoundly scientific and consistently revolutionary nature of all structural components of Marxism. He proved that the working class and the fighters for socialism are the true heirs to the ideological wealth of the philosophy, social thinking and culture of mankind.

Later, in 1914, in his article "Karl Marx," Lenin wrote that the best presentation of problems of Marxist philosophy and historical materialism are found in Plekhanov's works-collections, "In Twenty Years," "From Defense to Attack," and "Critique of Our Critics," and his books "On the Problem of the Development of the Monistic View on History," "Basic Problems of Marxism" and others (see op. cit., vol 26, p 88).

Lenin valued particularly highly Plekhanov's book "On the Problem of the Development of the Monistic View on History," which was written in 1894 and published in Russia in 1895 under the pseudonym N. Bel'tov. The main purpose of this brilliant book by Plekhanov was the scientific-philosophical substantiation of the revolutionary struggle waged by the working class and the toiling masses for the democratic and socialist reorganization of society. "... The human mind," the author wrote, "cannot be the creator of history because it itself is its product. However, since this product has appeared, it should not, and by virtue of its very nature, cannot obey the reality inherited from past histories; by necessity it tries to reorganize it in its own image, to make it sensible. ... Dialectical materialism is a philosophy of action."

Unlike many Western social democratic theoreticians, who considered it possible to combine the economic and sociopolitical ideas of Marxism with non-Marxist views (neo-Kantianism, for example), in defending and promoting in his book "On the Problem of the Development of the Monistic View on History" and in other philosophical and sociopolitical works, Plekhanov promoted the purposeful scientific-materialistic outlook of the working class. He opposed such a "pluralistic" approach and proved the organic unity among all structural components of Marxism. He described Marx's materialism as "essentially dialectic," for dialectics was its method, its heart. "Thanks to Marx," he emphasized, "materialistic philosophy has risen to the level of a purposeful, harmonious and consistent world outlook."

After Marx and Engels Plekhanov tried to provide a materialistic interpretation of all aspects of human activity. He turned to the study of ideological processes, the spiritual area of society, the legitimate development of ideology and its increased role and the role of the activities of individuals in history.



The "Outlines on the History of Materialism," the article "On the 60th Anniversary of Hegel's Death" and Plekhanov's book on the monistic view on history bring to light the basic, the qualitative distinction between the materialistic dialectics of Marx and Engels and the dialectics of idealistic philosophy, including Hegel's. Plekhanov wrote that dialectics "in Marx's philosophy... has become the complete opposite of Hegel's. To Hegel the dialectics of social life, as any dialectics of the finite, has, in the final account, a mystical reason, and the nature of an infinite, an absolute spirit. In Marx it is based on entirely real reasons: the development of the means of production at the disposal of society."

Plekhanov wrote a number of works on the history of philosophical and social thinking, socialist ideas, aesthetics and literary criticism in Russia, including valuable theoretical works on Chernyshevskiy.

The inspiring role of the Russian enlighteners and revolutionary democrats in the spiritual awakening of the progressive forces for the struggle for liberation from social oppression and despotic autocracy was clearly described in Zaslulich's works on N. A. Dobrolyubov, D. I. Pisarev, G. I. Uspenskiy and other Russian democratic writers, as did Plekhanov's works on V. G. Belinskiy, A. I. Herten, and the populist novelists. These works explained their historical role as the predecessors of the Russian social democrats. It was that the Russian Marxists emphasized their continuity with the revolutionary Russia of previous ages and the democratic culture of the Russian and other peoples in the country, thus debunking the fabrications of the populist, liberal and other opponents of scientific communism on the alleged rejection of the "legacy of the 1860s" by the Russian Marxists. Plekhanov convincingly proved in his works that, in developing the best traditions of their predecessors, the Marxists turned to the "producers," i.e., the working class and the toiling masses, "who should become the heroes of the forthcoming historical period."

It would be erroneous to limit Plekhanov's place in the history of Marxism to the 1880s and the first half of the 1890s, and the role of his ideological and theoretical activities exclusively to the dissemination of Marxist ideas in Russia and the critique of anti-Marxist trends in Russian social thinking. Starting with the end of the 1880s and the First Congress of the Second International, Plekhanov actively participated in European ideological-political life and in the scientific-political work of the international social democratic movement. Many of his works, particularly on the philosophy and history of social thinking (including the books "On the Problem of the Development of the Monistic View on History," "Essays on the History of Materialism," "N. G. Chernyshevskiy," "On the 60th Anniversary of Hegel's Death," and others) were translated into other European languages soon after their publication. Plekhanov's works were published in France, Switzerland, Germany, Italy, Bulgaria and other European countries.

Until the end of Engels' life Plekhanov enjoyed his firm support, used his wise advice and frequently earned high praise for his work. Plekhanov maintained close ties of friendship and ideological and political cooperation with European proletarian revolutionaries such as August Bebel, Wilhelm

Liebknicht, Paul Lafargue, Dimitur Blagoev, Antonio Labriola, Eleanor Marx-Eweling and, subsequently, Rosa Luxembourg, Klara Zetkin and others. In one of his articles for the French socialist journal he proved that the proper medicine for the affliction from which the working class the world over is suffering, i.e., the oppression of capitalism, is the "dictatorship of the proletariat as a means and the socialist organization of production as an objective."



In 1894 Plekhanov published the pamphlet "Anarchism and Socialism," in which he sharply criticized the "theory" and "practice" of anarchism in France, Italy and other Western countries, which hindered the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and led its politically immature strata toward extremism and syndicalism. Although this work by Plekhanov was not free of errors and limitations (the most severe among them was his effort to criticize anarchism bypassing its attitude toward the state), generally speaking it met with a positive response within the European socialist movement and was useful in the ideological struggle against anarchic and syndicalist confusions.

Despite the overall positive significance of the ideological and theoretical activities of Plekhanov and the members of the Emancipation of Labor group within the Russian and international labor movement until 1895, i.e., during Engels' lifetime, they were unable to assume an entirely independent ideological-political position. Forced exile and lengthy separation from the practices of the Russian labor movement frequently led Plekhanov and his fellow workers to one-sided leaning toward the policies and tactics of the Western European social democratic parties (the German in particular) where, at that time, opportunistic and revisionistic trends were beginning to develop to the right and the left, condemned by the old Engels but not always encountering the necessary ideological-political rebuff on the part of the social democratic leadership which was frequently displaying a centrist tolerance of vacillations in ideology and theoretical thinking.

In the field of theory, philosophy in particular, at that time Plekhanov was a convinced and strong fighter actively supporting Marxism. As a political leader and tactician, however, he could not rise to the level of the requirements of irreconcilable struggle against violations of the principles of scientific socialism supported by Marx and Engels.

The intensive process of dissemination of Marxism in Russia, in which the Emancipation of Labor group played a noted role, received new strong impetus and entered a higher stage of development during the subsequent period (1895-1903). The year 1895 was a turning point in the history of the Russian liberation movement, when it entered its new proletarian stage of development and when the working class became the main force of the movement. The widespread wave of worker strikes, which rolled over many industrial centers in the country, was a clear indication of the advent of a new stage in the Russian revolutionary movement. It was a time when, thanks to the "Alliance in the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class," which was created by Lenin in Petersburg, political agitation among the working masses, developed by the proletarian revolutionaries, and the dissemination of the ideas of scientific socialism in Russia, they merged with the labor movement.

Lenin's Petersburg "Alliance in the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class" was the embryo of the revolutionary Marxist party of the Russian proletariat. ISKRA, the newspaper of revolutionary Marxists, created and headed by Lenin, published abroad and clandestinely disseminated in Russia, prepared for the Second Congress of the RSDWP. As a result of these developing events the center of the international revolutionary and worker movements was shifting further and further and, by the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, had definitively moved to Russia.

The year 1895 was a turning point also in the ideological and theoretical work of the Emancipation of Labor Group, marking its rapprochement with the Russian labor movement and the social democratic groups and circles created in the country. This became possible as a result of the broader dissemination of the publications of the group, the works of Plekhanov and Zasulich and other Marxist works in Russia. This new period in the activities of the Emancipation of Labor Group was laid by Lenin's arrival in Geneva in 1895 and the organization of ideological and political contacts between his "Alliance in the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class" and Plekhanov's group. In a letter dated 1895, Plekhanov described his meeting with Vladimir Il'ich, who had arrived in Geneva: "A young comrade has come here, very intelligent, educated and gifted as a speaker. How lucky for our revolutionary movement to have such young people." On the other hand, recalling Lenin's attitude toward Plekhanov, N. K. Krupskaya wrote that "Plekhanov played a major role in the development of Vladimir Il'ich, helping him to find the proper revolutionary path, for which reason for a long time Lenin put a halo around Plekhanov's head and reacted extremely painfully to even a most minor difference with Plekhanov." However, already then some differences became noted between Lenin and Plekhanov on a number of problems of the revolutionary movement, including the approach to the "legal Marxists" (Struve and others).

In describing his encounters with Lenin, Aksel'rod recalled that whereas he and Plekhanov suggested that they face the liberals, Lenin believed that it was necessary to turn one's back to them. The certain amount of tolerance which the leaders of the Emancipation of Labor Group showed toward the "legal Marxists" and their illusion that the latter could "be recooked in the Marxist pot" lasted until the start of the year 1900, when quite belatedly and on Lenin's insistence, Plekhanov wrote an article critical of Struvism.

The publication abroad, between 1896 and 1900, of Lenin's works "Friedrich Engels," "To the Men and Women Workers at Thornton's Factory," "Interpretation of the Law on Fines...", "The Tasks of the Russian Social Democrats," "To the Petersburg Workers and Socialists From the 'Alliance for the Struggle'," "The New Factory Law" and "The Protest of the Russian Social Democrats," as well as materials written by other Marxist groups, introduced a new creative flow into the ideological and theoretical work of the Emancipation of Labor Group. These and other publications were clandestinely sent by the group to Russia where they were disseminated.

At that time the defense of scientific socialism and Marxist philosophy against anti-Marxist trends which had appeared initially in the German and, subsequently, the Russian labor movements, above all the systematic criticism of

the opportunism displayed by Bernstein and his supporters, philosophical-theoretical revisionism, "economism," which was the Russian variety of Bernsteinianism and its tailist "theory of spontaneity," which threw opportunistic dirt on the labor movement, assumed particularly important ideological and political significance.

In criticizing the Bernsteinian revision of Marxism and condemning the centrist tolerance toward it shown by K. Kautsky and some other leaders of the social democrats, Plekhanov proved the groundlessness and harm of "pluralistic" concepts in Marxism and the efforts to "update" scientific socialism and Marx's economic theory by combining them with bourgeois philosophical and sociological views alien to Marxism. In the articles "Bernstein and Materialism," "Materialism or Kantianism," "Konrad Schmidt Against Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels" and other works written at that time, published in the DIE NEUE ZEIT, the journal of the German social democrats, Plekhanov criticized with polemical sharpness and persuasiveness the revisionist withdrawal from scientific socialism and the "prime source" of this apostasy--the bourgeois idealistic philosophy of neo-Kantianism.

In answering Kautsky, who considered that one should thank Bernstein for "having drawn attention to some problems," Plekhanov wrote: "...Today it is a question of the following: who will bury whom--Bernstein the social democrats or the social democrats Bernstein?.... Do we really have to be thankful to a person who is striking a hard blow at socialist theory and is trying ...to bury this theory to the happiness of a cohesive 'reactionary mass?' No, no, a thousand times no."

Plekhanov's criticism of Bernsteinianism was supported by the proletarian revolutionaries of many countries, who were loyal to scientific socialism, and played a major role in the ideological struggle against this opportunistic trend in the international social democratic movement. The lessons of this struggle are instructive to this day, for today as well new attempts are being made to promote a "renaissance" of Bernstein's ideas and to resurrect them in the fight against Marxism-Leninism and real socialism.

In criticizing the opportunistic theory of "spontaneity," which was preached by the "economists" (Prokopovich, Kuskova, the leaders of the "Alliance of Russian Social Democrats Abroad," and others), a theory which rejected the revolutionary political struggle of the working class and the scientific-socialist ideology and leading role of the Marxist party, Plekhanov, Zasulich and the other revolutionary Marxists proved in their writings, particularly in the collection "Vademecum" ("Guide") the groundlessness and harm of this ideological confusion introduced by the "economists" and others like them in the labor movement, concealed behind false claims of its independence from politics and "freedom" from the leadership of political parties, thus dooming the worker organizations to become an appendix, an obedient tool of the bourgeoisie. Plekhanov faced the Russian social democrats with the task of "coming out of this chaotic and shameful situation at all cost. Woe to a party which patiently tolerates such confusion!"

"The 'Vademecum,'" Lenin wrote, "is a cry against base economism, against the 'shame and disgrace' of the social democracy" (op. cit., vol 46, p 35).

On Lenin's initiative, in 1900 Plekhanov and his fellow workers were invited to participate in the publication and editing of ISKRA, the clandestine all-Russian newspaper created by Lenin. However, such joint work was threatened by the thoughts of Plekhanov, who displayed here his own ambitions and tried, as he had frequently done, to impose his will. The differences, worsened by Plekhanov's behavior, were surmounted thanks to Lenin's wise and principle-minded position. Lenin was able to draw Plekhanov and Zasulich in jointly editing and publishing ISKRA and the journal ZARYA. Between 1901 and 1903 Plekhanov wrote in these organs of the revolutionary Russian social democrats a number of principle-minded theoretical articles. He called upon the social democrats firmly to struggle against the growing danger of Bernsteinianism and opportunism and pointed out that the "Bernsteiniada" is to be feared as a feature of decline. Plekhanov exposed concepts rejecting the application of the dialectical method of revolutionary Marxism toward contemporary capitalism and which proclaimed obsolete and groundless the Marxist concepts on leaps and revolutionary coups, as being allegedly "impossible" and "intolerant of intellect." He wrote that "if the concept of social revolution is groundless because nature does not make leaps and the intellect does not tolerate them, it is obvious that such firm conclusions should equally apply to the bourgeois and the proletarian revolution. If the bourgeois revolution has long been accomplished, despite the fact that such leaps are "impossible," and that change is "continuing," we have all the proper reasons to think that in its time the revolution of the proletariat will take place as well...."

During the period under consideration Zasulich wrote several articles against terrorism and the subjective-idealistic views and tactics of the imitators of populism, the social revolutionaries in particular, who had engaged in a number of terrorist actions against tsarist officials and praised individual acts of terrorism, which they presented as the most important weapon in the struggle against autocracy.

Between 1902 and 1903 the editors of Lenin's ISKRA engaged in preparations for the party congress and drafted the RSDWP program, the principal initiator and leader of which was Lenin. Plekhanov participated in the drafting of the program. However, the draft he suggested suffered from major shortcomings and was more like a textbook than a program of a fighting party. Thanks to the principle-minded position assumed by Lenin, the discussions on the draft RSDWP program ended successfully. Plekhanov acknowledged many of the shortcomings in his draft, which Lenin had criticized, and wrote to him that "for the sake of unity of thought differences should be basically ignored." Lenin and ISKRA submitted to the Second RSDWP Congress the draft party program written together with Plekhanov, a program which was accepted by the congress. Plekhanov, who opened the congress and was appointed its chairman, addressed the congress from Marxist positions entirely in accordance with Lenin's views, whereas the other members of the Emancipation of Labor Group (Zasulich, Aksel'rod, Deych), joined Martov and Potresov, pursued an erroneous and anti-Leninist line in the congress and joined the menshevik faction.

Although Plekhanov addressed the congress from the position of revolutionary Marxism, he was unable to retain them and displayed politically unprincipled tolerance of his friends in the Emancipation of Labor Group and an attachment

to the faulty tradition of "unity at all cost," which had been inherent in a number of leaders of the social democratic parties of the Second International. Soon afterwards he began to abandon the proper positions he had taken at the congress, and by the end of 1903 found himself in the menshevik faction. It was thus that Plekhanov's political fall from grace and his withdrawal from the policy of revolutionary Marxism began. This was no accident. Although he was a noted revolutionary leader, Marxist philosopher, convinced propagandist and outstanding critic of the "philosophers of anti-Marxism," Plekhanov nevertheless failed to pay the necessary attention during the preceding period and particularly after 1903 to the creative development of the economic doctrine and the theory of scientific socialism of Marx and Engels in terms of the new historical circumstances. He failed to see the advent of the new historical age--the age of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. He failed to understand its nature and laws. He was unable to apply Marxist dialectics in defining the strategy and tactics of the worker movement. He failed to note the new forms and methods of revolutionary struggle of the working class, particularly in Russia.

The truly creative development of Marxism during the new historical epoch and the creation of a revolutionary Marxist party of a new type in Russia are inseparable from the tremendous theoretical and practical activities of Lenin, the brilliant thinker and the follower and perpetuator of the great cause of Marx and Engels. The period from the Second RSDWP Congress, at which the Bolshevik Party was created, to the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution is inseparably related to the Leninist stage in Marxist history and the revolutionary-transforming activities of Lenin and the Leninists.

As to Plekhanov, after his transition to the menshevik camp, his ideological-theoretical positions frequently experienced major oscillations and contradictions. On the one hand, in philosophy he still tried to remain on the platform of dialectical and historical materialism and in many of his works and speeches until 1914 (particularly in the book "Basic Problems of Marxism," the collection "Materialismus Militans" and the series of articles "On So-Called Religious Searches") he defended Marxist philosophy. He criticized the Machist "infection" in the labor movement, God-building and God-searching, condemned the counterrevolutionary positions of the Cadet "turnaround," the liquidationism of Potresov, Zasluch and other mensheviks, and debunked the "latest" reactionary concepts of bourgeois philosophy and sociology, mysticism, decadence and symbolism in art, hostile to the scientific materialistic outlook. On the other hand, in the area of politics and tactics of the labor and revolutionary movements, Plekhanov was below all criticism. In his effort to reconcile politically irreconcilable forces within the Russian labor movement, in the period from the end of 1903 to 1918 he repeatedly committed extremely grave errors and engaged in unpardonable retreats from revolutionary Marxism.

Based on his exclusively accurate line of unifying all Marxist forces in the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat, Lenin tried to turn Plekhanov back to the true revolutionary path, to draw him into joint ideological-theoretical work and to encourage him to assume a consistently

internationalist position in the Second International, in which Plekhanov was one of the leaders. At the same time, however, he criticized Plekhanov's tactical opportunism and political oscillations on a principled basis.

When World War I broke out, Plekhanov (like Zasulich) committed an even greater political sin by assuming the social-chauvinist positions of supporting the imperialist war on the side of the Entente. Lenin and the bolsheviks condemned this as a betrayal of the cause of proletarian internationalism as well as Plekhanov's support of the bourgeois Provisional Government after the February revolution. In his 1917 articles and speeches (included in his shameful, posthumously published booklet "One Year in the Homeland"), Plekhanov opposed Lenin's course of the growth of the Russian bourgeois democratic revolution into a proletarian, a socialist revolution. He neither understood nor accepted the Great October Socialist Revolution. He considered it untimely and a violation of the "laws of history." This fateful end of Plekhanov's political path was his life tragedy: one of the pioneers of Marxism in Russia, the theoretician and propagandist of the ideas of scientific socialism, became at the end of his life the opponent of the revolutionary working class which, according to his mistaken claims, had made an error by assuming the power and thus establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, the need for which he had propagandized in the past.

Let it be said to Plekhanov's honor that even in the situation of a political collapse, which he experienced at the end of 1917, he refused to fight against the working class which had emerged victorious in the Russian revolution, and rejected the treacherous proposal of B. Savinkov, the malicious anti-Soviet social revolutionary, to participate in the overthrow of the Soviet system and to assume the head of the "government" which the counterrevolutionaries of various hues intended to set up after their planned "routing" of the Soviets. "I have given the proletariat 40 years of my life," Plekhanov angrily answered, "and I shall not be firing at it even if it follows a false path."

Plekhanov was profoundly mistaken in his assessment of the way chosen by the Russian working class. He took very hard his break with it, a break which had taken place through his own fault. Furthermore, between the end of 1917 and the beginning of 1918 tuberculosis, a disease which had tortured Plekhanov's body for long years, became aggravated and worsened. Plekhanov died on 30 May 1918 and was buried in the Volkov Cemetery, Literatorskiye Mostki, in Petrograd.

Already at that time revolutionary Soviet Russia paid honor to the memory of Georgiy Plekhanov. In his 6 June 1918 telegram, the old bolshevik M. I. Kalinin, at that time the head of Petrograd, expressed his sympathy on the occasion of Plekhanov's death, as the "outstanding theoretician and brilliant Marxist publicist, teacher of an entire generation of socialist intelligentsia and founder of the Russian worker movement, who predicted the path of Russia's revolutionary progress, currently being made by the Russian proletariat." At the same time, however, the fact that Plekhanov "had gone astray several years before his death" was pointed out at the funeral meeting in Petrograd on 9 June 1918.

The Soviet and foreign communists are familiar with and remember the high rating of Plekhanov's philosophical works given by Lenin, the founder and leader of our party, in 1921: "... One cannot become a conscious, a true communist without studying, precisely studying, everything written by Plekhanov on philosophy, for it is the best in international Marxist literature" (op. cit., vol 42, p 290).

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2



SPIRITED ASSISTANT OF THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83) pp 62-68

[Article by Ye. Bavrin and A. Taksabayev]

[Text] The journal NAMYN AMDRAL ("Party Life"), the theoretical and political organ of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee, will be 60 years old in October 1983.

The large amount of materials and articles carried by the journal over the past decades depict the great path covered by the party of the Mongolian communists, under whose leadership the working people in the country made an anti-imperialist and antifeudal people's democratic revolution in 1921 and realized the historical possibility of conversion to socialism bypassing capitalism and are now successfully struggling to complete the building of a socialist society.

Beginning with its very first issues, the journal NAMYN AMDRAL actively undertook to explain to the working people the importance of the revolution and the nature of the steps taken by the people's regime. It encouraged the political activeness of the broad masses and called upon them to rally around the MNRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party] as the leading force of the people's state. For example, here are some typical titles of materials published in the 1920s: "On K. Marx's Theory," "What Is the International?" and "The Communist International and the Small Oppressed Peoples." "... Marx's theory is the most influential doctrine of our time... One cannot be an educated revolutionary without knowledge of Marx's theory," was emphasized in one of the articles. The journal described the revolutionary example of Soviet Russia. It published translations into Mongolian of some of Lenin's works, including "Three Sources and Three Components of Marxism," "Socialism and Religion," "Report of the Commission on the National and Colonial Problems to the Second Comintern Congress," and others.

The NAMYN AMDRAL issues of the 1920s and 1930s are now considered a chronicle of the process of intensification of the ideological and political positions and the organizational strengthening of the MNRP, which took place under the beneficial influence and with the comradely aid of the Soviet communists and the Comintern. The journal contributed to the establishment of the MNRP as a truly revolutionary Leninist-type mass party. Its publications describe MNRP activities in the elaboration of the strategy and tactics of noncapitalist development, based on Lenin's advice and carried out in accordance with

specific Mongolian conditions. They describe the vivid manifestations of the revolutionary energy and social optimism of the pioneers of a new life.

The new features of party, state, economic and cultural construction, related to the conversion of the Mongolian revolution from a democratic to a socialist state were emphasized in NAMYN AMDRAL in the 1940s, particularly during the second half of the decade, when favorable international conditions for the extensive development of socialist changes were created in the MNRP after the end of World War II.

Guided by the party's general line, the theoretical and political organ of its Central Committee played its role in developing the basic problems of the socialist stage of the Mongolian revolution: the creation of a Mongolian industry, the shaping of a national working class, the socialist reorganization of agrarian relations and the making of a cultural revolution. Its materials reflect problems of party leadership in material production, work with cadres, education of the working people in the spirit of socialist ideology, and struggle against the vestiges of feudalism.

The MNRP entered the historical stage of completing the building of socialism at the beginning of the 1960s. Since then the country has covered a long path in the direction of its programmatic objectives, which presume the creation of an optimal complex of the material and technical foundations for socialism, the improvement of socialist social relations and the communist upbringing of the working people. "Socialism began to develop in our country in width and in depth, revealing its inexhaustible opportunities and advantages," noted Comrade Yu. Tsendenbal, general secretary of the MNRP Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the People's Great Hural (No 9, 1981). During these more than 20 years no single area of MNRP activities has failed to be reflected, one way or another, in the journal. All in all, its issues offer a broad panoramic view of the purposeful work which the party of Mongolian communists is doing in domestic and foreign policy.

NAMYN AMDRAL focuses its attention on problems of party leadership of economic construction and on the topical problems of the economy. As a result of the implementation of MNRP policies, which take into consideration the overall level of development and current possibilities of the MPR, and the advantages related to cooperation with the fraternal countries, the economic base of Mongolian society is developing successfully. The country is in the process of converting from agroindustrial into industrial-agrarian. Between 1961 and 1980 its average annual growth of industrial output was in the vicinity of 10 percent; the share of industry in the overall net industrial and agricultural output increased from 39 percent in 1965 to 66 percent in 1980. By the end of the current five-year plan, in 1985, this indicator will reach almost 75 percent, for the share of industry in the national income will exceed 40 percent. The sectorial structure of industry is improving and its geographic deployment is broadening (No 8, 1981).

The material and technical base of the leading industry--agriculture--has been strengthened substantially. This has created conditions for the intensification of crop growing and animal husbandry and their gradual conversion in the future to a contemporary industrial base. Each one of the

journal's issues carries materials on economic and social problems related to the development of the Mongolian village and disseminates the experience acquired in implementing the resolutions of MNRP Central Committee plenums, aimed at surmounting the lagging of the sector behind the requirements of the present and the satisfaction of the country's growing requirements.

In explaining MNRP economic strategy, as earmarked at its 18th Congress and aimed above all at increasing public production efficiency, in the article "Some Problems of the Theory and Practice of Socialist Construction" (No 10, 1981), NAMYN AMDRAL singles out some of its components such as increasing labor productivity, applying scientific and technical achievements and progressive experience, comprehensively improving work quality in all economic and cultural sectors, rational and efficient utilization of production capacities and material, financial and manpower resources, and further growth of the country's economic potential.

The journal emphasizes that the development of Mongolian production forces is inseparably related to improving socialist production relations. Noteworthy in this context are articles on improving economic management and planning and increasing the influence of the economic mechanism on achieving high end results (No 11, 1981; No 8, 1982). As indicated in a number of articles, the steps taken to strengthen cost-effectiveness and to expand the economic autonomy and rights of enterprises, based on the study of Soviet experience, substantially enhanced the role of economic methods in national economic management. Quality control and the norming of material resources are improving. For the first time, a general plan has been drafted for the development and location of Mongolian production forces through 1990. At the same time, as was pointed out at the 18th MNRP Congress, considering the significantly increased scale of public production and greater complexity of the structure and interaction among sectors, improving management and planning, and adopting the program-comprehensive approach to main problems become particularly relevant. In this connection, the journal emphasizes the need for stricter requirements concerning the quality of plans and plan discipline, the struggle against unjustified amendment of assignments, strict conservation measures, and further development of the forms of socialist competition, giving priority to efficiency and quality (No 11, 1981).

In close connection with MNRP economic strategy, the journal considers problems of party social policy. It convincingly proves that the creation of the material and technical foundations for socialism is the base for improving the well-being and cultural standards of the working people and ensuring the comprehensive and harmonious development of man. In one of its articles (No 2, 1983) the journal cites the following eloquent facts and figures: during the past slightly more than 20 years alone, in the course of which the Mongolian population almost doubled, the real income of the working people increased by a factor of 3.7; it will increase by yet another 11 percent between 1981 and 1985. Between 1976 and 1980 double the amount of housing than during the preceding 5 years was completed. Today 25 percent of the Mongolian population is engaged in studies. The task of achieving universal eighth-grade education has been completed in its essential lines. An increasing number of people are acquiring higher or secondary specialized

training. A health care system has been developed with a wide network of hospitals, polyclinics, medical centers, and prophylactic establishments. The journal concentrates on urgent problems of the social program and the elimination of existing shortcomings in this area, as pointed out at the 18th MNRP Congress.

The dynamic growth and quality changes in production, well-being and cultural-educational population standards lead to progressive changes in the class structure, in the social aspect of classes, social strata and groups. The journal's articles contain rich data characterizing such changes.

The working class, the size of which has doubled over the past 20 years, plays a leading role in contemporary Mongolian society. The workers launch a number of valuable initiatives and march in the leading ranks of the socialist competition and the movement of shock workers and production rationalizers. Following the completion of the cooperativization of the peasant farms and the creation of a new agrarian sector--crop growing--the social structure of the Mongolian village changed as well. A new generation of animal husbandrymen is being trained on an organized basis. During the 1970s more than 53,000 boys and girls, partial or complete secondary school graduates, joined their ranks, and the number of skilled mechanizers is growing. The Mongolian intelligentsia is helping with increased activeness the growth of the spiritual and scientific and technical potential of society.

In covering the development of the Mongolian political system, NAMYN AMDRAL pays prime attention to the MNRP line of comprehensive development of socialist democracy, which is "a tried political mechanism for ensuring the unity between party and people" (No 9, 1982). The broadened range of competence of the representative organs--hurals of different levels--and the energizing of the work of their permanent commissions, improvements in the legal foundations of governmental activities, and strengthened people's control and the public principles in administration are all components of the extensive and steady efforts which enrich the content of socialist democracy and contribute to the more efficient functioning of the entire popular democratic system in Mongolia.

The solution of the entire set of domestic and foreign political problems facing the MNRP under contemporary conditions calls for the further enhancement of the leading role of the party and the steady advancement of the means and methods of its organizational-political and ideological activities. This is one of the pivotal ideas contained in the programmatic documents of the MNRP and in the resolutions of its latest congresses and Central Committee plenums. NAMYN AMDRAL, which is called upon to sum up and propagandize everything progressive and new developed through party construction practices, plays a responsible role in their implementation. "The Mobilizing Force of the Party Organization" is the title of an article written by Comrade B. Altangerel, MNRP Central Committee Politburo member and first secretary of the Ulan-Bator MNRP city party committee, in which he describes the way that party members in the Mongolian capital are strengthening the directing and organizing influence of the largest party organization in the republic on the entire course of economic and cultural construction (No 3,

1981). Many of the journal's materials deal with the growth and improvement of the party's qualitative composition. Party committee secretaries share experience in implementing the stipulations of the 18th MNRP Congress of strengthening the party ranks with progressive working people with an active life stance, above all the best young people, increasing work with the young party members, enhancing the responsibility and discipline of the party membership and improving the deployment of party forces among the economic sectors.

NAMYN AMDRAL started a lively exchange of views on the ways and means of increasing the role and militancy of the primary party organizations in the section "Let Us Profoundly Study and Master the Leninist Workstyle." An article by Comrade B. Dejid, MNRP Central Committee Politburo candidate member and MNRP Central Committee Party Control Committee chairman (No 7, 1982) discusses means for upgrading control efficiency and verification of execution. Purposeful, systematic and planned control, the author emphasizes, is a major instrument in improving the activities of party, state and economic organizations, in discovering and harnessing reserves, strengthening the discipline and waging a decisive struggle against negligence, whitewashing, abuse of official position and other negative phenomena.

NAMYN AMDRAL focuses its attention on improving the means and methods of work with cadres in the light of the increased requirements based on the resolutions of the 18th MNRP Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums. They emphasize the particular importance today of qualities in leading workers such as high competence and responsibility for assignments, initiative and feeling for the new. They note the importance of the further development of principle-minded criticism, the development of a self-critical approach to the work and mastering the methods of self-analysis and self-control as mandatory prerequisites for preventing work errors and shortcomings.

One of the main sections in the journal is entitled "Ideological and Political-Educational Work." The articles published in this section describe the efforts of MNRP organizations aimed at enhancing the efficiency of ideological and political work, conducting it as organically related to the solution of practical problems, the elimination of formalism and pretentiousness and enhancing the substantiation of party propaganda and its political sharpness in the struggle against views alien to Marxism-Leninism. The establishment of a comprehensive approach in ideological work, experience in its long-term planning, improving the system of party training and the economic education and upbringing of the working people, propaganda through lectures and agitation-mass work are permanent topics discussed in NAMYN AMDRAL. Based on the stipulations and conclusions of the 17th and 18th MNRP congresses, the journal actively participates in the dissemination and elaboration of topical subjects related to the establishment of a socialist way of life in Mongolia --one of the pivotal problems in the further development of the socialist society (Nos 3 and 9, 1981; Nos 5 and 6, 1982).

The articles in the journal draw attention to the need to take fully into consideration the new realities created by the development of Mongolian society, the considerably enhanced cultural and educational standards, level

of information and spiritual interests and requirements of the people in particular. Today, we read in one of the articles (No 4, 1982), more than 70 newspapers and journals are published in Mongolia in 1.5 million copies; there are three to four subscriptions per family; four out of every five families have a radio; one out of six have televisions; there is one movie theater per 3,200 people, one library per 2,150 and one club per 4,700. All of this broadens opportunities for ideological-educational work but also faces it with new stricter requirements and with the need to seek more efficient forms of work with the people.

This applies above all to the education of the youth. Three-quarters of today's Mongolian population are under 35; the 16-35 age group accounts for more than 60 percent of people employed in material production (No 10, 1980). It is no accident that NAMYN AMDRAL tries extensively to cover the experience of party, state and revolutionary youth organizations, schools and production collectives which show particular concern for shaping a socialist attitude toward labor and the social activeness of young people, and who skillfully raise the growing generation in the spirit of revolutionary, combat and labor traditions, patriotism and internationalism.

NAMYN AMDRAL describes the basic trends and specific achievements in MNRP theoretical activities. Particularly noteworthy in this area are a number of articles on various aspects of noncapitalist development and building of socialism in Mongolia. They are distinguished by their substantiated and methodologically tested analysis of the historical experience of the MNRP and a profound theoretical interpretation of the real problems and practical tasks presented by life.

In an article written on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of the birth of D. Sukhe-Bator, Comrade J. Batmuh, MNRP Central Committee Politburo member and MPR Council of Ministers chairman, writes the following: "The historical path covered by our country under the leadership of the MNRP has been noted with its high dynamism, steady upsurge and major accomplishments in all areas. This is the best proof of the accuracy and fruitfulness of the Leninist course of noncapitalist development. The great merit of D. Sukhe-Bator was that he followed this course unhesitatingly and that under his leadership the MPR took its first step toward a new society which brought true freedom to the working people. Loyalty to Sukhe-Bator's behests, expressed in the talented and creative continuation of his cause, enabled the party to formulate the right strategy which ensures the implementation of the overall laws governing the building of socialism in specific political practical activities and with a thorough consideration of all historical, national and other characteristics" (No 2, 1983). Unity between the international and the national in MNRP activities and the organic combination of the line of socialist building within the country with a course toward socialism and internationalism in foreign policy ensured the success of the gradual and multiple-stage solution of the problems of Mongolian development from feudalism to socialism.

The essential significance of the Mongolian experience as a structural part of the experience of real socialism in the case of countries with a socialist

orientation is convincingly presented in the article "Some Problems of Transition of Backward Countries to Socialism, Bypassing Capitalism, and the Experience of the MPR" (No 9, 1982). NAMYN AMDRAL steadily turns also to the theoretical aspects of the contemporary stage of development of the MPR, when the laying of the material and technical foundations for socialism is nearing completion and an active search is under way for means to improve social relations, when fraternal cooperation has been developed extensively and a process of rapprochement among the members of the socialist commonwealth is taking place.

The essentially internationalist foreign policy of the MNRP is one of the most important contributing factors to the advancement of the Mongolian society. "The main directions of MNRP international activities," the 18th Mongolian Communist Party Congress emphasized, "are determined by the affiliation of our country with the great commonwealth of socialist countries and the need to ensure favorable foreign conditions for building socialism in the MPR." The intensification and development of relations and comprehensive cooperation with the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries are among the steady journal topics.

NAMYN AMDRAL brings to light convincingly and with proper substantiation the content of Mongolian-Soviet relations which are, essentially, the first historical form of implementation of socialist internationalism in intergovernmental relations and the prototype for the new truly fraternal relations among socialist countries. With the help of rich specific data the journal proves that the MNRP and the CPSU are developing and intensifying their internationalist traditions of inviolable friendship, selfless mutual aid and firm ideological unity, ensuring the steady broadening of the interaction between our parties, countries and peoples in all areas and along all directions in social life.

Exchange of experience in all of its various manifestations is one such essentially important direction. It is also a proven efficient method of party construction and ideological work, which includes new forms of production and management organization and the efficient solution of one economic problem or another, or the sum total of what could be described as experience in building socialism. The journal has always paid unabated attention to the dissemination of Soviet experience. In recent years it has been particularly active and specific in such work, involving a wide circle of party workers, specialists and scientists, based on the maximal utilization of practical experience in bringing to light the creative forces of the working people and enhancing public production efficiency.

The journal points out that the help given by the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries and Mongolia's participation in CEMA activities make it possible to formulate and successfully resolve major socioeconomic problems and to accelerate the development of the republic's national economy. "The prime significance of economic cooperation between our republic and the Soviet Union and the entire socialist integrational commonwealth," writes Comrade Yu. Tsedenbal, "lies precisely in the fact that it contributes to strengthening the inner sources of economic growth and expanding our own

possibilities of national economic progress.... In making its contribution to international socialist economic cooperation, the Mongolian people is thus contributing to the further blossoming of its homeland and to strengthening the power of the socialist commonwealth" (No 4, 1980).

The Mongolian communists ascribe particular importance to strengthening the unity among socialist countries and their economic and defense potential. This was most strongly reemphasized at the 6th (July 1983) MNRP Central Committee Plenum. Friendship and cooperation among fraternal parties, states and peoples and close coordination of their actions in the international arena are prerequisites for successes achieved by the entire socialist commonwealth and its individual members. NAMYN AMDRAL's materials on foreign policy (Nos 2 and 3, 1982; Nos 4 and 6, 1983 and others) clearly present the consistent MNRP line of comprehensive cooperation in implementing the initiatives of the USSR and the other fraternal countries aimed at the prevention of nuclear war, ending the arms race and promoting disarmament and protecting the security and national independence and social progress of the nations. In turn, the MPR has submitted and, with the support of the fraternal countries, is adamantly promoting the implementation of proposals for the elaboration and conclusion of a convention on reciprocal nonaggression and nonuse of force in relations among countries in Asia and the Pacific. This initiative, the journal points out, has met with broad response among circles of political personalities and the public on the Asian continent. It follows the common channel of the constructive efforts of the socialist commonwealth in favor of peace (No 4, 1983).

The main trends in the work of the theoretical and political organ of the MNRP Central Committee describe with convincing fullness the intensive and practical rhythm of life of the party of Mongolian communists. For the MNRP leadership the journal NAMYN AMDRAL, which is honorably fulfilling its role as collective propagandist, agitator and organizer of the masses, makes a considerable contribution to building socialism.

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

5003  
1802/2



THERE IS NO MORE IMPORTANT TASK THAN THAT OF PREVENTING WAR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83) pp 69-82

[Article by Academician P. Fedoseyev, chairman of the Scientific Council for the Study of Problems of Peace and Disarmament]

[Text] 1. The Main Problem of All Global Problems

Starting with the second half of the 20th century, the course of global social development has been facing more and more tangibly an essentially new sociohistorical reality--the appearance and aggravation of universal so-called global problems which affect, one way or another, the destinies of all countries and nations. The continuing growth of the planet's population and greater material requirements and spiritual demands call for the solution of energy, raw material and food problems consistent with the growth of global production forces. In turn, such growth is impossible without equalizing the currently uneven development of entire continents, eliminating the economic, scientific and technical and cultural gap between developed and developing countries and regions, and establishing a new international economic order. That is why the solution of global problems is a task facing all contemporary mankind.

This solution which, in the final account, is also the main and basic problem --that of eliminating the system of exploitation of man by man--also calls for mastering the laws of social development, the efficient management of social processes and the accomplishment of deep social and cultural changes in the world, as well as the coordinated and joint efforts of countries and nations, their cooperation, the changing of many historically developed customs, cultural stipulations and psychological stereotypes, and improvements in man's overall activities.

During the last decade international relations rose to such a stage of aggravation in which priority among all global problems of our time was given to that of war and peace. The inordinately severe and ugly consequences of a possible military clash on a global scale are concealed in the unrestrained growth of mass destruction weapons, nuclear above all. War not only threatens the future but has become the most alarming problem of the present. The entire world is in danger and the task of saving the world from military catastrophes and the reasons causing them, formulated by the communists as a basic programmatic task, is assuming more than ever before a universal-historical importance. "Putting an end to wars, peace among nations, an end to

plunder and violence are precisely our ideal..." V. I. Lenin emphasized ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 26, p 304).

Our age is a turning point in universal history not only in the sense that a transition is taking place in the course of profound revolutionary changes, from age-old relations of exploitation of man by man and racial and national discrimination, to new social relations based on just socialist principles and free national development, but also in the sense that mankind faces an alternative which affects the fate of all nations: either ensuring the possibility of social progress under the conditions of peace or a military catastrophe unparalleled in scale and consequence, which would threaten the accomplishments of human civilization and the existence of man himself.

During previous historical epochs mankind experienced a number of natural and social upheavals. Nature itself was subjected to a number of major cataclysms. However terrible these upheavals might have been, they brought about the fall of only individual empires and local civilizations, the destruction of individual areas on earth or the withering away or destruction of individual live species. Never before have they threatened the destruction of all human civilization and mankind and all life on earth. It was precisely the appearance of nuclear weapons, followed by other lethal armaments, which created for the first time in history such a danger, which is presented by imperialism, and which creates a threat not on a local but a universal scale.

With all their gravity, global problems vary in terms of their extent and urgency of their resolution. The most important and the most essential and crucial among them is the problem of war and peace. The danger of total annihilation has made it the key problem, problem No 1, among the other grave global problems. "... Mankind," emphasizes Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, "is facing a number of new concerns, some of them quite complex. It is justifiably concerned with the aggravation of the raw materials, energy, food, ecological and other global problems. The main thing which concerns the peoples today is the need to preserve peace and to prevent thermonuclear catastrophe." In the final account, no other global problem can be resolved without resolving the problem of war and peace.

"The bourgeois theoreticians do everything possible to bypass and suppress this truth, emphasizing one global problem or another, while pushing back or even totally failing to mention the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe. It is thus that they essentially supply arguments to those aggressive politicians who proclaim that today in world affairs there are "things more important than peace."

The liberal-bourgeois specialists in ecology and futurology either cannot or are unwilling to acknowledge that lifting the threat of a new world war is the most fundamental prerequisite in resolving all other global problems, both those which have already become apparent in contemporary global developments and those which will appear in the future. Putting an end to the arms race and turning the constructive possibilities and all productive forces toward peaceful objectives would not only eliminate the basic and most

terrible threat to human civilization but would also create the most favorable and healthy international climate which would provide the best possible conditions for surmounting ecological, energy, raw material, demographic, food and other processes which have attained global scale in the contemporary world. Yet instead of resolving such problems, today the peoples are forced to deal with whether there will be life on earth and mankind itself or not. This question, paradoxical though it might seem, appeared in an age when, for the first time in history, tremendous scientific and technical accomplishments and social progress have made possible the rational reorganization of the entire life of man, the mastery of the forces of nature in a new scale and form, the conversion of history itself into a sensible controlled process.

The imperialist ideologues and politicians deny that the vital problems of mankind are universal, as well as the need for a worldwide coordinated approach to their solution. The defenders of the American imperialists and their allies consider that achieving military superiority, imposing political diktat and gaining world domination are the very foundations for the solution of all global problems.

Along with clearly pro-imperialist concepts, an abstract-liberal approach to the interpretation of global problems has become widespread in bourgeois sociology. The supporters of this approach ignore the socioeconomic sources of such problems and the class base of the various programs for their resolution and engage in futurological prophecies.

One can easily see that in addition to natural scientific, technological, humanistic and many other aspects, global problems have an unquestionably social dimension. Planetary problems include the dialectics of the universal and class features. All solutions in these areas, not even excluding those which are strictly technical, invariably face the division of the world into conflicting social systems, the division of the bourgeois society into classes, the capitalist division of labor and the unequal system of international economic, political and cultural relations organized by capitalism. The sources of many of these problems, the ecological and resource above all, are deeply rooted in the principles of a consumerist, a predatory attitude toward nature, man and society developed within capitalism.

Nor do global problems exist outside the national and state-political situation prevailing in the contemporary world. Mankind can resolve them by mastering the dialectics of the national-sovereign and universal, and the general and individual aspects of the historical process. Naturally, despite the urgent nature of most of these problems, many of them can be resolved only in the course of a relatively lengthy historical development of human society. Not only the complexity of the problems themselves but a number of essentially important material, social and political objective and subjective factors inevitably will lengthen and complicate the resolution of existing contradictions in the development of mankind.

The conditions and factors which determine the overall solution of global problems also determine to the highest extent the outcome of the problem of war and peace. More than any other, it requires a reorganization of politics,

awareness, reorientation of production forces and scientific knowledge, and the joint coordinated efforts of contemporary mankind. At the same time, no other global problem depends to such an extent as this one does on the class positions of the forces which trigger it and the understanding of national and governmental interests. No single one of the multiplicity of universal problems is created so purposefully by specific social and class forces. The overwhelming majority of global contradictions in contemporary history arose in the course of a lengthy and largely spontaneous, uncontrolled social development under the conditions of an antagonistic society not subject to rational control. The problem of peace and war has always been both the manifestation and the result of the deliberate policies of the ruling classes and its contemporary universal nature, fraught with catastrophe, is predetermined not by the spontaneous course of events but by the class choices of the most reactionary imperialist circles, their choice of pursuing a policy of aggression, armament and preparations for war. Therefore, unlike any other analysis of a different global problem, the study of the threat of war presumes the identification of the social and class sources under the threat of war and its bearers and culprits. The problem of war and peace profoundly polarizes mankind. It clearly separates and pits against each other progressive and peace-loving forces and reactionary and militaristic forces. Such polarization is combined with the division of the world into two opposite social systems. The confrontation between the forces of peace and war is developing under the conditions of a class confrontation between the social systems, cultures and ideologies of the two systems. It is the sharpest, the most extreme front-end element of this confrontation.

Like all other global problems, the problem of war and peace is based on a complex system of cause-and-effect relationships, triggering factors and conditions for its resolution. Problems such as maintaining stable intergovernmental relations, preventing crisis situations, creating a climate of trust, observing treaties, reducing the level of confrontation, eliminating military confrontation and removing militarism from political theory and practice and state, economic and cultural life in society and from social consciousness and ideology are all structural components of the overall problem of war and peace. Peaceful coexistence and military-political detente are the most complete and essential means for its solution today.

## 2. Reasons for the Aggravation of the International Situation

The aggressive nature of imperialism is the most important general reason for the current military confrontation. Wars and violence are its organic creation. The intensification of the general crisis of capitalism is the closest objective reason for the current specific aggravation of this clash and its growth into a confrontation; the more immediate reason is the current economic crisis which has spread over the capitalist world and the weakening of imperialist, American above all, positions which it has created.

The worsening of the economic crisis and of the U.S. situation in the international arena are largely caused by the hegemonistic and aggressive policies pursued by American imperialism and its allies. This crisis, however, is based on the manifestation of the profound objective features of capitalism

and the aggravation of the conflict between the social nature of production and the private-capitalist form of appropriation.

The intensification of the general crisis of capitalism is taking place under essentially new objective conditions in contemporary global developments: in circumstances governed by the struggle between the two conflicting global systems of essentially identical military power, the intensification of the global revolutionary process, the collapse of the imperialist colonial system, the development of the scientific and technical revolution and the aggravation of the ecological, energy and raw materials situations in the world at large and in the capitalist countries in particular.

Under these circumstances not only paralleling and clearly negative consequences such as, for example, destruction of the environment and the exhaustion of resources, but also all of the factors which should have strengthened capitalism turn against the capitalist production method and capitalism as a historically obsolete social system.

Thus, the economic upsurge which lasted from the end of the 1940s to the beginning of the 1970s\*, which arose against the background of the favorable postwar situation, not only did not pull capitalism out of a general crisis (on which the ideologues and theoreticians of "changing" capitalism relied) but led to a profound subsequent decline in production. This decline, which developed into a real crisis during the second half of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s, proved that technical and economic growth does not strengthen the stability of the capitalist economy but, conversely, increases its instability and intensifies the internal contradictions within the capitalist production method. As economic contradictions worsen, unemployment becomes a structural feature organically inherent in the antagonistic process of capitalist production and assumes a gigantic scale (affecting more than 11 percent of the manpower). The crisis itself becomes a steady chronic economic condition, interwoven with monetary (characterized, in particular, by the tremendous budget deficit increases), ecological and profound social crises. This crisis tends to grow even with a relative increase in capitalist production, for all the noted negative factors it triggers inevitably grow as well.

The increasing militarization of the imperialist countries is its direct consequence. As a severe manifestation of the general capitalist crisis, it has its direct economic aspect. Unable to develop the production forces of society efficiently and without a crisis, capitalism reorients the mechanisms of state-monopoly economic control from civilian (where their inefficiency is manifested) to military production. Therefore, the anticrisis steps are taken in an area of fictitious construction, in which the material, social, human and intellectual resources of society are wasted on a tremendous scale. It is precisely in the area of war production, which kills material values and funds, that capitalism is primarily developing today its scientific and technical potential and concentrating leading industrial sectors (missile-outer space, aerospace, shipbuilding, instrument manufacturing, and so on).

---

\* However, not without declines. In the United States, for example, absolute declines in industrial output were noted in 1948-1949, 1953-1954, 1957-1958, 1960-1961 and 1969-1970.

In rechanneling into military production resources which could be used more efficiently in the civilian economic sector, capitalism wastes tremendous material values, turning them into losses and unproductive costs. It relies on the fact that the concentration of a significant percentage of production forces in the war industry could, for a while, ease the socioeconomic contradictions within the capitalist economy. However, the high level of development in the military industry, which is a characteristic feature of the contemporary capitalist economy, actually not only does not contribute to the development and efficient utilization of production forces but, conversely, leads to the intensification of crisis phenomena on capitalist society. Militarism and the crisis development of capitalism are, therefore, closely interrelated.

The lion's share of military orders goes to sectors ruled by the large monopolies, which are the main suppliers of the war departments. This leads to the further concentration and centralization of production and capital in the military industry.

It is no accident that the production of armaments is the most profitable business. Returns on capital invested in military production are considerably higher than in the civilian industry, which makes production militarization not only attractive but even the salvation of capitalist companies about to go bankrupt. The example of the Chrysler corporation, one of the biggest American companies, indicates the importance of this circumstance. Several years ago Chrysler was on the verge of bankruptcy. It was losing in its civilian output. Chrysler, however, is also the largest supplier of tanks and its war industry income accounted for as much as 78 percent of the total as early as the 1970s. By the mid-1970s the firm was given an order from the Pentagon for the production of the XM-1 tank, totaling \$19 billion.

Demand for military production is rising steadily, whereas non-military sales are declining. Military orders contain a deliberate possibility of steady profit increases. This is achieved through a well-developed mechanism known as "price overruns"--the payment of the difference between what the Pentagon agreed to pay for a military item at the time the contract was signed and what the state actually pays after the fulfillment of the contract. Such differences usually amount to 100-300 and, in some cases, even 500 and 800 percent. That same Chrysler estimated that the price of the first batch of tanks delivered in 1981 would cost \$600 million. Subsequently, however, the price rose by 380 percent as compared to the contract (from \$560,000 to \$2.7 million per unit of output). U.S. President Reagan paid the company \$2 billion in 1982.\* The exploitation of the state by the war merchants is rising along with the share of military output in the overall volume of production of the largest companies. Thus, as early as the beginning of the 1970s, the share of military procurements accounted for 80 percent of the output of General Dynamics, 89 percent of Lockheed Aircraft, 41 percent of McDonnell-Douglas, 61 percent of North American Rockwell, and so on.

---

\* This confirms today particularly emphatically Lenin's statement to the effect that "the capitalist economy 'for war' (i.e., an economy directly or indirectly related to military procurements) is the systematic, the legitimized robbery of the treasure..." (op. cit., vol 34, p 173).

"... Fast and deep changes are taking place in the development of military technology," the 26th CPSU Congress noted. "Qualitatively new types of armaments, mass destruction weapons above all, are being developed. They include varieties which could make control over them and, therefore, their agreed-upon limitation an exceptionally difficult if not impossible matter." The cost of new weapons is increasing unrestrainedly. In the period after World War II the cost of an aircraft carrier "increased" by a factor of 10-20; of a mine sweeper, 20-30; a bomber, 30-40; a submarine, 40-50; and a fighter plane 100-150. As a result, whereas in 1970 outlays for armaments in NATO countries, according to London's Institute for Strategic Studies, totaled \$99.5 billion, \$74.4 billion of which was spent by the United States, they reached \$278.7 billion in the NATO countries and \$171,023,000,000 in the United States in 1981. As they increased the arms race, over the past 30 years the NATO countries have increased their annual military outlays by a factor of 15.

Imperialism is dragging the entire world into multibillion dollar expenditures for military purposes. Already now more than \$1 million is spent on armament production every minute. The new American nuclear missiles and shells, bombers and navy ships, and outer space ray technology conceived by the most extreme militarists will raise armament costs to an unparalleled scale. It is no accident that Washington is planning for the Pentagon military expenditures totaling \$273 billion for 1984 and \$425 billion by 1988.

The qualitative and quantitative development of military equipment leads to an increasing involvement of the scientific-technical and production potential of the largest countries in the creation of means of destruction. Thus, today nearly 35 percent of this potential is used for military purposes in the United States. This includes 25 percent of the electronic industry output. The United States is planning to spend \$230 billion on military electronic hardware alone between 1978 and 1988.

Let us also bear in mind that approximately one-third of the appropriations goes to strictly war production. About one-half of all military outlays go to army logistics. The cost of maintaining a single soldier is rising steadily. In addition to everything else, militarism is a huge and expensive military-bureaucratic machine. Nevertheless, the capitalist armed forces and military apparatus are steadily growing quantitatively.

The cost of militarization does not end with direct and indirect financial outlays. Another incomparably higher cost of militarization exists--the social.

Not only direct material production is subordinate to the arms race. Science as well is forced to work for it and for the sake of military corporation profits. For a number of years the area of scientific and technological research and development, steadily oriented toward preparations for war, accounts for 50 percent of the U.S. federal science budget (0.7-0.5 percent goes to education, 0.7-0.6 percent to social benefits, etc.). Science is increasingly obeying the militaristic policy which exploits knowledge for aggressive purposes. The truly humane purposes and functions of knowledge are twisted for the sake of resolving narrow-class problems of oppression and

violence, while science is turning into a weapon for the class and caste-oriented policy of the leading imperialist forces.

The unrestrained and wasteful arms race draws the production possibilities, scientific knowledge and intellectual and constructive forces of mankind away from the solution of important vital problems raised by the course of history, such as eliminating the gap in the development of advanced and backward countries and rescuing hundreds of millions of people from chronic hunger, disease, illiteracy, mass unemployment, waste of natural resources and environmental pollution.

The arms race is becoming an increasingly heavy burden for the national economy and the living standard of the peoples throughout the world. In his time, Karl Marx noted that from the strictly economic viewpoint military preparations are similar to a nation throwing some of its capital into the sea. Today the volume of such material resources "cast in the waters" is rising steadily. Truly fantastic amounts of funds are being wasted thoughtlessly and unproductively, while many hundreds of millions of people live under conditions of poverty and privations. Therefore, the entire broad complex of socioeconomic problems which face today the individual nations and mankind as a whole persistently call for putting an end to the arms race and converting military to peaceful production. The scientists have at their disposal numerous data indicating the positive results of reducing the arms race and converting military expenditures to peaceful and constructive use.

According to the enemies of disarmament, military expenditures and the conversion of the war industry are allegedly fraught with increased unemployment and other economic difficulties. However, serious economic studies confirm the opposite. Large military budgets not only do not reduce overall unemployment in the capitalist countries but contribute to its increase. The inflation of military budgets invariably leads to general inflation and a reduction in solvent population demand. In turn, this reduces output and increases unemployment. According to all available estimates, investments in peaceful economic sectors create more jobs than corresponding investments in war production.

War outlays hold back the development of civilian sectors. The fact that the war industry is a major consumer of the output of the raw material and processing industries (steel, petroleum, machine tools, equipment, and so on) should have stimulated production forces. In fact, however, withholding funds from the nonmilitary area greatly outstrips the relative increase in the number of jobs and in production volume generated by military orders. As early as the 1960s V. Leontiev, the noted American economist, proved that reducing armament production by 20 percent would entail the loss of 300,000 jobs but open 697,000 new jobs in civilian production sectors. Currently increasing the military budget by \$1 billion, according to the specialists, involves the loss of 11,600 jobs in the United States.

The arms race not only absorbs resources which could be used for the solution of global problems and improving the standards and way of life of the people, but inevitably intensifies the crises and stresses caused by the sum total of



global difficulties in the development of mankind. We know that war production is unproductive and inefficiently wastes a large number of nonre- coverable energy and raw material resources. The production of modern mass destruction weapons, nuclear and chemical above all, and their testing, are a major factor in the worsening of the environment. Areas drawn away from production use by the armed forces are rapidly expanding.

Naturally, the arms race adversely affects the economy of the socialist countries as well. It draws away significant funds and a large contingent of skilled manpower from resolving topical problems of national economic development and enhancing the well-being of the people's masses. The Soviet people are unquestionably interested in putting an end to the arms race, realizing that this will not only lower the threat of war but make possible the more efficient solution of economic problems. Let us most strictly emphasize that in the socialist society there neither exist nor could exist social groups interested in and obtaining material benefits from the arms race.

The entire broad set of socioeconomic problems facing today the individual countries and mankind at large urgently requires putting an end to the arms race and converting war production to peaceful purposes. The main obstacle in this case is the militaristic policy of the most reactionary forces of contemporary imperialism.

### 3. The Imperialist Policy of War and Aggression

The present sharp turn taken by the reactionary imperialist forces toward confrontation and cold war and their open threat of unleashing a nuclear war did not occur suddenly. Despite frequent Western efforts to present this as the result of some specific events which occurred in recent years such as, for example, the substitution by the Soviet Union of obsolete medium-range missiles with a certain number of modern missiles, is not the determining factor. Actually, this turn was planned in advance and deliberately aggravated by the steady efforts made in the postwar period by the militaristic and imperialist forces of the United States to achieve military superiority and global rule and oppose detente and peaceful coexistence. The policy of torpedoing detente and aggravating the confrontation is the one pursued by the most reactionary segment of big capital, related to the production of weapons, known as the military-industrial complex. It is this complex which supports the current ruling political forces in the United States which directly guide this policy and exert steady pressure on the administration in Washington.

The military-industrial complex is very big business. It accounts for an influential part of the monopoly bourgeoisie which suffers direct losses from the developing economic and social crisis in capitalist society and is trying most energetically to come out of it by any means. This powerful group supports openly or secretly the political actions of the ideologues and official politicians who formulate the aggressive military-political strategy of imperialism. It is precisely this group that is applying today tremendous efforts to develop the new stage in the arms race. The alliance between the

armament magnates and the reactionary political leaders and ideologues has concentrated within its hands a tremendous power whenever it is able to place it in high positions its most obedient and aggressive stooges. Anticommunism and hegemonism blend within its single ideology.

It was the reactionary military-political U.S. circles which inspired, after World War II, the formulation of the hegemonistic concept of large-scale space planning, which to this day defines the aspirations of militarism. According to this concept, the entire world is a "space," a significant portion of which is proclaimed an area of "necessary control by the state." This concept concretized the "program of war and peace," which was drafted during the war by the U.S. Department of State and the influential Council for Foreign Relations, which includes the thesis according to which war would make the United States a dominant global force, called upon to rule the "space" under its control. It was during that period as well that the main planning document for the cold war was drafted--the so-called NSC-68 Directive (April 1950) on the strategy of "containing" and "throwing back" socialism, and the familiar anticommunist line of the Truman doctrine. The makers of said concepts acknowledged the impossibility of "absorbing" the Soviet Union in the "open" space of "necessary control" by the United States, but called for "restraining" it. In subsequent years, the strategy of "containment" was changed repeatedly, assuming more concealed or coarser and more intransigent forms of anti-Soviet and anticommunist policy depending on the ratio of forces in the international arena and within the United States.

The formulation of such concepts is an attempt at providing a global solution to the problem of the political, economic and social structure of the contemporary world as the ruling forces in capitalist society would like it to be--based on the U.S. model and under the aegis of militarism. From the very beginning militarism acted as an important striking tool for the implementation of such intentions. As we know, during Truman's time the Dropshot plan was drafted and approved. It was a plan for total nuclear war on the USSR, planned for 1957. Its implementation was spoiled by the appearance of Soviet nuclear weapons, unforeseen by the American strategists. However, subsequently as well, similar plans were ceaselessly concocted by U.S. reactionary circles.

The formulation of a variety of militaristic concepts never stopped during the postwar years. As we know, it has become particularly energized today. In the United States and other leading capitalist countries it is state-organized. The theoreticians of militarism and anti-Sovietism have become organized in both unofficial and official groups, frequently created directly under governmental leadership. Thus Document MSC-68 was born within the "Committee for the Struggle for a Democratic Majority," one of the most predatory lobbying groups and was drafted by a group headed by P. Nitze, the notorious "hawk," was especially set up by the Department of State. Also in the postwar years the "Committee for Present Danger" was created with a view to convincing the American people of the "salvation" mission of militarism in the face of the notorious "Soviet threat." The committee disbanded in 1952 but was resurrected in 1976 for the purpose of convincing the country's public that military outlays for counteracting this "threat" were a way to

surmounting all crises within American society, asserting global U.S. domination and increasing corporate profits. During the 1970s the committee actively sabotaged the efforts of the Carter administration to maneuver and contain the pressure of the openly militaristic agents of capitalism. Together with the other organizations (the "National Intelligence" agency, the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Council and others), for a number of years the committee has supplied U.S. government departments and mass information media grossly falsified data on Soviet defense expenditures.

Such groups, committees and commissions direct and practice a policy of deceiving the public with claims about a fictitious lagging by the United States in the arms race imposed by the Soviet Union. Under their influence and with their participation documents such as Carter's Directive No 18, which deals with protecting the Middle East as an area of U.S. "vital interests," Directive No 59, and others, see the light. That same "Committee for Present Danger" guided President Carter in making use of detente in promoting the concept of "interdependence" (so-called consolidation of the "industrial democracies" and "human rights," in order to use them in applying pressure on the socialist countries and strengthening the positions of American capital in the developing countries and Western Europe.

The concepts of U.S. and NATO military strategy and the various plans for preventive, "limited," "protracted," "space" and other nuclear wars, and so on, are formulated on the basis of the common political concepts shared by the reactionary imperialist circles. The peak of such activities is the insane idea of waging a nuclear missile war against the socialist world. Ignoring all obvious facts and irrefutable scientific proofs of the danger of destroying civilization and life itself on earth in the case of a universal nuclear conflict, the generals and the present U.S. administration are instilling in their people the exceptionally dangerous idea of "surviving" a thermonuclear catastrophe.

The essence of combining the military-technical boom and the arms race with a corresponding massed political offensive was openly formulated by C. Weinberger, the U.S. secretary of defense, who described the creation of new types of mass destruction weapons as "the second half of the administration's program for the rebirth of America." The first half includes the militaristic indoctrination of the masses and an aggressive offense in the realm of international relations.

The activities of reactionary political groups are also reflected in the overall direction followed in bourgeois social thinking. The upsurge of neoconservatism in social theory in the United States, the FRG and other imperialist countries means that liberalism, which was a convenient ideological platform during the period of relatively favorable economic and political circumstances, no longer suits the ruling forces in these countries in the conditions of an aggravated crisis. In their own area, willy-nilly joining the Washington "hawkish" lobby, the theoreticians of bourgeois social development act as the ideological defenders of a system in which militarism is blossoming. The "unification" between noted propagandists of increased military-political power and neoconservative and openly reactionary theoreticians in the fields of sociology and social philosophy is no accident.

Noted bourgeois sociologists, such as Z. Brzezinski, I. Christol and many others, are on the mastheads of all kinds of reactionary political committees. This unity is being steadily supported and strengthened. Foreign students of this serious danger have painted a quite expressive picture of the ideological offensive mounted by the militaristic forces against the society.

"Its scope (of the ideological offensive--the author)," notes, for example, the noted sociologist E. Thompson in his book "Zero Option," "is becoming increasingly broad. It covers public opinion, the mass information media and military and political circles. Consequently:

"Technologists, lobbyists and public relations manipulators are concentrating on a broad scale on weapons systems and in their 'laboratory' the resources and scientific forces of many countries, becoming a tremendous internal power in the society, acting both publicly and privately;

"These forces join the governmental bureaucracy (by trading places with ministries of defense, party bureaucracies, etc.), thus becoming involved in lobbying among information media and state organs;

"An extensive apparatus develops around them, which secures and protects them and their policies and, in turn, increases its control over information and in penetrating the opposition, thus actively contributing to crystallizing the ideology supporting them."

In the United States and in the other Western countries the progressive forces legitimately reached the conclusion that control over armaments cannot be effective without control over the political and military leaders who are developing such armaments. Mass antiwar movements involving the participation of noted scientists and public figures, supported by soberly thinking members of business circles, are largely in favor of the movement for such control. The policy and ideology of the militant imperialist forces are today a direct threat to the peace and security of the peoples. The unabatable aspiration of the American militarists and their NATO allies to deploy Cruise and Pershing II missiles in Western Europe has triggered a new wave in the arms race and is drastically aggravating international tension. The deployment of first-strike American missiles in Europe and the unrestrained increase in the nuclear potential within the United States itself will inevitably trigger corresponding measures on the part of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries threatened by the NATO military machine. Guided by the principle of equal and identical security, the Warsaw Pact members will be forced to increase the defense potential of the socialist commonwealth.

Therefore, the thoughtless policy of the United States and its allies has intensified the danger facing not only the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries but the NATO country as well including, naturally, the United States. Instead of identical security with a declining level of military confrontation, the equally great danger of reciprocal annihilation in a nuclear conflagration has intensified. Metaphorically speaking, the global beam of the nuclear balance is rising much higher and the nuclear load weighing on the nations is increasing threateningly. It is this type of criminal

policy which the ideologues of imperialism are stubbornly trying to substantiate by offering mankind the prospect of "survival" under the conditions of a reciprocal threat.

The peace-loving forces on earth are decisively acting and actively struggling not for "survival," while living under the fear of destruction, but for the right to live under conditions of peace and progress. The strengthening front of progressive and peace-loving forces is countering the reactionary front of militarism and aggression.

#### 4. Detente vs. Militarism

The Soviet Union and the members of the socialist commonwealth have developed an efficient and consistent system of proposals and initiatives, the implementation of which would bring about a radical improvement in the international situation and the lifting of the threat hanging over mankind. The Soviet proposals of freezing existing nuclear weapon arsenals and their substantial reduction on the basis of parity and identical security, and progress toward real disarmament to the point of totally eliminating any mass destruction weapon on earth and achieving universal and total disarmament are particularly important. The obligation assumed by our country not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and its appeal to the other nuclear powers to follow this example express the sincere desire for peace on the part of the USSR. "... All the thoughts of the Soviet people and their leadership," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized, "may be reduced to the simple and natural desire to engage in peaceful toil, to live in good harmony with other nations and to find a common language with them, above all in matters such as restraining the arms race, preventing a new war and strengthening universal peace and international security."

The struggle against the danger of war is a struggle for the salvation of mankind and for survival not after a nuclear, chemical or bacteriological war but by preventing it. Saving mankind from a new world war and excluding wars from international relations means, precisely, resolving the universal-historical problem of war and peace. Yet the policy of the imperialist circles, aimed at urging on the arms race, poisons the international political climate and contributes to the growth of mistrust among countries. The aspiration of some political forces in the West to achieve nuclear superiority at all cost is disorganizing the entire mechanism for resolving topical international problems. The normal functioning of this mechanism presumes political prudence and a search for mutually acceptable solutions and agreements. However, the positions taken by the rulers of some Western countries, on the problem of thermonuclear weapons in Europe, for example, not only excludes such agreements but is sometimes totally lacking in elementary common sense. For example, how could there be any kind of sensible reason to refuse to include British and French missiles in the overall balance of nuclear armaments of the opposing military alliances? Why is it that in Europe it is not these nuclear means but the deployment of American missiles that should be taken into consideration in a comparison with the nuclear potential of the USSR? It is as though the hypnosis of "nuclear power" develops in some political leaders an entirely irrational, an absurd approach to foreign policy problems.

Furthermore, they are stubbornly trying to impose upon their own peoples such pathological political thinking.

Under the influence of a militaristic intoxication, the present American administration is trying itself to break and to force the other capitalist countries to restrict their commercial relations with the socialist countries and to give the status of law to discrimination and boycott in the field of economic relations, although such a line clearly conflicts with the requirements of the international division of labor and the vital economic interests of the United States itself, not to mention its allies.

In the fever of military preparations and to suit the military-industrial complex, the American administration is forcing scientific institutions and industrial circles to restrict and break scientific and technical relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. This is the purpose of the spy mania and the malicious campaign of slandering Soviet representatives in the capitalist countries, including scientists, encouraged by the military, the political reaction and the intelligence services. Science, however, and the scientific and technical revolution are the result of common efforts. They are the joint possession of all mankind. The efforts of American ruling circles and their allies to break international scientific and technical relations, to mount a scientific and technical blockade of the Soviet Union and the members of the socialist commonwealth and to pursue a policy of isolationism in science means a destruction of the foundations for the joint development of science and the enrichment of the common creative potential of all civilized mankind. Unquestionably, such an unreasonable policy which violates the laws of scientific development will be rejected by life.

Awareness of the global nature of the common problems facing mankind is related to the process of internationalization of the economic, political and spiritual life of the nations today. Considering the aggravated international situation, it is particularly important to emphasize that this internationalization of the various aspects of life is an objective requirement for the further progress of mankind.

The existence and competition between the two conflicting social systems do not exclude the sharing of common interests in the progressive development of human civilization. We firmly reject the metaphysical concepts of the division of mankind into two separate species and the splitting of global civilization into two absolutely different historical developments. However, equally alien to us are the cosmopolitan concepts of bourgeois futurologists on the possibility of resolving vital global problems through the creation of some kind of single global government or worldwide administration. The theoreticians who formulate such ideas ignore the real conditions of the contemporary world and suppress the class contradiction between the two world systems and the historical possibilities and actual role of the national-state form of development of nations. The only fruitful and realistic prospect is not that of eliminating national states but pursuing a policy of peaceful coexistence based on the principles of equality and identical security. In our time a rejection of the peaceful coexistence among countries

with different social systems and turning to their nuclear confrontation means nothing other than rejecting the possibility of the existence of human society in general.

From our viewpoint, a "convergence" of socialism with capitalism is impossible. However, their coexistence and competition under peaceful conditions, i.e., the peaceful competition between two opposite socioeconomic systems, is entirely possible. Such interaction between the two global social systems does not exclude but presumes the growth of the international potential for the existence and development of mankind.

Today the world socialist commonwealth is a vivid example and superior form of internationalization of economic development and all social life. The development of socialist economic integration and the strengthened cooperation among fraternal countries in all fields of life provide practical confirmation of the inexhaustible opportunities for social progress and for harmonious and mutually profitable relations among countries.

The importance of major universal problems affecting all countries, such as developing new sources of energy, the conquest of space, developing the resources of the world's oceans, protecting the environment, forecasting and preventing natural disasters, and so on, becomes increasingly great. Let us emphasize in this connection the particular responsibility and consolidating role played by scientists in the development of global civilization and ensuring the present existence and the guaranteed future of mankind.

The increase in international tension destructively affects the domestic political and social life of many countries as well. The current energizing of military preparations in the West is closely related to the propaganda campaign inspired by military-industrial complexes on the subject of the notorious "Soviet threat." This campaign is instilling in Western public opinion the idea that war is inevitable. Its purpose is to develop the impression that mankind has no solution other than a nuclear conflict.

The dissemination of ideas on the inevitability of nuclear war and misinformation on the sources of military threat trigger dangerous trends in the public mentality of the bourgeois world. To begin with, they develop in the mass consciousness a condition of fatalism and social pessimism, as well as a passive attitude in the face of grave social problems, above all the gravest among them--that of preventing a thermonuclear cataclysm. Secondly, feelings of chauvinism and hostility toward nations living under the conditions of a different social system intensify in the atmosphere created by the militaristic campaign, the condition of "war alert," and the spreading of alarmist, extreme nationalistic and extreme Atlantic passions. Such trends are an obstacle to the positive development of international relations and the awareness on the part of the masses of the full importance of global, of universal problems of our time and the aspiration to resolve such problems through joint efforts.

Militarization and its sociopsychological consequences draw the attention of a considerable segment of the public in the capitalist countries away from

the real and urgent internal sociopolitical problems and imminent social needs. To one extent or another, this frees the hands of the most privileged social strata, monopoly capital above all, enabling them, in pursuit of their self-seeking objectives, to take less into consideration the counteraction of the working people and grossly to neglect the needs of the popular masses. It is no accident that the development of militarism between the end of the 1970s and beginning of 1980s in a number of capitalist countries coincided with the elimination of even limited social reforms. The set of ideological-political concepts and moods related to militarization prepares the grounds on which extreme rightist and neofascist movements are revived and energized.

Under the conditions of the economic crisis and the increased difficulties and privations experienced by the broad population strata, bourgeois propaganda substitutes the true culprit for the difficulties of daily life with a fictitious "external enemy." This makes it possible to channel social discontent and mass protest into a bed suitable to the monopolies and to inflate militaristic moods which serve the interests of the military-industrial complex. This creates a vicious circle--the aggravation of social difficulties is used to justify militarism, and its inflation distracts forces, means and public attention away from touchy sociopolitical problems and intensifies the crisis condition in society.

A number of facts from the recent past and the present unequivocally prove that reaction, chauvinism and militarism are inseparably interlinked, and grow from the same social grounds--the aggravation of social contradictions within bourgeois society and the crisis in the domestic and foreign policies of the ruling classes. This sinister "trinity," these three "hypostases" of the monopoly bourgeoisie and its military-industrial complex poison social life and the consciousness of the masses in capitalist countries.

Naturally, the impact of the arms race on the individual and the public consciousness is by far not identical. The threat of mass doom hanging over mankind could and sometimes does lead, as we know from the Western press and the studies made by Western specialists, to increased alienation, mistrust in one's own forces, and breakdown and disintegration of the personality and, correspondingly, to antisocial behavior. Nevertheless, the main thing is that the appearance of a threat of the doom of civilization and the destruction of all its achievements acquired over millenia of human history, triggers in any reasonably thinking person the desire to remove this threat. This reaction is embedded in the very nature of the human mind. It has been shaped throughout the history of the development of man as a thinking being, who can not simply adapt to changing circumstances of life but influence them actively, change them in the interest of social and individual development. The unparalleled scope of the mass antiwar movement, which is involving within its ranks increasingly broad public circles and people of most different political persuasions and outlooks, is a confirmation of this.

Along with the increased aggressiveness of the extreme reactionary forces, the antiwar forces are growing and multiplying in the capitalist world. Political leaders, who take a more realistic view of existing conditions and current requirements, are becoming energized.



In our time a persistent struggle for peace and the prevention of a universal military conflict is the prime task of all progressive forces and the common platform for action for the broadest possible popular masses and all possible social circles. In their approach to the basic problem of war and peace, the foreign policy of the socialist countries expresses the interests of the overwhelming majority of mankind and the true ideals of humanism, justice and democracy. Particularly relevant today are Lenin's words that "the greatest manifestation of democracy is found in the basic problem of war and peace (op. cit., vol 40, p 92).

The real support of democracy and human rights is particularly clearly seen in the solution of this problem, for the right to life and safety from destruction is the primary human right. It is in the defense of this right and in the name of humanism and human progress and for the sake of life on earth that the public forces and scientific organizations and the broad popular masses are rising more and more actively in the struggle for a durable peace and international cooperation.

In this respect the active efforts of all detachments of the international communist movement are of tremendous historical significance. "The communists," as Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized, "have always fought the oppression and exploitation of man by man. Today they are also fighting for the preservation of human civilization and for man's right to life."

The communists do not impose their views on anyone and are ready to cooperate in the defense of peace with people and organizations of different persuasions, who oppose the arms race and the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe. Peace and cooperation among nations is the programmatic communist objective which governs the policies of the Soviet Union and is shared and actively supported by all Soviet people.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## GLOBAL PROBLEMS AND THE DEVELOPING WORLD

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83) pp 83-94

[Article by Dr of Economic Sciences N. Shmelev]

[Text] An entire series of new and important problems faced the overwhelming majority of countries, which were previously imperialist colonies and semi-colonies, after they gained their political independence, shifting the center of gravity in their development to tasks of economic growth and structural social changes. Not least among such problems is the increasingly manifested profound link between prospects for the further socioeconomic progress of the young countries and processes of global and universal significance. The more the countries which were previously stagnating in the backwoods of history become involved in global political life and economic relations, the more they, like other countries, experience the influence of such processes.

Strictly speaking, the already difficult and, sometimes, even apparently seriously insoluble economic situation of the developing countries is one of the most major global problems of our time. Over the past 20 years, the liberated countries as a whole have been able to secure relatively stable rates of gross domestic output (on the level of 5.3-5.8 percent annually) and to increase their share in global production from 14.5 percent during the 1950s to approximately 18.5 percent today. Despite such successes, however, the economic situation of the overwhelming majority of young countries remains extremely unfavorable. The per capita income gap between them and the leading industrial countries is widening instead of narrowing decade after decade. The developing countries remain the object of unrestrained exploitation on the part of imperialist monopolies: neocolonialism has replaced the old traditional colonialism; it is no less and, perhaps, even more merciless in terms of its objectives and socioeconomic consequences. The dramatic nature of the developing situation and the potential threat to peace and international stability it creates, not to mention the understandable concern regarding the possibility of meeting even most elementary living conditions of many hundreds of millions of people, trigger increasing concern on the part of the global public and all progressive forces today.

In his time V. I. Lenin wrote of the "unity and connection, interdependence and integrity of the global process" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 29, p 135). Today all global problems are related to one extent or another. This includes, above all, the uncontrolled arms race and the threat of global thermonuclear catastrophe; the need to ensure the global

economy with reliable sources of energy and raw materials at acceptable prices; the "demographic explosion" and the related threat of mass hunger; and the danger of irreversible destruction of the environment. Let us add to this general problems facing contemporary civilization, such as the elimination of illiteracy and the most common diseases, and the unification of global research possibilities of resolving scientific and technical problems which determine the future of mankind, including the development of near space and the world's oceans.

Both technically and economically mankind has reached a level of development in which all or at least most global problems can be efficiently resolved by the present and immediately following generations. "...Mankind," K. Marx wrote, "always sets itself exclusively problems which it can resolve, for their close consideration always proves that the problem arises only when material conditions for resolving it are either extant or at least about to become such" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 13, p 7). However, whereas the material and technical prerequisites for the solution of contemporary global problems either exist or are being developed in under our very eyes, this does not mean in the least that the necessary political conditions are available, above all, naturally, in the international area. Imperialism and its claim to world domination and the self-seeking policy of the international monopolies not only bear the main responsibility for the gravity and scale of contemporary global problems but are the main obstacle to their solution in the interests of all mankind.

## I

It is unquestionable that as long as the danger of thermonuclear war, which threatens all contemporary civilization with doom, remains, the problem remains and so does the practical prospect for resolving all other global problems facing mankind, however grave and urgent they may be. Therefore, an unbreakable tie exists among the policy of peaceful coexistence, detente and the possibility of ensuring a comprehensive improvement in the living conditions of all mankind. The annual military outlays in the world, which exceeded \$650 billion at the beginning of the 1980s, substantially outstrip all current global outlays on education and health care. The threat of annihilation of all life on earth, provoked by imperialism, and the insane waste of the labor and talent of dozens of millions of people on destructive rather than constructive purposes is a question which today directly affects the basic interests of all nations, including those in the developing countries.

As to the latter, a new dangerous trend intensified here during the 1970s-- increased outlays for armaments by the developing countries themselves. Currently, they jointly spend for such purposes some \$90 billion annually. The most important role in this connection was the one played by the policy of incitement on the part of the United States and many other Western European allies who played on the chauvinistic ambitions of the heads of some of the development countries for the sake of increasing their influence on the policies and accelerating their armament exports, which enable the West partially to compensate for increased energy and raw material imports.

"Despite differences in the level of development among individual countries," noted the Paris journal LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE, "a general 'culture of armaments' is becoming widespread.... This 'culture,' extensively encouraged by the United States, is ascribing a new feature to imperialism: following colonialism, which was based on military occupation and after imperialism with a 'democratic face,' represented by multinational corporations, and after imperialism in the field of culture, represented by the mass information media, a hegemony based on the 'armaments culture' is taking shape."

In addition to everything else, the current scale of military expenditures of the developing countries is an unaffordable luxury for countries in which some 500 million people are chronically hungry, more than 1 billion are undernourished and some 40 percent of the population is unable to meet its most basic vital needs, while millions of people totally lack medical care, and when virtually all basic development problems, such as industrialization, agricultural upsurge and elimination of tremendous unemployment, illiteracy and mass diseases remain unresolved. We can confidently say that the overwhelming majority of developing countries need today not to increase expenditures for military purposes and for armament imports but exactly the opposite. That is precisely why today the socialist countries provide military aid exclusively to countries which must oppose imperialist aggression with weapons and in whose case the question of a definitive assertion of true national independence is still an open question.

According to United Nations estimates a general disarmament (full or even partial) would increase the growth rates of the global economy by at least 1-2 percent annually. This would mean almost doubling the average pace of economic progress of mankind characteristic of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s. To stop and turn back the arms race would mean to ensure for the balance of the 20th century material opportunities for the virtually full satisfaction of the sensible needs of all mankind for food, housing, education and health care, on the basis of achievements of science and technology already available to mankind, not to mention possibilities of new scientific and technical solutions and discoveries. The funds currently spent on armaments in a single year would be sufficient, for example, for the construction of 900 million apartment units per year, i.e., for providing comfortable housing for 500 million people, or the construction of as many as a million schools, in which some 650 million children could be educated. According to some estimates, in order to put essentially an end to hunger on the planet in a few years, as well as to the most dangerous diseases and illiteracy, it would suffice to reallocate for such purposes 8 to 10 percent of current annual expenditures for armaments.

In this light, the concept still extant in some circles in developing countries to the effect that peaceful coexistence, detente, disarmament and cooperation in establishing a lasting peace on earth involves problems affecting above all countries such as the United States and the Soviet Union is profoundly antihistorical and nearsighted. In particular, the programmatic document adopted at the 35th Session of the United Nations General Assembly, "International Development Strategy for the Third Decade of UN Development" specifically indicates the direct and unbreakable connection between problems

of disarmament and the vitally important interests of all nations, including the developing countries. The document emphasizes that "a close relation exists between disarmament and development. Progress in the former would considerably contribute to progress in the latter. That is why resources released as a result of the implementation of disarmament measures should be channeled into the economic and social development of all countries and contribute to narrowing the economic gap between developed and developing countries."

In this connection, it would be impossible to overestimate the initiative of the Soviet Union, which has twice suggested at UN General Assembly sessions both a relative and an absolute reduction in the military budgets of countries with major military potential and channeling a considerable percentage of the thus-released funds into Third World development needs.

The increased moral and political weight of the developing countries broadens the opportunities for their constructive participation in resolving global problems, that of disarmament in particular. An important step forward in this respect was the 7th Conference of Heads of States and Governments of Nonaligned Countries in New Delhi. It focused its attention on the basic problems of the international situation, above all the preservation of peace and detente and limiting the arms race. The conference stipulated that the struggle for such objectives is the key task in the foreign policy of the nonaligned countries.

## II

The problem of ensuring the global economy with reliable energy and raw material supplies became particularly grave during the 1970s. Relatively recent forecasts made by a number of Western scientists, according to which virtually all known petroleum and gas, uranium, nonferrous metal and many other mineral resources will be virtually exhausted in the next 50 to 100 years, became widely known. To this day voices are still heard in the West (although sounding less alarming than at the beginning of the 1970s), predicting if not a universal catastrophe in any case an end to global economic growth within foreseeable decades.

However, starting with the second half of the 1970s, thanks to a variety of energy conservation measures, the global economy began to show a noticeable trend toward a relative and, in a number of countries, also absolute reduction in the consumption of energy carriers and basic mineral raw materials. A great deal has changed in this respect by now. More precise evaluations indicate that proven world reserves of basic industrial minerals, even excluding those discovered after 1976, could fully satisfy the needs of the global economy through the 21st century, not to mention the amount of known potential resources, which exceed this level by several hundred percent. Currently ensuring the global economy with the most important minerals, compared with the first years after World War II (despite the headlong increase in their consumption in past decades) has as a whole not worsened but even improved in terms of volume. We would be fully justified in assuming that by the year 2000 such supplies will be not worse but, possibly, even

better than those of the mid-1970s, keeping in mind such factors as the existence of huge and still geologically unsurveyed territories, the continental shelves, the increased coefficient of utilization of deposits, conservation and recycling of raw materials, and others.

At the beginning and during the middle of the 1970s such alarming and frequently dramatic assessments frequently did not take into consideration possible and probable revolutionary changes in production forces in the future such as, for example, the extensive use of thermonuclear reaction as the basic source of energy, the development of synthetic fuels, and the appearance of essentially new types of technological solutions and materials. According to current ideas, in the long term global energy and mineral raw material production will not be restricted by the lack of natural resources. It is expected that by the middle of the 21st century nuclear power will become the basic energy-generating system (fission or thermonuclear reactors), along with solar energy. The transition from a power industry based on petroleum to a new power system could, according to the specialists, take no less than 50 years, in the course of which, naturally, a variety of events could interfere, including temporary aggravation of energy situations. However, progress in the development of new energy sources is clear and, unquestionably, irreversible. A scarcity of one resource or another has frequently appeared in the history of mankind and, in the final account, the people have always been able to resolve, one way or another, arising problems although, naturally, this always required corresponding efforts and outlays.

As to the various developing countries, their interests in the fields of energy and industrial raw materials are quite disparate. The basic problem facing today importing countries, particularly petroleum importers, i.e., the majority of developing countries, is not the potential shortage of energy and raw material resources but the price at which they will be forced to purchase in the future on the world markets the necessary amounts of fuel and mineral raw materials for their various economic sectors. Price is a basic question also for countries which export fuel and mineral raw materials, at least over the next 20 years, i.e., while the threat of the exhaustion of reserves of minerals at their disposal remains excessively topical. It is obvious, however, that the interest of both groups in the level of world prices of energy and industrial raw materials varies: high world prices are consistent with the interests of exporting countries and, conversely, cause additional difficulties for the economic development of importers. However, another aspect of the problem is also clear: the long-term interest of all developing countries (and of other countries in the world) in stabilizing the situation in the area of fuels and mineral raw materials, ensuring the reliability of deliveries and shaping a level of global prices consistent with the legitimate interests of both suppliers and consumers of such commodities.

During the last decade the overall index of world prices of most important energy raw materials increased by a factor of nearly 7, whereas prices of finished goods approximately tripled within the same period. As a result, the level of fuel prices in relation to the prices of finished goods quintupled. However, such a substantial shift in the structure of world prices was achieved virtually as a result of the sharp increase in the price of

energy, petroleum above all. The ratio between export and import prices improved in the case of petroleum exporters during the '70s by a factor of almost 3; for the developing petroleum importing countries it worsened by 20 percent. In this connection, we could speak with full justification only of a single phenomenon--the unprecedented increase in petroleum prices during the 1970s--rather than of any basic change in the structure of costs in the global economy, which would mean changes in the proportions between extracting (with the exception of fuel) and processing sectors.

The overall positive balance of the so-called current operations of petroleum exporter OPEC countries, which account for more than one-half of the reserves and some 70 percent of petroleum exports in the capitalist world, totaled \$450 billion between 1974 and 1981. It was only a percentage of this tremendous surplus which was used by the petroleum extracting countries themselves, whereas their foreign surpluses invested primarily in the reproduction system of the developed capitalist countries, increased within that time to \$350 billion. The annual income from foreign investments of OPEC countries alone is today some \$30 billion. The overall deficit of developing petroleum importers, a considerable percentage of which is the result of the high prices of energy, exceeded \$300 billion between 1974 and 1981. Since these countries were forced essentially to borrow to pay for their petroleum, their overall indebtedness was in excess of \$626 billion in 1982, while annual loan repayments and interest rates servicing this indebtedness totaled \$130 billion. Let us note that a very substantial part of this debt (about one-fifth) is owed by the poorest petroleum importing countries, which account for 35 percent of the population of the developing world, and which were able to survive the situation of energy prices only thanks to the flow of foreign funds--aid received through governmental and international channels, subsidies, private investments, and aid given by the OPEC countries.

The question which naturally arises is will we, in the final account, lower the relatively high level of petroleum prices or is this an objective phenomenon which will be facing all countries on earth for a long period of time, or at least until expected progress in the development of new sources of energy has led to a decline in these prices? This question is particularly relevant today, when petroleum consumption in the West has declined by approximately 15 percent compared with 1979, when a substantial surplus has developed on the market and when extraction by OPEC members has dropped by more than one-half.

The Marxist theory of rent for production from the soil and the subsoil and the shaping of value and prices of minerals in accordance with extraction outlays at the worst (yet necessary, considering the market circumstances) sectors and outlays for the mass production of substitutes for such commodities, is a reliable guideline in long-term assessments and forecasts. As long as mankind needs the petroleum of the North and Norwegian seas, where extraction costs average \$90-100 per ton, as well as the petroleum of Alaska, Siberia and other hard-access areas, outlays for petroleum produced in such places, added to normal profits, will always serve as the lowest level of global petroleum prices. Objectively, the upper level is that of the cost of the mass profitable production of synthetic fuels from coal and shale which

today, considering the high capital-intensiveness of such production, is on the level of \$220-440 per ton. A number of factors, the increased value of petroleum as a chemical raw material in particular, indicate that the trend of contemporary scientific and technical progress toward the creation of synthetic fuels and a corresponding structural reorganization of the world's industry will, one way or another, go on, despite their temporary slowdown under the influence of developed petroleum surpluses, and this process should economically and objectively set the price of petroleum. In other words, we must obviously acknowledge that the age of inexpensive mineral fuel, petroleum above all, has gone irreversibly into the past.

The developing countries cannot ignore these factors in their long-term strategy for economic growth. During the last 20 years power consumption in the liberated countries has grown 6 to 9 percent annually, substantially outstripping the pace of their industrial growth. The overall power-intensiveness of the growth of their gross national product increased correspondingly. These countries must put an end to the existing trend. A careful choice of structures of newly developed industrial sectors, based on conserving energy and comprehensive conservation of fuel and raw materials, the use of energy-saving equipment and the development of domestic energy resources are trends in industrial progress which would enable the young countries better to adapt to the new global economic processes and to the objective changes which are taking place in the development of contemporary production forces. Not foreign subsidies, the positive influence of which can be only short-term by its very nature, but national efforts to reorganize the industrial potential are the basic factors for the gradual adaptation of the developing countries to the new and, obviously, irreversible structure of world prices.

Naturally, this does not mean in the least that the role of international cooperation will diminish in resolving global energy and raw material problems. The stable development of the fuel and raw material base of the global economy, rebuff of imperialist attempts to subordinate to its domination the basic fuel and raw material extraction areas, the intensified control by the developing countries over their own natural resources and the creation of an efficient international mechanism for stabilizing trade in energy and raw materials and the formulation of prices on a level acceptable to both exporters and importers are tasks of primary global economic importance. Unquestionably, international cooperation will be able to resolve them, providing that the principles of true equality, mutual profitability and international aid become the very base of a comprehensive system of long-term agreements between world producers and consumers of fuel and raw materials, a system the development of which is included in today's agenda.

The stabilization of the energy and raw materials situation in the world is objectively an important part of the program for a new global economic order favored by the developing countries. However, the results of the meeting between a large group of young countries and leading developed capitalist countries, held in Cancun in 1981, convincingly proved that imperialism is continuing to sabotage this program and that the developing countries must wage the struggle for their rights and interests on a qualitatively new level.



The West, which had exploited the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries for centuries, left no doubt whatsoever at that meeting of its unwillingness to engage in any kind of substantial redistribution of global income in favor of the developing countries and would hinder by all possible means any efforts to resolve major global economic problems outside the framework of international organizations under the control of the United States and its allies. The constructive position assumed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries is of particularly important international significance against this background. Although the socialist countries had never participated in colonial exploitation, their aid to countries which the United Nations classifies as developing has long exceeded in terms of its relative level (share of the national income of countries providing such aid) similar indicators in the United States and the other leading Western countries. Practical experience indicates that the socialist countries are reliable and consistent allies of the young countries in their struggle for the democratization of contemporary global economic relations and for extensive international cooperation in the solution of global problems.

Increasing reciprocal cooperation in this field among the socialist countries is an example of a truly internationalist approach to the solution of the energy and raw material problem. The long-term target program for cooperation in the fuel and raw material area became the basic trend in the adaptation of the economies of CEMA-member countries to the contemporary energy situation and the joint resolution of the major economic and scientific and technical problems which arose in this connection. In this case the facilities provided in deliveries and payments within CEMA continue to play a most important role. During the first energy crisis of 1973-1974 petroleum was delivered in the reciprocal trade among socialist countries at the old prices. Starting with 1975 petroleum prices in reciprocal deliveries within CEMA were 40 to 50 percent below world levels, while payments for petroleum were largely subject to easy credit conditions. This substantially facilitated the need for CEMA petroleum importers to engage in the difficult and expensive structural reorganization of their national economies, inevitable under the new circumstances. It would be no exaggeration to say that the fraternal aid given in terms of low prices and easy payment conditions played a decisive role in the fact that the CEMA members were able to deal as a whole with the new energy situation and to undertake far-reaching structural reorganization of their economic potential, as confirmed by the successes reached in recent years by the GDR and Hungary in the conservation of energy resources.

The activeness of the socialist countries in resolving the energy and raw material problems of our time is not limited in the least to the area of reciprocal cooperation. Currently, with the economic and technical assistance of the USSR, more than 400 energy projects have been built or are under construction in many countries throughout the world. Their combined capacity is 97.5 million kilowatts. Significant deliveries of Soviet petroleum, natural gas and enriched uranium to Western Europe are also another important factor in maintaining the global energy balance. The construction of the Urengoy-Western Europe gas pipeline was another manifestation of the constructive approach taken to the solution of the energy problem. Unquestionably,

this will have a major positive impact on stabilizing the energy situation on the scale of the European continent as well as globally. The socialist countries proceed in their long-term policy from the fact that today the formulation of a broad international program for action in the production and rational utilization of global fuel and raw material resources is not only necessary but realistically possible.

### III

The rising stress in meeting the rapidly increasing earth population with food has become a truly universal problem in recent decades. Unquestionably, today food holds a leading position among the prime requirements of developing countries.

In principle, the current food resources produced in the world are adequate for ensuring a per capita nutritional level throughout the earth double the necessary minimum. For the past 20 years the average pace of the annual increase in the production of food in the nonsocialist world was about 2.8 percent with a population growth of approximately 1.8 percent. However, whereas the averaged availability of food throughout the world is more or less sufficient the problem is far more difficult in the developing countries. Today these countries account for more than 70 percent of the population in the nonsocialist world but produce no more than some 30 percent of basic food staples. Currently every year 30 to 40 million people throughout the world die of hunger in the literal meaning of the term, primarily in Asian and African countries. Whereas until World War II the developing countries were net food exporters, today they have become net importers of agricultural production. Grain imports alone by the developing countries increased from 33.5 million tons in 1970 to 78.7 million in 1980 and are expected to reach 120-145 million tons by 1990.

At the present time the world's grain production is 1.4-1.5 billion tons per year, 400-450 million of which are in the developing countries. Against such a background, the size of their shortage does not appear excessively threatening. However, we must take into consideration the instability of global harvests of basic food crops, the drastic differences among the individual countries and areas in terms of foodstuff supplies and the future increase in the consumption of comestible products by hundreds of millions of people who are currently either starving or undernourished. Obviously, the gravity of the global food situation could remain for a long period of time, for economic growth, increased populations and improved nutritional levels and structures lead to a corresponding increase in grain outlays, including for animal husbandry and, therefore, increased demand on the world markets.

The difficult food situation in many liberated countries is caused by the backwardness of their socioeconomic structures, low agricultural productivity and weak technology. Technical progress, capital investments and progressive social reorganizations are the main ways to resolve the food problem in the developing countries.

The current level reached by technology enables us to double the size of cultivated land on earth. Global agricultural production could be increased by

no less than a factor of 5 through the cultivation of new areas, irrigation, use of high-yielding strains and increased agricultural labor productivity in the developing countries. Raising the technical facilities in global agricultural production and productivity to the current Western European level, for example, would enable us to feed more than 70 billion people on the basis of 2,500 calories per day, or 40-50 billion on the basis of 4,000-5,000 calories. All of this could be accomplished without any further development of the food resources of the world's oceans or the creation of synthetic foods.

Commercial grain exports from the industrial capitalist countries to the developing countries have been increasing in recent years, while their aid in food supplies has been declining. Available food resources in the world exist (about 300 million tons). However, chronic currency difficulties force the liberated countries to rely more on international aid in food despite its disinterested or, frequently, even openly imperialist nature. Indicative in this respect is the statement of the former U.S. secretary of agriculture Butz: "Food is a weapon; when we engage in talks food is one of the main weapons in our arsenal."

The interconnection among all global problems is particularly clear in the case of food. Even a most modest progress in the actual reduction of military outlays could eliminate the current grave situation which exists in the area of the food problem on earth. For example, experts have estimated that if the developing countries are to achieve self-sufficiency they would need specific foreign aid in the order of \$5 billion per year, which is less than 1 percent of the current arms expenditures or the cost of three nuclear-powered submarines.

The socialist countries give extensive and effective aid to the developing countries in improving their agricultural infrastructure and in industrial sectors serving the countryside. One of the most impressive examples in this respect was the building of the Aswan Dam in Egypt, which expanded by one-third the cultivated land in the country, including the quadrupling of areas planted in rice. According to official testimony, without this dam the losses caused by the three floods of the Nile (in 1964, 1972 and 1975), which paralleled severe droughts, would have exceeded the cost of construction by a factor of 20. The socialist countries give substantial aid for agricultural development also to other countries in Africa and the Middle East and many large Asian countries. Unquestionably, the greater economic progress achieved by CEMA members and the successful solution of their own agricultural problems will increase the possibility of their participation in international cooperation in this important area.

#### IV

The threat of environmental pollution and the irreversible disturbance of the balance between men and nature are causing great concern today in virtually all countries on earth. The social nature of the governmental system and the nature of the domestic and foreign policies pursued by one country or another are directly related to the ecological problem. In his time, Marx wrote that "... culture, if developed spontaneously rather than deliberately controlled ..., leaves behind it a desert..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 32, p 45).

It has been estimated that the developed capitalist countries, which now account for about one-half of the global industrial output, are responsible for 63 percent of global environmental pollution, while the CEMA countries, which account for approximately one-third of the global industrial output, for 15 percent only. The United States alone accounts currently for more than 40 percent of global pollution. Let us also recall the barbaric destruction of the environment in South Vietnam in the course of the fruitless attempts by American imperialism to suppress the liberation struggle of its heroic people, which led to the devastation of approximately 12 percent of the country's territory. U.S. and French nuclear tests conducted in atolls in the Pacific also played a strictly negative ecological role. It was not without reason that the United Nations coined the concept of "ecological aggression," which, along with purely military features, included actions such as depriving a neighboring country of precipitation by causing precipitation over its own territory, polluting its water and atmosphere, and others.

Naturally, it would be an exaggeration to claim that ecological problems as a whole have already become uncontrollable and that the course of events in this area has become irreversible. Contemporary technology enables us, with corresponding outlays, to establish an acceptable balance between man and nature and to prevent undesirable changes in this area. The British journal THE ECONOMIST noted at one point, not without some irony, that any forecast of the development of transportation in London, made in 1872, would have predicted that "by 1972 the city will be inevitably buried under a pile of horse manure." However, the seriousness of environmental problems no longer needs proof today: it is quite eloquently confirmed by the scale of expenditures made in the struggle against pollution, which virtually all countries, the industrial ones in particular, are forced to make, by appropriating for such purposes 1-2 percent of their gross national product. However, this is insufficient. The cost of the damage caused annually to the environment accounts as a whole today for 3-5 percent of their GNP and the situation in this area is continuing to worsen. It has also been proved, however, that outlays for environmental protection are recovered the very first year.

The struggle against environmental pollution in the main Western countries is conducted through purely capitalist methods: the monopolies shift the main burden of expenditures to the shoulders of the taxpayer, i.e., the toiling masses. Meanwhile, a method for "resolving" environmental problems, such as shifting "dirty" production facilities from industrially developed to developing countries, where they allegedly cause less harm, is becoming increasingly popular. This argument may appear convincing only to the uninformed. Actually, the environment in the areas of industrial development of the liberated countries, to which the imperialist monopolies are trying to shift "dirty" industries threatened no less, and perhaps even more, than in the West. For example, whereas population density in New York, London and Tokyo is today between 10,000 and 11,000 people per square kilometer, it is about 40,000 in Bombay and more than 400,000 in the slums of Calcutta.

Although, obviously, environmental protection outlays equaling 1-2 percent of the GNP are for the time being outside the reach of the majority of developing countries, a planned national economic policy would, unquestionably, as

of now protect them from many of the destructive consequences of uncontrolled economic development similar to the one during the period of industrialization of the now-developed capitalist countries. Intergovernmental cooperation, naturally under the conditions of a stable political climate, could play a most important role in protecting the ecological interests of the developing countries. Practical experience proves that no single major international environmental protection project can be accomplished if the countries which should participate in it have tense political relations. Thus, the plan for protecting the waters of the Baltic became possible only after the political situation in Central Europe became relatively normalized in the course of the European detente, and the failure of the plan for protecting the waters of the Mediterranean is largely related to the continuing tension in the Middle East.

International cooperation in developing the world's oceans is also assuming increasing importance to the developing countries. Initial encouraging results have been achieved in this area. Unquestionably, the conclusion of an international convention on the law of the sea, initialed in 1982 after many years of preparatory work, which provides a legal base for equality and mutually profitable international cooperation in the use of a great variety of resources in the world's oceans, is a major accomplishment by mankind. This problem is of prime importance to many developing countries. Today nearly 40 percent of the surface of the world's ocean is under national control, and the fact that one way or another the interests of all the participants in the convention became more or less balanced (with the exception of the United States which is making excessive claims), makes it perhaps the most successful example of the formulation of a global approach to contemporary world problems in recent years.

The practical significance of political resolve and will to cooperate in resolving global problems is particularly clear. Considering the present pace of the arms race and the growing dangers related to the aggravation of such problems, mankind can simply not afford to stand idly by, totally relying on the natural course of events.

Clearly, it would be realistic to expect within the next 15 to 20 years the implementation of the first joint international large-scale initiatives in world history aimed at resolving the global problems facing contemporary civilization. Within the framework of such measures, the further expansion of cooperation among socialist, developing and developed capitalist countries and acquiring a certain amount of practical experience in joint planning and joint actions appear inevitable. We believe that in addition to progress in disarmament, joint investigations and development of natural resources in developing and other countries, and cooperation in developing new energy sources, including nuclear power, cooperation in transportation, joint construction of hydroreclamation projects, joint development of the resources of the world's oceans, cooperation in the development of outer space, international measures in the struggle against mass diseases and for environmental protection and other steps are possible and likely in this area.

By virtue of its very nature socialism is a profoundly international system alien to narrow national isolationism in all its aspects. The concern shown

by the socialist countries for global contemporary problems is no circumstantial phenomenon in the least. "Our objective is not simply to prevent war," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. "We are trying to achieve a radical improvement in international relations and the strengthening and developing of all good principles in such relations. ...In our age it is precisely socialism which is the most consistent defender of the healthy principles in international relations and a defender of the interests of detente and peace, the individual nations and all mankind."

International cooperation in resolving the common problems of contemporary civilization follows the channel of processes which, in their totality, form the historical trend of the growth of the social nature of production on a global scale, i.e., the trend of preparing the material conditions for socialism.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## FOR THE SAKE OF A BOUNTIFUL HARVEST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83)  
pp 95-100

[Letter to the editors by Prof S. Radchenko, doctor of biological sciences, Odessa]

[Text] The key problem in agriculture, as stipulated in the Food Program, is to reach an average annual minimal output of 238-243 million tons of grain and, in the 12th Five-Year Plan, 250-255 million tons. This is a difficult but entirely attainable order. Its implementation calls for concentrating the efforts of all scientific and production collectives and the cooperation of the full currently available scientific and technical potential in the development of this sector. The yield level which was accessible essentially to the leading farms and crop growing scientific research institutions and selection centers 15 to 20 years ago is now attainable by many kolkhozes and sovkhazes. Today a wheat, rye or barley crop averaging 30-40 quintals per hectare is no longer considered an exception or something extraordinary.

Further improvements in yields and quality of crop growing on all planted areas largely depend on the skill to make practical use of agrotechnical achievements. Today this factor becomes particularly important in connection with the extensive dissemination of highly intensive strains. Life itself has put on the agenda the exceptionally important task of developing industrial methods for growing a number of farm crops, including cereals. Naturally, their technology will be different from the technology used in planting corn, potatoes or sugar beets, for example, for plant agrotechnology is most closely related to plant biology. It is precisely this which determines the choice of optimal means for the adaptation of crops to their environment.

We must admit that the traditional technology used in the cultivation of winter cereals insufficiently takes into consideration one of their characteristic features, such as their clustering. For quite some time winter rye and wheat have been considered seasonal crops, although their vegetation period actually spreads over two seasons, which include the most hard winter period. This forces the farmers to resort to complex preventive measures which involve outlays higher than just about all other outlays related to the cultivation of cereal crops. Despite all this, the desired results are not always attained, as confirmed by the loss of winter crops during the winter and the spring, which have become more frequent in recent years. According to the botanists this is due mainly to the fact that biological characteristics are by far not fully considered in the cultivation of grain crops and

modern agrotechnical methods which encourage intensification are not always applied.

The biological nature of the ear is manifested most fully in its natural capacity for active clustering which leads to the formation of the cluster. Studies have determined that the cluster is the ecological form of the existence of the species, expressing its morphological adaptation to environmental conditions. This characteristic was developed in the course of a lengthy evolutionary process. The property of forming a cluster was established in the final account as an expedient means for the survival of the plant organism under extreme conditions of wintering, drought, diseases and pests. Therefore, the moisture and nutrition are evenly distributed among the shoots and the most viable (or productive) plants are selected, thus meeting the economic interests of the sower.

The cluster creates (and maintains) within its "family" an optimal phyto-climate. By clustering together, the plants can resist tornado-strength winds incomparably easier. Furthermore, the high-stem mass reliably protects the soil from overheating, excessive evaporation, drying and wind erosion. During the winter, the cluster actively protects the plants from freezing. Together with the shoots, the live and fallen leaves form a reliable protective stratum (the so-called "mulch"), which protects the field during periods of sharp temperature drops. They also help to retain the snow. As a form of ear, the cluster is useful also by effectively contributing to the implementation of the law of correlation which operates between the soil and subsoil organs. This is expressed in the fact that the well-formed underground part of the plant stimulates the development of the stem and the ear in which the most valuable product is accumulated.

Despite the tempestuous development of biological science, our knowledge of even the most important agricultural crops is far from complete. As it accumulates, the universally known view on apparently quite unquestionable and obvious facts changes. Many people are concerned today by the so-called vicious circle in cereal crops, the nature of which is the following: with high-level soil fertility, sufficient moisture and acceptable temperatures... the likelihood of crop losses increases as a result of the lodging of the almost ripe straw. The harvesting of lodged grain crops requires tremendous labor outlays, four or five times higher than average. Equally important is the fact that the grain from such fields loses its food value and is essentially used as fodder.

This contradiction, strange though it might seem, is caused by the insufficiently planned wish of agronomists and farmers to ensure the soil against weak and uneven crops, as a result of which they plant an excessive number of seeds. Such good intentions, however, conflict with the biology of the species. Actually, in some farming areas the agricultural authorities persistently recommend to the kolkhozes and sovkhoses to use 3-3.5 quintals of seeds per hectare, or 5.5-6 million grains. Such an "agricultural method" is considered almost progressive.

According to the latest research data, increasing the number of seeds sown unjustifiably wastes first-rate grain, hinders the development of the grass



by artificially intensifying the intraspecies struggle for "domination" in terms of vital space, light, moisture and nutritive substances. In the course of this struggle the plant organisms expend an excessive amount of their energy on survival and less on shaping the ear.

The agronomists should remember the perhaps-forgotten words of Dmitriy Nikolayevich Pryanishnikov: "The following rule is applicable to grain crops: the better the conditions, the less seed should be used." It would be pertinent to mention in this connection the statement by the German natural scientist M. Kraus, who arrived at the same idea although somewhat later: "Rare sowing is the top of the building which we must patiently construct... The fact that so far such a great number of seeds are used in the fields could be described only as unforgivable waste which steadily reduces the harvest."

The problems we are discussing are hardly created by the biology of the winter crops or their hereditary characteristics (genotypes). They were created by man in the course of the historical development of farming. The widespread grain-growing agrotechnology has very vulnerable places. However, this had not become obvious while the agronomists dealt with extensive strains. Intensive strains are now being used in farming, which means that the farmer must change existing agrotechnology somewhat.

What kind of agrotechnology should it be? No simple answer to this question is possible. The answer may be obtained in the course of purposeful scientific research and the testing of the latest crop control methods. In any case, we could say most definitely that our agriculture needs new ideas which could revolutionize agro-cultural production. It urgently needs added basic knowledge on the nature of plants and animals.

The author of this article determined many years ago that the surface and subsoil plant organs amazingly adapt to various temperature regimens by accelerating or slowing down the development of processes at their separate development stages. During the vegetation period, when the weather is sunny, the plants grow better. Their parts are shaped more actively in the so-called negative gradient, when the optimal temperature of the air in the area of the surface part of the grass is between 3 and 8 degrees Centigrade above the optimal temperature of the soil where the root system is located. During the night, the situation is reversed. Further studies led to the conclusion that autumn-winter and early spring conditions are consistent with the nighttime vertical profile of the temperature, known as the positive gradient. In this case, the soil temperature is higher than that of the air which, unquestionably, is related to the daily and even seasonal fluctuations in nature. The thermogradient adaptability of plants and certain corresponding coefficients were determined experimentally and could be applied in practice.

The appearance of temperature gradients is accompanied by typical external features: when the gradient is negative a powerful white root system develops, which can meet better the needs of the plants for nutritive substances; with a positive gradient the radicles are as a rule unramified, thin and weak, and of brownish color, and so are the roots and the stems. It is precisely when

the gradient is positive that the plants are subject to various functional diseases, which is accompanied by the withering away of the growth areas, dryness of crown (wood species) and other clearly expressed symptoms of plant metabolic disturbances.

These laws do not apply to cereal crops alone. Today they provide a scientific explanation for some "puzzling" phenomena in nature. As we know, wild plants prefer to grow in communities; if this principle is violated, the individual species perish rather quickly. The influence of temperature systems on the development of the underground part of the plants may be traced also in the potatoes. If the soil temperature is not kept at an optimum (high level), the crop, simply stated, degenerates. Another phenomenon is noteworthy: sugar beets begin to accumulate sucrose in their roots if the plant tops fall between the rows and, therefore, a negative temperature gradient develops. If we remember this we could change the time of the harvest and complete it when the weather is warmer and dryer.

Here is another botanical example: in his time, K. A. Timiryazev was concerned by the problem of the excessive use of soil moisture by the plant which thus allegedly develop excessive leafiness. It seemed as though nature was violating its own rule of observing a "sensible" expediency in everything. This phenomenon can be explained simply if, in addition to everything else, we take into consideration the influence of temperature systems. It is indeed true that trees waste a great deal of energy on their "main crop" not for the sake of beauty but for protecting the root system from overheating in the summer. In winter as well the fallen leaves act once again as an excellent heat regulator.

Unfortunately, agricultural practice rarely pays attention to such plant characteristics. This frequently explains crop losses, the real reasons of which the agronomists sometimes do not even suspect.

Could temperature gradients of winter crops be controlled under field conditions? The task is entirely realistic but with the help of proper agrotechnology. Long years of research have determined some elements of the technology in growing winter grass crops, which are essentially different from traditional methods. The changes apply mainly to sowing periods, which are shifted to the middle of the summer. Experiments have indicated that the best time to sow winter crops is after the temperature of the soil does not drop below +5 degrees Centigrade. In the northwestern zone this takes place at the end of the first 10 days of June, i.e., 2 months before the time considered "optimal" here. In the south of the Ukraine this applies to the first 10 days of July, or 1.5-2 months before the usual time. Later plantings in summer are equally inadmissible, for the probability of moisture losses and of having favorable temperatures for clustering increase. Furthermore, clustering is actively assisted by the number of daylight hours.

We developed the new agrotechnology in two variants: winter seeded fallow (for areas with adequate moisture) and winter-autumn fallow, for droughty areas. The basic difference between them is the following: in the winter seeded fallow interrow striped two-furrowplants (45 by 15 centimeters)

include two rows of compacting crops. During the first year of vegetation we plant winter seasonal grass-leguminous mixtures (oats or barley--35-50 kilograms per hectare, plus peas or narrow-leaf vetch--120-150 kilograms per hectare, etc.); during the second year, if the farm so decides, a mixture of perennial grasses (clover and timothy, esparto grass, lucerne, etc. are planted.

The first year compacting crops yield not only green fodder but enrich the soil. Furthermore, they create a negative temperature gradient by shading the soil between rows.

In the winter-autumn fallow the interrows are periodically hoed (in feeding the soil) in order to destroy the radicles and weeds. Interrow howing preserves the moisture in the soil, improves the aeration of the roots and maintains the necessary temperature gradient.

The sowing norm of a winter crop is one-half of the norm for the specific area. The seeds must be planted at a greater depth than is usual for the area (5-6 centimeters in the north and 7-8 centimeters in the south).

Sowing in winter-seeded fallow is done with a combined planter or SU-24A, adapted for row seeding. A standard seed drill with stoppers on both colters is used in winter-seeded fallow.

In the green leguminous and pea phase, the compacting crops, together with the main crops, are mowed (no lower than 6-7 centimeters) for fresh fodder, after which the existence of the winter crop does not prevent the application of nutritive substances in the interrows. The stubbles of the compacting crop are covered and the soil is loosened up. After the plants have grown once more, it would be useful to carry out the winter feeding along with making small piles around them (wherever possible), which will help them winter better.

Winter crops must be similarly prepared for the winter-autumn fallow as well. Preliminary experiments must be made in each soil and weather zone in order to determine the optimal agrotechnical means, sowing times and norms, depth of planting, choice of compacting crops, and others.

Long studies conducted in the northwestern areas, Eastern Siberia and the south of the Ukraine have proved that wide-row winter crops planted in summer increase the nourishment of the individual plants through the maximal development of the root system. The powerful roots developed by autumn guarantee normal wintering conditions, increase resistance to drought (or excessive moisture) and, in the final account, contribute to the fullness and better quality of the grain. At the same time, an active process of natural enrichment of the fields with organic elements, biological nitrogen and food for microorganisms takes place. Therefore, without any additional outlays the optimal structure of the soil and its fertility are preserved.

Let us note the economy achieved in sowing on the basis of our system. Seed outlays in this case are reduced by more than one-half. Naturally, the implementation of some operations both during the sowing and the interrow cultivation requires the attention and application of the servicing personnel.

Actually, it is a question of normal work by tractor drivers and sowers, observing normal agrotechnical rules.

What could be said of the practical results of work based on this technology, still considered experimental at this stage?

Experiments conducted under the supervision of the young scientist A. K. Lyashka proved the clear advantages of the new agrotechnology. For example, here is the way wheat planted at the Training Farm imeni Trofimov of the Odessa Agricultural Institute displayed its productive characteristics: the sowing took place on 22-25 July and 20-23 September. The norm was 2.5 million seeds per hectare (in the first case) and 5 million (in the second). The interrow space in the experimental sectors were compacted with a pea-oat mixture.

The experiments were made during different years. The following parameters were established: drill-sowed Odesskaya-51 wheat yielded 44-46 quintals per hectare, while control plots with summer stripe sowing (compacted) averaged 48-50 quintals. The same difference in yields was noted in the other varieties as well. The experimental plots also yielded fodder--fresh compact crops--therefore averaging 170-180 quintals per cycle.

Therefore, the net income per hectare for the Odesskaya-26 autumn drill seeding averaged 175 rubles, while income from summer compacted stripe sowing averaged 317.7 rubles. The Bezostaya-1 strain proved more productive, averaging respectively 219.1 and 412 rubles.

No cases of lodging or freezing of the rye or wheat were noted. As a rule, the summer crops are strong, growing abundantly in the autumn with 150 or more shoots per cluster; at harvest time from 9 to 42 ear-carrying stems remain, looking like young reeds. We also came across ramified ears numbering 170 or more grains.

In a word, ear crops have a tremendous potential. As to forecasts of future harvests, let us point out that they could outstrip even the most daring assumptions. Nature is inexhaustible and its resources are immeasurable, particularly if sensibly used by man.

As we undertake the implementation of the long-term food program earmarked by the party, we must bear in mind that agricultural production is a complex process influenced not by favorable but by the worst (droughty or excessively moist and cold) seasons, i.e., by weather which could throw agricultural production back. Consequently, farm crop agrotechnology should take above all extreme conditions under consideration, in order to counter on time the whims of nature and raise stable crops.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## CONTROLLING THE COMPETITION PROCESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83)  
pp 100-103

[Letter to the editors by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences O. Kosenko, head of sector at the AUCCTU Higher Trade Union Movement School]

[Text] The 26th CPSU Congress concretized the long-term party strategy for the 11th Five-Year Plan and the 1980s as a whole. "This strategy," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, emphasized at the November 1982 party plenum, "is aimed at enabling the Soviet people to live better with every passing year, for their labor to yield increasingly substantial results and for our socialist system to reveal increasingly its human nature and constructive possibilities." Socialist competition plays an essential role in the successful implementation of this task.

Socialist competition helps us to resolve a wide array of national economic, sociopolitical and educational problems. This is the consequence of the growing activeness of the broad masses and the labor enthusiasm and creative initiative of the individual collectives and workers. "It is precisely this initiative," the CPSU Central Committee accountability report to the 26th Party Congress stated, "that enables us to bring to light and utilize production reserves and to improve work efficiency and quality."

In this connection the very organization of the competition, which is called upon to channel the live creativity of the working people in such a way that efforts, possibilities and capabilities of the competitors are displayed most fully, is of great importance. It enables us to give efficient form to the competition and to observe the necessary conditions for maintaining the high spirit of competitiveness and reciprocal aid among the competitors. Naturally, the organization of the competition and its forms, methods and indicators must be consistent with economic management conditions and, whenever necessary, be related to the process of improving the production planning and management system.

We know that changes have been made in the system of indicators of production-economic enterprise activities, which enable us to take more accurately into consideration not only the implementation of the plan in terms of volume but in terms of cost and outlays of raw and other materials, labor and equipment, as well as production quality. Today the counterplans and socialist pledges assumed by the labor collectives are directed toward increasing labor

productivity, conserving material and manpower resources, lowering labor intensiveness and upgrading the quality of output, ensuring the fuller utilization of the equipment, and so on. For example, the basic competition indicators of the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building are the volume of goods marketed in accordance with the implementation of obligations concerning deliveries, improved quality, production costs of marketable output, lowered norms of outlays of metal, fuel and electric power, share of increased volume of commodity output as a result of increased labor productivity, national economic results of enterprise output and technical production standards. Other permanent coefficients include the use of production capacities and equipment loads, share of new output in the overall production volume, and increased production capacities of operating enterprises resulting from organizational-technical steps.

The obligations assumed by the collectives of the Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment and Control Systems emphasize the further application of new automated control systems for machine units and technological processes in all economic sectors. The machine tool builders have charted a course toward enhancing the technical standard of output, considerably improving the structure of the equipment and producing its most progressive models which will make it possible to achieve high processing precision and reduce the number of machine tool workers.

However thoroughly the competition conditions and the obligations may have been formulated, their implementation rarely takes place precisely in accordance with previous set objectives. To begin with, deviations occur in the organizational-technical support of the competitors (they are frequently let down in the field of procurements, by departmental disorganization, lack of cadres, and so on). Secondly, it is neither possible nor necessary comprehensively to program the creative activeness of the working people (such as, for example, at the obligation-assuming stage, the competitor expresses the intention to use some reserves in his work whereas in the course of their mastery greater results than planned are achieved). Thirdly, the competition itself could bring about surprises (the excellent yet hasty implementation of planned assignments in one sector sometimes hinders the work of another).

Naturally, if no proper reaction on the part of the organizers of the competition is triggered by such "surprises," i.e., if the participants are not helped to correct their activities on time in accordance with the specific production situation, or if no prompt measures are taken to supply them with everything they need to fulfill their assignments, one should not expect high achievements. In a word, controlling the competition process becomes a task of prime importance.

For example, when under the conditions of automated production a competition is organized among shifts for the highest output, it practically assumes the guise of competition for raising the technological process to its highest regimen. Labor savings achieved in the course of this process hardly compensate for the considerably superior material outlays and essentially causes material harm.

A different situation prevails when shift collectives compete for achieving optimal technological parameters and for the best preparation of facilities for work by subsequent shifts. At the Kuybyshev Petroleum Refinery, for example, the extent of maintaining optimal technological parameters is assessed on a daily basis. The individual brigades and their members know who is to be blamed for the downgrading of the results of the collective's work. This has drastically reduced defective work and the number of technological deviations and violations. It has made it possible to extend the length of work of technological systems between repairs.

Of late a number of qualitative aspects of the labor process and the social activeness of the competitors have become important points of attention by competition organizers. For example, the method of statistical analysis of the quality of the work and social activities has become widespread at the Gorizont Production Association (Minsk). Its purpose is to supervise the course of the production process and to influence it by taking fully into consideration the individual contributions of collective members by combining production with education. The method is based on the use of two basic documents: the defect classification (deviations from the production and education processes) and the bonus classification (which takes into consideration the professional growth of the workers, their training and participation in the collective's social life). Added to such classifications are tables on labor analysis based on quality characteristics, which help to determine the development of technological and production processes and the place and reason for deviations. Only a worker or a collective which either has no or fewer deviations from the norms, compared to the others, may be declared a competition winner.

Extensive attention is being paid in the course of managing the competition process to the discovery of hidden labor and production reserves and the creation of corresponding facilities for their development. For example, at the UralAZ Trucks Manufacturing Association, the application of a system of mass certification of parts for metal-intensiveness became an essentially new direction in the work of the collective. Here through the joint efforts of specialists and leading workers the possibility of improving the design of each part, reducing its dimensions, reducing machining tolerances, and so on, is periodically determined. Every year hundreds of automobile parts undergo metal-intensiveness certification and possibilities of conserving metal and making structural changes which ensure the reliability and durability of motor vehicles while reducing their weight are carried out. In a number of leading radio industry enterprises charts on time and rating norms are set up for each part, assembly, item or operation, which include the estimated time norm, the current time norm, the coefficient showing the disparity between the current and the estimated time norm, the rating based on salaries, and the estimated and actual labor-intensiveness of the items. The charts for the time norms and ratings show with absolute accuracy shortcomings in labor norming. Taking corresponding steps to eliminate discovered shortcomings positively influences production efficiency and work quality. In the course of the competition attention is also paid to resolving social problems and the implementation of the collective's educational function.

Briefly, a process of organizational establishment of a variety of ways and means of controlling the competition is taking place in the country's labor collectives, aimed at achieving the following purposes: ensuring the uninterrupted work of the equipment; observing the requirements of technological discipline; maintaining an efficient labor rhythm by the collective; ensuring high labor quality; reducing unproductive outlays and work time losses; identifying and disseminating progressive labor methods and forms; and implementing measures related to the social development of the collective.

Comrade Yu. V. Andropov noted at the November 1982 Central Committee Plenum that the conversion of the national economy to the track of intensification remains slow. The organizers of the competition could make a contribution to the acceleration of this process. To this effect, they should ensure the efficient management of the creative process. Is everything developing as planned, are there breakdowns and if so what causes them, is the administration fulfilling its obligations and how stubbornly and intensely is the collective working to fulfill its plans? These and other similar problems always draw the attention of the competition organizers. They are studied thoroughly and, above all, are resolved on time and accurately.

The experience of the leading collectives proves that the efficient management of the competition process is possible only through the steady supervision of its course. Thus, every production manager, each plant management department and social organ of the collective at the Ivanovo Automotive Cranes Plant has its own clearly stipulated range of assignments in controlling the implementation of the plant's contractual obligations. The collective knows at any moment at what stage is the fulfillment of one order or another, and where and what kind of obstacles have been encountered as it proceeds along the technological chain. Immediate steps are taken in cases of schedule or production rhythm violations to correct the situation. The efficient implementation of the schedule is a mandatory condition for winning the competition. Naturally, control over the course of the competition must be continuing. It takes place on several occasions and at different times, which makes it possible to cover every single important event in the competition process. The point is that it is occasionally worthy to allow a major deviation from the optimal course of the progress if many expected results at the final stage are threatened. In our view, the control should be exercised during the critical times, when important qualitative changes take place in the competition process. Obviously, in controlling the course of the competition among related groups, it is very important to check at the proper time, first of all whether each collective has been supplied with everything necessary for the implementation of its obligation and, secondly, the extent to which it is fulfilling its obligations to others accurately and qualitatively.

No efficient competition control is possible also without periodical determination of the basic characteristics of the course of the labor competition. For example, within the framework of the "work without laggards" system, applied at many enterprises in Rostov Oblast, there is a daily accounting of the implementation of individual production assignments for all worker categories engaged in basic and auxiliary production. Reports are submitted by



heads of brigades, sectors and shifts at joint sessions of the administrations and representatives of public organizations on the implementation of production plans and socialist obligations. This identifies all lagging workers who fail to fulfill their shift assignments and all collective subunits which fail to cope with their production plans and socialist obligations. All of this helps the competition organizers actively to react to violations of its planned course and promptly to eliminate the reasons which prevent the participants in the competition from reaching their planned levels.

Control over the course of the competition cannot simply consist of objectively recording events. It must be an active means of ensuring the optimal parameters of the competition. For example, if breakdowns appear in material and technical production procurements, they must be promptly identified by the system in charge of controlling the course of the competition. Furthermore, obviously, that same system must make the event known to the corresponding enterprise services and managers. Finally, mandatory control is necessary over the efficiency with which the responsible enterprise services react to received information, for any delayed reaction may occasionally prevent the participants in the competition to fulfill their obligations. It is to this effect, for example, that most machine tools at the Kommutator Production Association in Riga are equipped with special counters which record machine tool idling. A worker who turns off the machine tool must note on the counter the main reason for the occurrence including the lack of attachments for machining, insufficient raw and semifinished materials, technical documentation errors, and others. All such information is not only recorded by the counter but, with a special signaling system, is immediately brought to the foreman's attention. The latter must immediately react to such signals so that the competitors may be assisted immediately.

By having a clear idea of the course and the most important aspects of the competition process, its organizers can not only provide prompt support to the initiative-minded actions of the competitors but also ensure a relatively high level of objectivity in the summation of end results. It is to this effect, for example, that in summing up competition results at the Kirovskiy Zavod Production Association in Leningrad, a thorough investigation of the "veracity" of each individual result is made. In other words, the "cleanliness" of the very means used in reaching the main objectives of the competition is confirmed and the question of whether or not there were violations of the optimal work regimen is investigated. For example, if the obligation assumed regarding the volume of output has been met but rushing occurred in the course of its implementation, the violator of the optimal regimen is excluded from the list of those competing for competition ratings.

The objective need of controlling the labor competition process itself under the circumstances of the current line of improving the economic mechanism becomes particularly relevant. The spirit of competition and the interest in it and, therefore, its results, can be enhanced if constant attention is paid to all competition stages and, in the summation of its results, not only the final accomplishments are considered but the process itself, the course of the competition struggle.

Since the competition is the live creativity of the masses, the management of this process is quite complex even with the help of a relatively large number of representative organizers and a detailed system of indicators. It is in the course of the competition that refinements realized only by its direct participants appear. That is precisely why during all competition stages we must identify and take into consideration the collective's public opinion. The thorough consideration of this opinion will help to formulate more substantiated socialist obligations and counterplans. The view of the collective should be considered also in summing up the end competition results. On the one hand, this will strengthen the democratic principles governing the organization of the competition and, on the other, will contribute to enhancing the level of the qualitative analysis of the achievements of the competitors.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2

'BIOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL INHERITANCE'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83)  
pp 104-111

[Letters to the editors]

[Text] Such was the title of the article by Academician N. Dubinin (KOMMUNIST, No 11, 1980). It discussed topical problems of human genetics and its methodological aspects. The author considered the nature of man and, on a principled basis, from Marxist class positions, criticized the vulgar biologizing treatment of the phenomenon. He emphasized, in particular, the theoretical and practical rebirth of eugenics, which had compromised itself in connection with racism and fascism. Eugenic ideas are radically hostile to the scientific understanding of the nature of man. As we know, it is precisely such an understanding that is the methodological base for resolving a problem of historical importance--the shaping of a comprehensively developed individual of a new type. The article noted the role of genetic factors and biological characteristics in terms of the persons' physical health and the strengthening of his physiological constitution and the unquestionable social importance of this role. In a number of political problems it resolves, the communist party assigns an important role to health care, the protection of motherhood and childhood and the development of medical genetics.

The mail received by KOMMUNIST on the subject of this article becomes particularly interesting in connection with the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The plenum emphasized, among others, that attempts at mechanically applying the concepts and methods used in the natural and technical sciences to social phenomena are underproductive. "One could hardly acknowledge as scientific concepts which explain human qualities such as honesty, courage and decency with the existence of 'positive' genes and actually deny that such qualities are shaped by the social environment," Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, said at the plenum. "We have long been familiar with the unproductive efforts of automatically transferring the concepts and methods of the natural and technical sciences to social phenomena and the simplistic interpretation of the interrelationship between nature and society. Essentially, this hinders the strengthening of fruitful cooperation between these sciences and social science." In order to surmount scientifically unsubstantiated and philosophically erroneous views we need clear conceptual positions and the tools of Marxist-Leninist methodology.

The article was received with great interest by the readership at large. The editors were informed that it was discussed at theory and methodological seminars. The problems raised by this outstanding Soviet specialist exceed the limits of "pure" science and the members of the different professions, who responded to the article, indicated its theoretical and practical importance in resolving the topical problems of developed socialism. The overwhelming majority of letters express satisfaction with the publication and support its scientific and philosophical content and party-minded orientation.

The shaping of the ideological "frame" of consciousness is the most responsible task of all propaganda and education work. The Soviet press must contribute to its solution. In this connection, Prof G. Biyashev, Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences member, believes that the article "should play a very positive role in the accurate development of the outlook of biologists, philosophers and all other journal readers."

The effectiveness of scientific publications is determined above all by their truthfulness--in terms of the theoretical and actual content and presentation method. In this sense as well science and communist party-mindedness objectively blend. This is also the main prerequisite for the educational influence of scientific works. "The tasks of building communism and the plans for the further development of our country demand a party-minded assessment of the situation in the various fields of science, due to the fact that the methodological and social study of a number of crucial scientific problems is a necessary and important matter," writes A. Zhuchenko, Moldavian SSR Academy of Sciences president. He draws attention in his letter to the fact that "the scientific and philosophical substantiation of theoretical concepts on the social nature of man, social heritage and social programs is an important accomplishment by Soviet science. It serves the further strengthening of the ideas of equality, comprehensive development of the individual and the idea of developing every genetically complete person as a creator and builder. The spiritual blossoming and economic power of the Soviet republics confirm the accuracy of the Marxist-Leninist concept of the equality of all nations and races."

The problem of man runs throughout the history of the development of social thinking. Under the conditions of the contemporary ideological struggle interest in it becomes increasingly keen. "This problem, which is characterized by a variety of approaches (sociological, ethical, technological, psychological, pedagogical, biological, and others), is also gaining an increasingly clear global, conceptual and methodological significance, for in the final account it is within it that all basic features of contemporary social life are concentrated and expressed," write Dr of Philosophical Sciences Prof A. Logachev and candidates of philosophical sciences V. Kondaurov and V. Matviyevskiy (Moscow). "Naturally, it is posed and resolved differently by the supporters of the conflicting outlooks. The bourgeois theoreticians consider man from the positions of subjectivism (with all entailing consequences). Marxism considers man as the product of social relations, the progressive development of which is the base for shaping the new person (in the truly humanistic meaning of the term). Under circumstances in which man is the subject of the close attention of a number of sciences and the center

of the ideological struggle, the defense of the Marxist-Leninist theory of man against the increasingly frequent attacks by the ideological opponents has become a most important and urgent task...." Noting the relevance of the irreconcilable attitude toward distorted interpretations of the nature of man, the authors consider the article a worthy example of the party-minded approach by a scientist to the study of complex and conflicting phenomena.

It is easy to realize why arguments continue unabated on problems of the biological and social aspects of man. They are caused, on the one hand, by the complexity of the problem and the intertwining within it of basic natural scientific and philosophical aspects and the increased amount of most recent knowledge of man and his various manifestations, in which various forms of matter dynamics interact directly and indirectly and in which the superior social form plays a determining role and, on the other, the inability of some theoreticians to rise in their analysis of complex phenomena to the level of their dialectical-materialistic understanding.

In fact, on the one hand, thanks to discoveries in genetics, certain laws were determined of the transmission of individual biological characteristics from parents to progeny, and new and extensive opportunities were given mankind in the struggle for its health and the reorganization of the vegetal and animal world on a scientific basis. However, the experimental manipulation of genetic codes on the molecular-cellular level and the experimental modification of animal development processes have nurtured fantastic plans for changing the natural foundations of man. Psychology, pedagogy, criminology and other sciences turned their sights toward genetics, hoping to resolve many of their vital problems with its help. Some even began to consider genetics as a kind of panacea for social evils: various sociobiological concepts were energized in bourgeois science. In particular, the "theory of two factors" appeared, for the sake of providing a "scientific" substantiation to the existence of two beings in man: the biological and the social. The supporters of this viewpoint formulated the thesis to the effect that the genetic program allegedly guides the social behavior of people and tried to debunk the Marxist-Leninist theory of the single social nature of man and restore the worst variant of eugenics, the "theory" of improving the human species through selection. This "science," as we know, was used in its time as a base for the substantiation of social Darwinism, racial theories and the practice of genocide; its frankly biologizing approach to man, having proved in practice its entire immorality and anti-humaneness, could not fail to trigger the natural repulsion of most scientists.

"...Unlike the biologizing approach, the practical adoption of which leads to belittling the role of social consciousness and the conditions of the environment shaping man, the implantation of ideas of elitism, social passiveness and irresponsibility and surrender to developing reality and the inability to recognize it accurately," emphasized A. Logachev, V. Kondauronov and V. Matviyevskiy, "the Marxist-Leninist concept of the social nature of man opens to science and practice broad horizons for active and creative building of the true history of man, consistent with his true nature."

A. Kuliyeu, I. Abdullayev and M. Ali-Zade, Azerbaijan SSR Academy of Sciences members, expressed their agreement with the viewpoint presented in the

article. They say in their letter that "to us, biologists, there is no question that the biology of man is the most important part of his existence. The most important component of human life is health, which is based on a full genetic program... The purpose of medical genetics is to free man from hereditary diseases. However, the ideas of eugenics are incompatible with communist morality. No other view is possible. Eugenics always remains socially dangerous, whatever its form. It can be neither "socialist" nor 'communist.' In order for the dangerous eugenic ideas of biologically redoing man not to become widespread, a clear Marxist-Leninist theory of the origin and nature of man must be erected on their way." This theory, however, the letter says, still has supporters. "Many biologists are ready to farm out man's genes." Unfortunately some philosophers are beginning to believe them. Alas, this topic has still not found its place within the network of methodological seminars offered by scientific institutions. That is why this article proved to be so useful and timely.

K. Marx already pointed out in his early works that the nature of man as a "'special individual' is found not in the species, the blood or abstract physical nature, but the social quality...." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 1, p 242). Naturally, the Marxist-Leninist classics never denied the role of the natural prerequisites of man, stating that as a "natural being," all forms of dynamics of matter are actively manifested in him--mechanical, physical and chemical, rather than merely biological, and that the social form of dynamics of matter is a superior dialectical unity of all previous ones. The natural life of man within man himself is socially determined, i.e., his social nature has become humanized and a living element of his social life. The social factor, write Moscow professors and doctors of philosophical sciences S. Petrushevskiy and G. Platonov, "dialectically embodies all forms of dynamics of matter and life in terms of its material substratum both within the individual and in society. The social factor has its own specific laws which do not reject in the least the universal natural laws but dialectically change them within themselves, realizing them in their 'social quality.' .... We paid some time ago attention to the publications by Academician N. Dubinin in which he develops philosophically quite important matters.... In his new article, written in a sharply critical key, he emphasizes even more strongly that 'man's supra-biological evolution develops only on the basis of social inheritance, unlike the biological evolution of living beings based on genetic heredity'." S. Petrushevskiy and G. Platonov consider more noteworthy the idea that to modern man the social program is not the external influence of the environment but an internal condition for the development of his personality. In other words, human nature determines the sum total of social relations, rather than simply the influence of the environment as such, with its extremely flexible, fast-changing and unstable parameters. "The thesis of the 'biosocial' nature of man and its 'double determinant,' it seems to us, penetrated our Soviet literature as a result of the exaggerated interpretation of the successes of molecular biology as applicable to man and thanks to its eugenic interpretations." What is even more valuable, they conclude, is that the question was discussed in the journal by an acknowledged specialist in this field of knowledge, whose opinion cannot be ignored.

V. Kudryavtsev, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the State and Law, deems it proper for the journal to discuss a topic of such great scientific and ideological significance. It is not a question, he writes, of the preferred term, whether "social inheritance" or "continuity," but of the answers to two basic questions: (1) Are still-existing social differences among people explained in terms of genetic, hereditary factors; (2) Is it possible and necessary to change human nature through medical-biological means? The article, V. Kudryavtsev writes, justifiably rejects both. In his view, this constitutes its main ideological significance. He reminds us that party congress documents point out the decisive role of social factors in the exercise of demographic policy. The main way to resolve demographic problems is to enhance the living standard of the population, including concern for the family and young married couples, and for women above all. Such is the human, the scientific way consistent with Marxist-Leninist ideology and practice. Social measures (in the broad meaning of the term) are of prime importance also in the struggle against antisocial phenomena and crime. "Does all this mean that we should deny the role of genetic factors of biological heredity in individual human development? No, naturally, and in my view the article does not lead to such an opinion, although some of its formulations may appear excessively categorical. Obviously, this is inevitable in a polemical discussion."

A group of scientific associates of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Academy, headed by I. Mikhaylovskiy, doctor of juridical sciences, who support the scientific enthusiasm and principle-mindedness of the article, write that they found it useful, for it provided them with basic methodological and philosophical foundations in resolving problems of the sociology and mentality of crime--the Marxist-Leninist concept of man is as important to the social sciences as the law of preservation of energy to the natural sciences.

"On the grounds that a certain percentage of crimes are committed by individuals suffering from mental deviations, which are partially hereditary," the jurists write, "some specialists conclude that there is a 'biological predetermination' of crime. However, few of the criminals are mental deviates. What then explains the crimes committed by the others, who are biologically entirely normal? The view is that all of this is caused by distorted needs (?!), a bad character, ill will, and so on. In a word, the 'evil spirit' is to be blamed. In other words, the entire answer lies exclusively with the individual.... Some have tried directly to link the criminal type to his genes and, particularly, to their spatial location. All such concepts, from the open biologizing to the refined biosocial, one way or another proceed from the assumption that a crime belongs exclusively to the area of the individuality of the criminal and is related to his unique and specific biological and mental organization. Human behavior is considered from the viewpoint of psychobiological determination, whereas the social factor is considered as belonging to the purely external environment. The social factor acts as some kind of 'field' of activities or as an outside agent, rather than a qualitative determination of the individual. It is precisely through here that the watershed travels, separating Marxist from bourgeois criminology."

It is obvious that those who conceive of society as merely the sum total of individuals also consider the social factor as a simple sum total of people. Marx had a different view on the social factor. He believed that despite what seems obvious, "society does not consist of individuals but expresses the sum total of relations and ties maintained among such individuals," and that all such "relations are determined by society rather than nature" (op. cit., vol 46, part I, pp 214, 228).

"To us, who essentially deal with applied research," write the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Academy associates, "discussions related to the nature of man are not abstract, for in the area of our activities quite specific practical conclusions may be reached on the basis of false theoretical premises ... Unquestionably, the better way is the formulation of measures related to social prevention within the framework of economic and social planning."

Conversely, the adoption of erroneous biologizing postulates in juridical practice leads to overestimating the repressive aspect. Practical conclusions based on the antiscientific interpretation of the nature of man and of his behavior misguide the activities of social institutions which struggle against crime, create the illusion that this problem is "easy," and lead to the path of sterile and futile efforts. "When social practice on the scale of the state is based on scientific recommendations, it becomes obvious that the delusions and errors of the scientist in the field of theory become a problem not only of his scientific conscience but his social responsibility."

A joint session was held by the departments of dialectical materialism and philosophical problems of the natural sciences and the sector on the theory of reflection at the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy and Law, in connection with the publication of N. Dubinin's article. The letter signed by Zh. Abdil-Din, Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member and institute director, and K. Abishev, scientific associate at the institute, states, among others, the following: "The fact that a new person can be shaped only through the creation of new material and economic conditions, the improvement and development of the system of social relations and the application of a scientific educational system has been tested through the entire practical experience of building socialism in the USSR and the other socialist countries. Further studies of these conditions, the determination of the profound mechanisms which shape the individuals and their development as universal personalities demand, naturally, major efforts on the part of Marxist philosophers, psychologists, pedagogists, legal experts and so on.... Such studies cannot be conducted outside the unquestionable, scientifically proven and practically justified concepts of the Marxist-Leninist classics, which are a historical accomplishment of the scientific and theoretical thinking of our age. Nevertheless, occasionally publications on philosophy, psychology and, most frequently, biology, carry articles in which the theme song is the idea of the genetic (biological) congenital nature and predetermination of strictly social human qualities and features like man's ability to act, spiritual qualities, egotism, altruism and so on. Voices have been heard defending selection methods and, in some cases, even sterilization of people, related to education and upbringing processes. Influenced by such 'scientific' works, the popular press sometimes presents their ideas as something self-evident. This is inadmissible."



The scientific pedagogues and teachers who have written the editors point out that efforts are still being made to revise the fundamental Marxist-Leninist ideas regarding the nature of man and, in particular, to split him into two parts--the biological and the social. The fact that such attempts are being made in the West is entirely explainable, for they are used by a number of "scientists" pursuing class-oriented objectives. In our country, where all science develops on the single base of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, inherent in which is an understanding of the nature of man as the sum total of social relations, such attempts are considered a sort of scientific atavism. However, the underestimating of such basic concepts becomes even more puzzling when found in some Soviet philosophers. Extensive experience in participation in discussions on the problem of "the biological and the social" and observations of means used in resolving the vital problems of the upbringing and education of children, according to the specialists, leads to the conclusion that the struggle for the advantage of acquiring a higher education under the influence of technocratic concepts, which exist in some of the intelligentsia, provides real social grounds for ideas on the existence of so-called "innate capabilities" in man (which is, actually, the essence of the entire theory of the two natures of man and the two factors of his development). It is precisely on such grounds that academic biologizing blossoms, which is a kind of animal husbandry approach to man, totally incompatible with the principles of our science and ethics. Naturally, many supporters of such a distortion are unaware of its social prerequisites. This, however, does not change matters. Our correspondents believe that when such views are exposed they should be given a blunt assessment.

N. Dubinin's article triggered a lively exchange of opinions in the country's VUZs. One such discussion is reported by V. Shpak, dean of the philosophy faculty of the university in Rostov-na-Donu. He believes that the article could be a summation of a debate on the problem of the social and the biological, which has been going on among specialists during the past 10 to 15 years; for it establishes accurately the main features and the positive and negative results obtained in the course of the exchange of views on this problem. What is man? This is the main question in the field of Marxist humanism, which demands a simple answer: a biological or a social being, for there is no third ("biosocial") possibility. "If efforts are made to prove the opposite, sooner or later they lead to insurmountable theoretical difficulties." V. Shpak agrees with those who state that the "biologizers" essentially abandon Marxism when it comes to the question of man. The harmfulness of this is obvious. That is why the author considers it expedient to recommend this article for reading by students taking the course on dialectical and historical materialism.

The next is a letter by Prof V. Golovanov, head of the chair of philosophy, and V. Merklin, senior instructor, both at the medical institute in Rostov-na-Donu: "... To the philosopher teaching in a medical VUZ the problem of the knowledge of man and his place on earth and the universe is resolved through the lens of the correlation between the biological and the social, and the extent to which this problem will be resolved with theoretical knowledge and philosophical thinking depends on the various "outlays" incurred along the progressive path of development of philosophical thinking and

biology itself." Referring to their long pedagogical and scientific experience, the authors point out the substantial energizing of attempts at giving a biological interpretation to the nature of man under the banner of socio-biological dualism. In agreeing with the methodological, conceptual and political conclusions contained in the article, they draw attention to the fact that the level of theoretical thinking characteristic of the scientific workers criticized in it, corresponds to the so-called "substratum approach" to theoretical biology. It is a traditional materialistic method which, however, falls within the framework of 18th-century natural sciences and philosophy. However, such a position entirely conceals the social nature of man. "Nineteenth-century, not to mention 20th-century science goes beyond the limits of the substratum approach in the world of essential relations which can be developed only on the grounds of dialectical philosophy. It is precisely through dialectical tradition that the social nature of knowledge and the social essence of man were substantiated for the first time and the material base of all superior mental human functions, including thinking, was confirmed. That is why the pseudo-innovational attempts of 'contemporary' followers of obsolete traditions can only hinder the development of scientific thinking and the creative solution of topical problems of natural scientific and philosophical knowledge."

As to the ideological-political aspect of all this, under circumstances in which the contradiction between socioeconomic systems is intensifying, particularly tireless attention should be paid to the theoretical front. Many readers emphasize that neutral and compromising attitudes cannot exist in this area. The main criterion in assessing the philosophical significance of theoretical works is their ideological trend and purity of class, conceptual and methodological positions. This is particularly emphasized in the letter of S. Savenkov, interim professor of economic and social geography, Saratov University: the question raised in the article is as topical today as it was when K. Marx and F. Engels were fighting bourgeois philosophers-idealists and when V. I. Lenin was fighting Machists and empiriocritics; crawling idealism sneaks into the printed organs concealed behind fashionable words....

In his brilliant work "Materialism and Empiriocriticism," in considering the question of the true nature of man, Lenin pointed out that Ludwig Feuerbach himself criticized Kant for his idealistic and clerical approach to the question. Vladimir Il'ich cited Feuerbach who said that "man is a being distinguished from the sun, the moon, the stars, the stones, the animals and the plants. In a word, from all beings (Wesen) which he describes as nature ..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 18, p 119). Lenin criticized particularly sharply A. Bogdanov's "Play at Biology and Sociology," pointing out that "we do not find in this entire game...a single particle of Marxism" (ibid., p 347). "There is nothing easier," Lenin wrote, "than to put the labels of 'energy' or 'biological-sociological' on phenomena such as crises, revolutions, the class struggle, etc. However, nor is there anything more sterile, scholastic or dead than such occupation.... The shifting of biological concepts in general to the area of social sciences is nothing but phraseology" (ibid., pp 348-349). Lenin taught us to identify "forgeries of antimaterialistic theories concealed behind Marxism" in looking at such phraseology and "words which conceal idealistic philosophy."

The same features describe the criticized deviation in biology, sometimes concealed behind "Marxist" phraseology, which officially quotes from the classics but in fact supports the biologizing approach to man and claiming that the spiritual life of the people is dictated by genes, thus erecting a theoretical obstacle to shaping the member of the new communist society. This precisely is the final objective of the foreign supporters of man's "biosocial" nature. They would like to prevent the strengthening of the new historical community--the Soviet people--and to hinder the shaping of its new generations, for such shaping means above all the purposeful development of a set of social measures rather than relying on genetic predetermination and inherent qualities biologically inherited from the previous generation. No, here we are dealing with a social inheritance which is of a qualitatively new type. The people are not born communists but develop as such in the course of the revolutionary struggle and constructive activities for the sake of communist ideals.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of the single social nature of man alone, notes Prof S. Savenkov, can be a reliable foundation for social practice in the development of a historically new type of people. "We would like," he writes, "for the USSR Ministry of Higher and Specialized Education to pay most serious attention to curricula and lecture courses and for the various theories of man's 'biosocial' nature to be removed from the arsenal of Soviet pedagogy."

A. Shvartz, teacher at a children's music school, shares his thoughts on the fact that erroneous views of the nature of human talent (which can be understood only on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist concept of the nature of man) determine the faulty practice of "sifting out" many students for allegedly being "professionally unsuitable." It is thus that educators themselves play a poor game. "This matter is so serious that in my view the party should express its weighty opinion...."

Misinterpretations of the achievements of genetics are found in pedagogical circles along with petit bourgeois prejudices. "For this reason, it is particularly important for precisely a genetic scientist of world fame to expose erroneous views and prove their scientific groundlessness," believes Senior Scientific Associated N. Mironov, who worked side by side with the noted Soviet defectologist I. A. Sokolyanskiy, who was posthumously awarded the USSR State Prize, in Kharkov in the 1920s. "I am an educator and frequently hear the way successes in genetics are reinterpreted by people, who are familiar with it from hearsay only, as 'proof' of the hereditary predetermination of the nature of the mind and the entire behavior and activities. A teacher would frequently explain failing grades or poor behavior of a student by referring to his genes. By this token the teacher awards himself an indulgence and relieves himself of responsibility for the low level of his own educational work."

Actually, the textbook "Obshchaya Biologiya" [General Biology], a textbook for the ninth and tenth grades (Yu. I. Polyanskiy, editor. 14th edition, Prosveshcheniye, Moscow, 1983), which was given to the editors, clearly states on page 210: "It has been genealogically established that the

development of some human capabilities (such as inclination for music, mathematics, etc.) is determined by hereditary factors."

Candidate of Biological Sciences M. Bordukova writes on this subject that "such 'information' not only distorts the truth but implants in the developing mind false concepts which remain with the person for the rest of his life."

The genealogical method calls for the study of hereditary characteristics of people based on genealogy. However, we should not confuse examples of biological hereditary characteristics of the organism and features of the basic natural system with the duplication or reproduction of one personality trait or another, which are exclusively based on social environment and cultural tradition.

In the past special books were published on the genealogy of kings, princes and the high nobility "proving" "noble" features (i.e., the power of the haves) of tribes and families. In these and other cases to this day genealogies which allegedly prove inherited "blue" blood were and remain a political weapon in intraclass and interclass relations. Such genealogies are of no scientific interest. In our working society, where the individual is valued depending on his own contribution to the common cause, cases of boasting and arrogance related to distant "artistocratic" origins make a strange impression. Hereditary diseases in families are strictly a subject of medical genetics.

In supporting the views expressed in N. Dubinin's article, Dr of Biological Sciences Professor A. Studitskiy points out the role of natural scientific concepts in ideology and in shaping pedagogical views and the consciousness and self-consciousness of the individual; unfortunately, the idea of hereditary genetic "talent" and "lack of talent" of children is beginning to dominate in the school. This becomes even more inadmissible when we are dealing with mass physical culture and sports training. "In physical training practice," the scientist writes, "the selection of specific 'talented' candidates for future masters of sports, record-setters and olympic champions, based on a specific program, has begun to be applied widely. Editorial boards receive numerous statements by parents on the inaccessibility of sports and physical education schools to children, on the basis of failing to meet contemporary genetic requirements. It is as though the history of sports does not include the case of the famous Dane Muller, who was a sickly and weak child and adolescent but who, as a result of intensive practice of special calisthenics, became a Danish champion in a number of sports. It is as though no theoretician in the field of physical education has paid attention to the statement by Yurik Vardanyan, the outstanding domestic and worldwide champion in the field of heavy athletics, who described his poor physical condition during his childhood and adolescence. The theory of the development of the human body which prevailed from the time of ancient Greece to the present has vanished. Yet, with striking clarity, this history proves the role of social conditions and, above all, of physical and spiritual upbringing in the development of the characteristics of the human body and mind, which could be described as the qualities of the human

species." The scientist emphasizes that "the model of the ideal body, developed in ancient Greece with the help of an efficient system of physical and spiritual upbringing, remains to this day as proof of the tremendous role which social conditions play in achieving the harmonious development of man under the influence of proper and purposeful efforts, as well as the degradation of the body and general physical development under the influence of the ideals of asceticism which prevailed in the Middle Ages and as a result of exhausting work under the conditions of the capitalist system, proving that physical and spiritual underdevelopment of man is the result of the suppression of his physical and spiritual forces by adverse social factors."

Prof A. Studitskiy further notes that "in following the tradition developed in Western genetic literature, domestic specialists frequently extrapolate without restrictions genetic laws of human heredity mainly developed in modern genetic research on the basis of bacteria (intestinal), ignoring not only man's social nature but the biological specifics of his body as a whole. The idea that all human characteristics are programmed by genes has become not a conclusion but a premise in human genetic research and may be found in hundreds of popular science pamphlets, articles, books and even general biology textbooks, from where it enters the outlook of our readers, developing a genetic fatalism in them. Let us hope that the ideas so boldly and firmly developed by N. Dubinin will have a beneficial influence on the situation in this area of our social life."

Dr of Geographic Sciences A. Chepalyga, Dr of Geological-Mineralogical Sciences V. Yakhimovich and Senior Scientific Associate G. Matyushin express their indignation at the opinion which is widespread in bourgeois literature that a genetic structure which has existed since the Stone Age allegedly biologically determines aggressiveness or tribal egotism today. They support the viewpoint of the suprabiological evolution of man and write about the basic role which instruction and education play in social behavior not only of men but, according to published scientific data, of higher primates.

Incidentally, several letters to the editors disagree with the article. Their content proves the lack of scientific information on the part of their authors on the subject of the article and their low philosophical culture. Thus, for example, V. Strugallo from Krasnodar tends to see in this article the "dogmatic adaptation" of scientific-philosophical conclusions to political doctrines and party stipulations "which were made or derived from other scientific data and trends in the development of human society." This unsubstantiated and unfair accusation is not supported in the letter by factual data or convincing logic.

It would be stupid to consider a scientific concept of man as a social phenomenon (i.e., a Marxist truth confirmed by practical experience) or as a "stipulation," and it would be equally foolish to ask that such a concept not be considered a dogma. Alas, in this case it is precisely dogmatism that is manifested in an uncritical attitude toward imperfect natural scientific conclusions or the blind acceptance on faith of something which needs a sober philosophical interpretation based on dialectical materialism.

Reader Ye. Ostapov from Sum claims that N. Dubinin allegedly ignores the thesis of Marx and Engels on the physical organization of man (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 3, p 19), and sharply disagrees with the idea in the article according to which "the human mentality cannot be found either in the function of genes or of neurons for the simple reason that its level has exceeded the limits of biology." According to Ye. Ostapov, "the human mind, fortunately (!) has not exceeded the limits of biology." What are we arguing about? All we can do is to recommend to the author to consult the textbooks.

However, whereas the reason for philosophically erroneous views by non-specialists can be explained, we are quite puzzled by the statement by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences N. Gubanov, from Aktyubinsk, who confuses mental with physiological functions, and by his excessive temper in opposing the entire article and failure to understand the dialectics of conversion which takes place in human biology.

Prof M. Karpov, head of the chair of philosophy at the university in Rostov-na-Donu expressed (without rejecting the entire article) a doubt concerning the universal possibilities of human nature to engage in a variety of activities. In calling upon the editors of KOMMUNIST to publish the responses to N. Dubinin's article and to "separate more thoroughly accurate from inaccurate and doubtful ideas," M. Karpov considers the author's criticism of loose and equivocal theoretical judgments on the basic question of ... "the way to separate scientists from Marxism with one stroke of the pen."

We cannot agree with this conclusion. If theoretical postulates and conclusions are inconsistent with objective truth, their only possible interpretation is a frank assessment, and not a question of "separating" from the truth. It has always been the custom in scientific circles to call things by their proper names. Something which is incompatible with Marxism will not become Marxist as a result of a bashful failure to mention a basic disagreement with it.

The readers draw the attention of the editors to the fact that some authors who actively write on problems of man conceive of the concept of "social inheritance" ... as impoverishing the historical process and not defining the mechanism of human "socialization" in the course of his individual development and allegedly concealing "an attempt to apply some biological concepts of heredity to social phenomena which are of an essentially different quality." "The reason for such views is puzzling: it is either due to a superficial reading of the criticized material or tendentiousness which clashes with scientific ethics," writes Engineer A. Gusev.

The editors were informed of some public addresses by specialists, including philosophers, who disagree with N. Dubinin's article and who support the biologizing viewpoint but who, however, have not responded in writing. VESTNIK AKADEMII NAUK SSSR (No 6, 1981) carries the article by A. D. Aleksandrov (Novosibirsk), academy member and mathematician, in which, referring to KOMMUNIST, he states that "the article by Academician N. P. Dubinin, with all its claims to a Marxist viewpoint, is in reality something

entirely contrary to Marxism" (p 46). However, does this statement mean anything more than a ponderous, discouraging and unappealable sentence? As a specialist unrelated to genetics, and relying only on popular common ideas (or, more precisely, prejudices) on the genetic predetermination of the normal human mind and intellect, Academician A. D. Aleksandrov considers it incredible that a professional geneticist would deny the genetic determination of spiritual capabilities. Dr of Medical Sciences N. Khursin writes on the subject of the article by Academician A. D. Aleksandrov that "the development of capabilities, talent and brilliance are social phenomena. We are saddened by the fact that the editors of VESTNIK AKADEMII NAUK SSSR published a false article without deeming it possible to comment on it and give it a principled and a party-minded assessment. Such 'objectivism' is not in the tradition of the Soviet press."

Human nature is social. This is the main idea in the article. It is not a "stipulation" (in the primitive understanding of the word) but a scientific concept confirmed by historical practice and thousands of years of experience in the search for the truth. No accurate data exist to the effect that man's spiritual world and labor activities are biologically determined. Actually, the entire specifics of the person, everything human in the person is the product of human relations. This fact opens to the people opportunities of a tremendous social range. As the lowest form of matter dynamics in man, the biological foundation is only a prerequisite for becoming part of the social form of matter dynamics. Consciousness, a spiritual world and the ability to work develop in the child not from his biology but as a result of his active participation in the world of social practice. It is here that are contained the tremendous opportunities of pedagogy and psychology, and the main feature which is the base for shaping new generations under the conditions of a social environment, the socialist way of life.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of man formulates as one of its basic theses the comprehensive development of his socially determined capabilities. This thesis is based on all natural and social scientific data. It is on this basis that the CPSU formulates its policy in the realms of economics, science, culture and education. In the final account, man is the purpose of all building of communism. The proper understanding of the nature of man is consistent with the objective requirements of the legitimate historical process.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## 'LIGHT AND GRAIN'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83)  
pp 112-118

[Letters to the editors]

[Text] A number of responses from many parts of the country were received by the editors of this journal in connection with the publication of A. Shakhov's article "Light and Grain" (No 18, 1982). Their authors included party workers, scientists, practical workers in agriculture and engineers. All of them discuss with great interest the problem of the influence of light on crops, describe the results of such influence, indicate ways to improve crops and to apply new methods for upgrading crop productivity and consider theoretical questions.

A. Markov, Enbekshikazakhskiy Rayon, CP of Kazakhstan, secretary, writes that "The article accurately raises the question of the need to pursue scientific and practical work on the application of various means of light influence with a view to increasing the size of crops."

Candidate of Agricultural Sciences M. Andrushkiv, deputy director of the Scientific Research Farming and Animal Husbandry Institute for the Western Areas of the UkSSR, and Dr of Agricultural Sciences Ye. Kozak, head of agrochemistry and plant physiology laboratory, believe that thanks to the use of nontraditional sources of light energy (concentrated solar light, lasers, pulse light, etc.) the sciences of biology and agriculture have acquired a new way for the development of plants through light control and, on this basis, the creation of new crop strains and higher productivity. This will considerably contribute to the implementation of the Food Program.

### I

Laser-light stimulation of seeds increases field seed-germinating capacity by 15-18 percent, reports M. Rudev, chief agronomist at the agroindustrial association in Oktyabr'skiy Rayon, Turgay Oblast. Irradiated seeds increase yields by 0.6-4.3 quintals per hectare depending on the strain and number of irradiations. Over a period of 2 years (1979-1980), with quadruple irradiation the hard Kharkovskaya 46 wheat strain increased yields by 4.29 and with a single irradiation by 1.59 quintals per hectare. The triple irradiation of the soft Saratovskaya 29 wheat in 1980 increased yields by 2.53 quintals per



hectare. Higher yields are obtained as a result of the increased number of grains per ear (as many as five) and their greater weight. The shoots of irradiated grains appear 2-3 days before the nonirradiated (control) seeds. The vegetation period of Kharkovskaya 46 grain is completed 7-8 days earlier and of Saratovskaya 29 4-5 days earlier compared to the control groups. "Considering our relatively short autumn," M. Rudev goes on to say, "this is quite advantageous: we start our harvest earlier, avoid the October rains and reduce crop losses. I have practiced laser irradiation since 1976. Between 1977 and 1981 some 130,000 hectares were planted in grain crops in the rayon (wheat, barley, oats), including as much as 50,000 hectares in twice and thrice irradiated seeds. The net income of the Molodezhnyy Sovkhoz alone was, in thousand rubles, as follows: 234.9 in 1977 and 1978; 189 in 1979; 288.4 in 1980 and 240.9 in 1981. Outlays for seed irradiation per hectare average 50 kopeks. Therefore, the sovkhos earned about 1 million rubles. Production quality improves as well and so do the technological and baking qualities of the grain: greater vitreousness, dimensions, shape stability and porosity. This means that the Russian loaf has become richer and tastier, for which we must thank the scientists." The agronomist hopes that the rayon agroindustrial associations will make the use of laser light systems easier.

In Kokchetava, another oblast in Kazakhstan also located in the risky farming zone, the fullness of wheat and barley shoots has improved by 4.6 percent and the survival of the plants by 3 percent as a result of laser seed stimulation; the number of productive shoots increased by 12.4 percent. V. Shnayder, head of laboratory at the Ruzayevskaya Agricultural Experimental Station, who reported these data based on many years of study, reaches the conclusion that the presowing light stimulation of seeds increases grain crop yields by 0.8-2 quintals per hectare, which is a significant addition.

Ya. Svavol', chief agronomist at the Kolkhoz imeni K. Marx in Lvov Oblast, had a lively reaction to the article: "I find it difficult to explain to the kolkhoz members why beets irradiated with the 'red reflection' grow better, but all of them, in addition to myself, see the results of this "miracle" at the very beginning of the shaping of the crop. At harvest time the additional quintals are obvious: on an area of 80 hectares we harvest every year an additional 30-40 quintals of beets per hectare. That is why we have decided this year to ask the Lvov Agricultural Institute to treat all sugar beet seeds. We would like to express through your journal our thanks to Prof A. A. Shakhov for his developments, and V. F. Yakobenchuk, docent at the same institute for the active application of light-energy methods. However, I cannot understand why this practice cannot be spread throughout the country, seeing the amount of unused opportunities concealed in the wonderful laser beam!"

A bioenergy seed stimulation center, which uses stationary and movable laser systems for agricultural purposes, has been established at the virgin land Kapal'skiy Grain Sovkhoz in Taldy-Kurgan Oblast. B. Nyazbekov, director of the Koksuskiy Agricultural Technicum, writes that in 1982 a triple irradiation was performed on 75.7 tons of sugar beet seeds with the Amazonka-1 system and 6,000 hectares were planted. Currently, he writes, construction has begun on a stationary laser seed-processing shop. The Taldy-Kurganskiy party raykom has set up a rayon coordinating council on the use of laser technology in agriculture.

For many years work on upgrading yields and sugar content in sugar beets has been under way in Kuybyshev Oblast, under the management of the Pokhvistnevo CPSU City Party Committee. Yu. Sizov, gorkom secretary, and B. Kudinov, rayon agroindustrial association chairman, report that during the last 3 years the sugar beet crop in the rayon increased by 30,000 tons, and the net profit by some 1.5 million rubles as a result of seed laser irradiation.

Docent M. Yusupov, head of the vegetable-growing chair of the Kazakh Agricultural Institute, who has studied the light-pulse stimulation of vegetable crops with pulsing concentrated solar light (IKSS) since 1962, reports that "We have determined that IKSS-radiated seeds increase open-air yields by as much as 22 percent of the total harvest and as much as 30 percent of the early crop. The stimulating effect is retained also in growing cucumbers on covered ground. In tomato growing, the irradiation seeds and plants help to upgrade the quality of transplants, yields and fast ripening. The same method is promising in melon-crop growing as well. Irradiation increases the germination of Nezhinskiy 12 cucumbers by 19.4 percent and of tomatoes by 14 percent. The irradiation of seeds and vegetating plants grown in the open ensures a profit of up to 300 rubles, without transplanting, and up to 1,500 rubles in transplanted crops, and up to 1,500 rubles per hectare on covered soil. The extensive use of light pulse irradiation would enable us to raise additionally in Kazakhstan as much as 200,000 tons of vegetables and improve the profitability of vegetable and melon crops. To achieve this, the rayon, oblast and republic Sortsemovoshch associations should organize the centralized irradiation of seeds."

The use of new light energy sources, lasers in particular, for the purpose of improving yields, writes T. Strel'tsova, docent at the Pavlodar Pedagogical Institute, is one of the means for the implementation of the Food Program. The institute's specialists conducted a series of laboratory and research tests, followed by semi-industrial experimentation. We do not need, the author writes, to convince the managers and workers at the Teplichnyy Sovkhoz that laser processing benefits farming. During the very first plant rotation tomatoes grown from radiated seeds outstripped the control group by three weeks, and cucumbers by two weeks in their development. This means that the question of supplying the town working people with fresh produce during the winter can be resolved faster.

Candidates of Agricultural Sciences A. Petrykin, V. Gribovich and M. Maryzina (Ryazan Agricultural Experimentation Station) report that in the course of 10 years of experiments in irradiating onion seeds and mother plantations with light generated by different types of lasers confirmed additions to the crops, averaging some 12 percent, were achieved. Increases in barley and spring wheat were as much as 4.8 quintals per hectare.

Odessa Agricultural Institute Docents V. Shcherbakov and V. Bezrukova report that in the course of their 1980-1982 experiments, laser irradiation of sunflower seeds increased yields by 2.5-3.9 quintals per hectare, or 10-16 percent. Seed huskiness is reduced by 1-2 percent and the fat content is increased by the same amount. As a result, oil production per hectare in sunflower is increased by 2-3 percent.

Some of the materials addressed to the editors discuss the potato crop as well. A. Roshal', head of a design bureau group (Minsk) reports, on the basis of experiments conducted jointly with the Belorussian Potato and Fruit and Vegetable Growing Scientific Research Institute and with other establishments, that the light pulse irradiation of some potato strains increases yields by 20-25 percent under field conditions. The comprehensive system suggested by the author, consisting of several modules, including light (pulse light tubes) significantly lowers the amount of planting material needed.

In noting that A. Shakhov failed to pay proper attention to cotton in his article, many scientists contribute new data on increasing yields from strains they are developing in the area of this important industrial crop.

G. Umarov, Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, reports that for a number of years studies have been conducted in Uzbekistan on the influence of presowing irradiation of cotton seeds with pulse-concentrated light and with powerful xenon tubes, the spectrum of which resembles that of the sun. A module for an industrial system of xenon lamps for seed pulse radiation, developed by the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences Physical-Technical Institute, was manufactured in experimental batches and tested. Seven years of production testing with irradiated seeds in 14 farms, on an area of 3,738 hectares yielded an additional 1,425 tons of cotton to the crop, and the additional income exceeded half a million rubles. "It would be expedient," G. Umarov concludes, "to organize the light pulse processing of cotton seeds at all cotton-growing farms."

Kh. Nazirov, T. Derkach, Kh. Umarov and T. Azizov, scientific workers at the Uzbek bast-crop experimental station, describe their lengthy work on the light pulse and laser irradiation of kenaf seeds and plants. The scientists note the increased laboratory and field germination, seed growth energy and increased crop yields of up to 20 percent.

The Polyaron Production Association deserves great credit for successes achieved in laser irradiation. On the basis of a study of a number of consumer surveys, V. Savel'yev, chief of the association's design bureau, draws the conclusion that the proper use of the "Lvov-1 Elektronika" system yields good results.

B. Solyarskiy, chief agronomist at the Melenkovskiy Sovkhoz, Vladimir Oblast, requests a more detailed presentation of the question of the struggle against the loose smut with the help of laser irradiation. The method is described in detail in M. Rudev's response to A. Shakhov's article.

"The scientists have given us a weapon," M. Rudev emphasizes, "with the help of which we can fight covered smut and entirely eliminate the use of granosan, the most terrible toxin the grain growers have to deal with."

In the course of his small and industrial-size experiments with grain crops, M. Rudev dyed the seeds with a water solution of malachite green, using 20 grams per ton of grain. In the course of the drying the seeds were irradiated with a laser beam twice within a 17-hour interval. The results were the following: No plants contaminated with covered smut were identified on the

experimental wheat and oat plots; contaminated plants on the control fields, covering 100 square meters, totalled 1-2 wheat plants and 7-8 oat plants. On the barley control plot (without irradiation and dye) there were 18 plants stricken with smut; in the plot with seeds treated with granosan there were seven affected plants; in the variant involving irradiated seeds there were four affected plants and in the sector planted in dyed and irradiated seeds three plants were affected. According to M. Rudev, in no case should we allow an interval longer than 24 hours between the coloring and irradiation of the seeds, for in that case the chlamyospore, the covered smut agent, will fail to oxidize.

Docent T. Strel'tsova writes about fighting fungus diseases with laser irradiation. She studied the effect of red laser light of different power on the multiplication of the *Verticilium lecanii* fungus, the solution of which is used in the struggle against the whitefly, a pest affecting plants raised on covered soil. It turned out that a low-intensity laser beam accelerates tenfold the multiplication of the fungus, whereas a stronger laser light destroys it. T. Strel'tsova considers the laser "a source of pure light energy and one of the most effective instruments for influencing the bioenergy of living organisms harmless to animals, the environment and man."

In 1980 it was at the Partizan Sovkhoz, Amur Oblast, that irradiated seeds were virtually free from fungus diseases. Therefore, according to data supplied by V. Zenin, the sovkhov's chief agronomist, the cost of the facility was recovered simply by saving on the purchase of toxic chemicals. He also reports that the Lvov equipment needs improvements.

## II

The readers were also interested in selection and genetic problems closely related to plant photoenergy.

Docent A. Kaliyev (Alma-Ata) writes: "It has now been established that high-intensity light has a stimulating and form-shaping effect on seeds, vegetating plants and pollen. For example, as a result of the presowing irradiation of seeds and vegetating hard spring wheat in Kazakhstan with concentrated pulsating solar light, somewhat changed and, in subsequent generations, entirely stable mutant forms were obtained. After their selection as a strain they were submitted to the State Commission for Agricultural Crop Strain Testing."

"After long years of work," writes N. Mansurov, a selection worker (Dushanbe), "we can firmly say that IKSS is a mutagenic factor when solar light is concentrated by a factor of 100. This is confirmed by the mutants we have developed and the IKSS-1 new cotton strain which, after 3 years of contest testing, we are ready to submit to the Strain Testing Commission in 1983."

Candidate of Agricultural Sciences K. Partoyev (Dushanbe) reports that exposure to pulsing light of the generative organs of the cotton plant has yielded large-box, wilt-resistant and highly productive mutants, currently at the stage of final selection rating. Particularly interesting is a cotton mutant obtained through the influence of IKSS, which is pollinated in closed blossoms, and which is of great importance in selection-genetic research.

Prof Ye. Alekseyeva, head of the Plant Cultivation and Selection Chair, and V. Bilonozhko, senior scientific associate, write that at the Kamenets-Podolsk Agricultural Institute fast-ripening buckwheat strains were obtained by exposing seeds and pollen to red and ultraviolet laser beams. In a 3-year competitive strain testing period, selection No 253/76, named Lazurnaya, cultivated under irrigation conditions, exceeded the average by 2.9 quintals per hectare (by 40 percent), while No 267/76, after 3-year tests in a control nursery, exceeded it by 4.9 quintals per hectare (more than 60 percent).

Other readers as well report on the development of durable mutant forms under the influence of ultraviolet laser irradiation.

I. Kalinina, VASKHNIL academician, and Z. Zholobova and L. Sankin, candidates of agricultural sciences, at the Siberian Truck Gardening Scientific Research Institute, believe that plant light energy must find a broader application also in the selection of fruit and soft-fruit species, in speeding up the selection process and in the vegetative multiplication of new promising hybrids. They believe that the influence of light on this process should be comprehensive and include the following consecutive stages: use of laser and pulsing concentrated solar light in the irradiation of pollen and seeds, the growing of plants in greenhouses under a specific light regimen in winter and the irradiation with light of grafts of elite strains to accelerate the process. "This entire set of new light energy methods," the Siberian scientists emphasize, combined with universally practiced selection methods, can be applied in the selection centers currently being established."

### III

The article under discussion proved to be of interest also to those currently engaged in the study of biotechnological problems, which are quite topical the world over. In particular, it has drawn the attention of microbiologists at the All-Union Bacterial Preparations Scientific Research Institute (Moscow). M. Skvortsova and M. Mirzayev, candidates of biological sciences, note that the usefulness of light stimulation in plant development, metabolic control and photomutagenesis is unquestionable. The still existing skepticism is obviously caused by the absence of a uniform method for influencing the vegetal organism through light. Another restraining factor is the insufficient development of a uniform theory of photometabolism. That is why they agree that theoretical and experimental work must be intensified. Furthermore, it should involve the use of industrial microorganisms as well, for recently information has been obtained on the possibility of controlling the metabolism of microorganisms through light technology used in the microbiological industry. The successful application of light technology methods in the microbiological industry would result in the development of an additional number of industrially valuable products.

An industrial technology for chlorella production is being developed at the Stavropol Agricultural Institute. This microalga will be fed to livestock as a feed additive rich in protein and vitamins. Institute workers V. Kuz'menko and I. Gorelov, are concerned with the development of the type of rational system for chlorella light irradiation which would ensure the greatest increase in the volume of dry substance with minimal electric power outlays.

The current system of intensified permanent electric lighting is quite power intensive, as a result of which production becomes unprofitable. The authors consider that pulse irradiation resolves this problem. One of the difficulties which is holding back progress in this direction is the lack of serially produced industrial light pulse radiation systems using electric bulbs.

The responses are based on specific and quite tangible practical and theoretical developments in plant photoenergy. We are familiar with the truth that the most valuable part of science is a new creative idea; the more original it is the more difficult it is to surmount old ideas. Naturally, the readers are concerned about the further development of this new scientific trend.

The editors have accomplished a great party deed by publishing the article "Light and Grain," many of the writers emphasize. It is entirely natural that a great deal is still unstudied in this new scientific area. However, this should not hinder those who use the new methods in creating richer, faster-ripening and better-quality strains and hybrids and developing a new theory.

V. Bezuglov, senior scientific associate at the plant physiology laboratory of the All-Union Forestry Chemization Scientific Research Institute, writes that "In 25 years substantial experimental data, which require systematizing and summation, have been acquired. Favorable conditions have been created for the development of a light energy theory for upgrading overall vegetation productivity. The study of the laws governing the influence of light on the life processes and light control of plant organizations and plant light energy as a basic applied task results in the comprehensive enhancement of plant productivity and crop quality improvements. Nontraditional concepts on the mechanisms of the interaction between light and the substances of the vegetal cell are used and developed, based on the concepts of nonlinear optics and the thermodynamics of unbalanced processes. The article accurately raises the question of the considerable advantages derived from the use of the achievements in the field of light energy and the fast recovery of invested funds. The skeptics' pseudoscientific arguments about alleged insufficient knowledge of the internal mechanisms of the influence of light on nonchlorophyll tissues should not constitute an insurmountable barrier on the way to the extensive use of the methods of plant light energy in the national economy, for in the opposite case we may throw out the baby with the bath water."

Prof O. Ksenzhek, doctor of chemical sciences (Dnepropetrovsk Chemical Technology Institute), points out the prime significance of the study of the energy transforming function of plants writes the following: "If the light influence is extreme (concentrated high-intensity light, for instance), entirely unexpected results from the viewpoint of conventional concepts may occur. In his article, Prof Shakhov describes some such effects and the very encouraging prospects for their practical utilization. The new means of influencing plants, based on the use of intensive light are gradually gaining an increasing number of supporters and enthusiasts and becoming widespread. However, far more studies should be made on the role of nonphotosynthetic and thermophysical processes related to plant activities, the structure of the energy outplays by the plants for their own needs, etc., in order to determine the mechanisms governing such phenomena..."

M. Sivtsev, docent at the Plant Physiology Chair, Simferopol University, points out that "the author of the article approaches the photobiology and photoenergy of the vegetal cell from the position of systems analysis. This has led to the appearance of a new concept on the unity and interconnection among individual vital processes of the cellular membranes in the nontraditional influence of light on the nonphotosynthesizing structures."

Some textbooks and method recommendations already include the theory of light energy. Thus, the latest scientific achievements, including a special section on photoenergy, are described in the second edition of Prof S. I. Lebedev's textbook "Fiziologiya Rasteniy" [Plant Physiology] (Kolos, Moscow, 1982).

In the hands of knowledgeable specialists armed with progressive theory and practical experience, light becomes a powerful lever for drastically increasing agricultural production intensiveness and quality improvements, points out N. Lemeza, docent at the Belorussian University. He writes that the article was discussed at production conferences on possible trends of scientific activities at the biology faculty, related to the Food Program.

Belorussian scientist G. Dolbik warmly supports the ideas on light control of plant development presented in the article. The great importance of the fullest possible utilization of the "light reserve" in raising the level of agricultural production is entirely clear, he writes.

A similar viewpoint is expressed by Leningrad researcher B. Korzh, candidate of biological sciences, who notes that the profound further study of the mechanisms which stimulate plant productivity, involving pulse irradiation, will enable us to make fuller use of the established effect. "Without accepting all the theoretical stipulations presented in the article," he writes, "as a whole such studies must be considered progressive, for they result in substantial increases in crop yields with minor material outlays."

L. Bartosh (Minsk) and other readers agree on the fact that "the journal's editors have posed for public discussion the problem of ensuring the fast increase in crop yields, which awaits its resolution. I believe that Soviet science is able to resolve this major problem."

#### IV

Many readers are interested in problems related to the development of new light agricultural technology, its reliability, productivity, availability in experimental stations and farms and the production of various light pulse, laser and other systems for purposes of scientific research.

Aluminum semiparaboloid solar light concentrators were first developed in 1964 under the guidance of N. Lidorenko, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, who was granted authorship certificates in 1962-1964 for developing the technical basis of such concentrators. Unfortunately, so far their series production has not been organized, and no more than a few dozen of them have been manufactured.

The first experimental automated laser system for the irradiation of biological objects (LOBO-1), created in the country for the development of light energy research, was developed at the Moldavian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Applied Physics under the guidance of Academicians B. Lazarenko and N. Devyatkov, with A. Shakhov acting as a consultant, in 1972.

The first experimental prototype of the Ushkyn-1 machine was produced at the Ushkyn Student Design and Technological Bureau of the Kazakh Agricultural Institute, under the guidance of bureau chief R. Galiullin. It was on the basis of this system, the series production of which was not carried out, that improved KL -- "red beam" -- laser systems (red neon lamps combined with helium-neon laser) were created under the guidance of Professor V. Inyushin at the Kazakh University. They became the prototype for the Lvov-1 Elektronika systems manufactured in Lvov. V. Inyushin reports in his letter that these systems have been patented in the United States, Canada and other countries.

There is growing need for more light equipment.

However, many difficulties arise along this way. No facilities are available for assisting to the fullest extent the fastest possible progress of new ideas along the entire line from invention to mass production.

"Unfortunately, the Lvov-1 Elektronika system is not included in the system of machines for serial production," write A. Dovgan' and A. Shletgauer, sovkhos chief agronomists (Kustanay Oblast), although it is very needed, and all 1983 orders have already been filled."

The students at the progressive experience course in the use of lasers in agriculture (Lvov) point out in their collective letter the shortcomings of existing laser irradiation systems and ask for help in obtaining method publications, lecture courses and other aids related to laser stimulation.

A. Zasheylovskiy and I. Shtang note with satisfaction that in the course of the work on plant light energy conducted for the past 4 years in Vostochno-Kazakhstan Oblast close cooperation and a firm businesslike alliance have been achieved between production (Nikitinskiy Sovkhoz), science (the Biofizika Training-Science-Production Association, Kazakh University) and school (Secondary School imeni S. M. Kirov). The article enabled them to make a critical assessment of their work. The authors of the letter note that the information center and archives of the Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy failed to give them an exhaustive answer to the question of the use of laser systems in agriculture. A. Zasheylovskiy and I. Shtang believe that information on the subject should be stored in the "memory" of the exhibition's information center.

As we know, the problem of introducing something new is difficult, complex and troublesome. It frequently faces the resistance of those who have become accustomed to work as usual. The article mentions, among others, the "psychological barrier," which is difficult to surmount. Docent V. Yakobenchuk (Lvov) notes that people whose ambitions prevent them from seeing its advantages stand on the way of the new scientific-production trend. "One could understand them," V. Yakobenchuk goes on to say, "if instead of something that



is new they would contribute something even newer and more efficient. Unfortunately, all they can offer are words. Fortunately, however, there also are people such as V. F. Dobrik, first secretary of the Lvov Obkom, CP of the Ukraine, who help us steadily." In citing examples of yield increases under the influence of light energy, V. Yakobenchuk writes that "Therefore, it is worth working with lasers and believing in the science of plant light energy!"

A. Markov, raykom party secretary, expresses an interesting view in this connection: "It seems to us that we should apply as of now that which can already benefit our nationwide cause."

Using a number of convincing examples, A. Markov proves the advantages of laser technology. Thus, a set of laser agrotechnical methods was applied in the Kolkhoz imeni Lenin in Enbekshikazakhskiy Rayon, under the guidance of Prof V. Inyushin, yielding real economic results in excess of 150,000 rubles annually and producing hundreds of tons of additional goods. The writer emphasizes that the rayon's practical experience in the use of laser agrotechnology at the Kolkhoz imeni Lenin proves the practical need to organize a specialized agrotechnical laser service. We must now think of training and retraining cadres familiar with laser technology. This is an imperative of the times requiring the assistance of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and USSR Ministry of Agriculture. The time has come to organize centers for the repair of laser equipment and dosimetry by the rayon Sel'khoztekhnika. It is clear that the use of lasers in agriculture is one of the ways of the scientific and technical revolution in agriculture.

On the basis of his own experience in the use of laser equipment, Docent A. Bel'skiy (Sumy) claims that the difficulties in this area are caused by the sluggishness of some local and departmental managers. Some managers of farm-managing departments advise them to cancel their contracts with scientific or training institutes, arguing that the farms themselves could engage in applied work. They ignore, however, the fact that a researcher engaged in applied work takes into consideration a greater number of various factors which the practical worker may ignore.

In sharing his work experience in Sumy Oblast, A. Bel'skiy writes: "After reading the article 'Light and Grain,' I. G. Grintsov, first secretary of the Sumy CPSU Obkom, asked me and the personnel of the oblast agroindustrial association to report on our 5-year work results. He approved the positive results and gave us active help in expanding the use of crop seed laser irradiation. A centralized facility for seed irradiation and scientific research was opened with the facilities of our chair. The personnel includes an agronomist, a physical engineer, laboratory technicians, a driver and a vehicle equipped with a laser system. The oblast executive committee (V. A. Shevchenko, chairman) and the oblast agroindustrial association supported and approved the plan.

The question raised in the article on creating a specialized scientific-production association (NPO) was the topic of lively discussions. Thus, Candidate of Biological Sciences V. Bezuglov notes that the country has no scientific and production center for problems of plant light energy and that the large army of enthusiasts-researchers requires steady attention and

coordination of their work. Funds and specialists are needed to develop the theoretical foundations of plant light energy and scientists and agricultural production organizers must address themselves to this problem.

Many experimentation workers are studying plant photoenergy and the practical application of its results, writes Candidate of Biological Sciences V. Gorya, head of the plant physiology section at the Selektiya NPO (Bel'tsy, Moldavian SSR), frequently working on enthusiasm alone, squeezed by extreme economy of facilities and funds going to other topics and problems. The Selektiya NPO as well has done research on the use of IKSS in selection work. A number of promising strains of winter wheat, winter barley, soybeans and peas were developed and offered to selectioners, but the work had to be stopped because of lack of funds. The idea of establishing an independent scientific-production association on plant photoenergy is quite proper and timely.

The need for a scientific-production association on plant photoenergy is supported by many readers. Candidate of Technical Sciences V. Khazanov (Moscow) believes that such a center should be under the aegis of the USSR Ministry of Agriculture.

Along with the creation of NPOs the readers write about the organization of laboratories and scientific groups in various republics, krays and oblasts, the production of measuring equipment and high-efficiency light-pulse and laser systems, the need to organize courses on plant photoenergy in agricultural institutes, and seminars at the Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy.

Yu. Kolesnikov (Mytishchi), B. Divinskaya (Moscow) and others consider it useful to publicize achievements in light technology in plant growing and selection in order to provide specialists with more information on the new methods for improving farm productivity.

Scientists and specialists from various institutes write on the expediency of holding an all-union conference on plant photoenergy.

The Lvov Obkom, CP of the Ukraine, has agreed to convene such a conference.

In addition to the Lvov Oblast party committee, the Alma-Ata, Kuybyshev, Turgay, Perm, Sumy and other oblast party committees are providing great assistance in developing the use of light energy in upgrading farm crop yields.

According to M. Shakirov, first secretary of the Bashkir Oblast CPSU Committee, the republic is conducting experiments on laser seed stimulation and developing method systems for experimentation and industrial testing. Such research will be conducted at the Agricultural Scientific Research Institute and the Bashkir Pedagogical Institute.

More than 20 systems for presowing laser seed irradiation are being used experimentally, writes E. Salikh, Kurgan CPSU Obkom secretary. Future developments will depend on the results of such experimentation.

Experimental testing of systems for presowing seed laser irradiation has been initiated in Vologoda Oblast, reports M. Sychev, head of the CPSU obkom agriculture and food industry department. Such work is taking place in three farms and will be continued.

The large number of responses triggered by the article "Light and Grain" proves that the problems it discusses are of interest to many scientists and practical specialists. The readers' response proves that light energy ideas and methods are being developed in institutes and universities and tested and refined in the fields of kolkhozes and sovkhoses, experimental stations and selection nurseries, grain reception and industrial raw material centers and sugar refineries and bakeries.... Scientific research is continuing. A great deal of work lies ahead. Unquestionably, it must be energized in order to contribute to the fastest possible implementation of the Food Program.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2

WORKING CLASS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR BUILDING SOCIALISM AND ELIMINATION OF THE  
FASCIST THREAT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 1983 (signed to press 21 Sep 83)  
pp 119-122

[Review by Academician S. Tikhvinskiy of the book "Mezhdunarodnoye Rabosheye Dvizheniye. Voprosy Istorii i Teorii" [The International Worker Movement. Problems of History and Theory]. Academician B. N. Ponomarev chairman of the main editorial commission. Vol 5. "Sozidatel' Sotsializma, Borets Protiv Fashizma" [Builder of Socialism and Fighter Against Fascism]. S. S. Salychev responsible editor and head of authors' group. Mysl', Moscow, 1981, 750 pp]

[Text] The period from 1924 to 1945 was a time of historical accomplishments by the Soviet working class, sharpest class battles and struggle against fascism, upsurge of the national liberation movement and the great antifascist war of liberation. Socialism, which had won in the Soviet Union, brought with it new laws which refuted all the old concepts on the principles of social organization and development and had a tremendous impact on social processes in the capitalist world and on the nature of international relations. The interpretation of the laws of the historical process of that period faces researches with most difficult tasks, the more so since our ideological foes are engaged in a fierce polemic on the international significance of the victory of socialism in the USSR, the contribution of the Comintern to defending the interests of the working people and the struggle against fascism and war, the reasons for the division within the working class and the policy of the social democrats, and the nature of World War II and the role which the Soviet Union and the international working class played in it.

Vol 5 of the reviewed work provides convincing and truthful answers to such questions related to the class and party interests of the various sociopolitical forces. The authors faced a most difficult scientific and political task: based on extensive factual data, to provide an objective evaluation of one of the most important and crucial stages in the development of the world worker and communist movements and of mankind at large. The authors' decision not to cover equally all aspects of the activities of worker parties and organizations but to concentrate on the main motive factor of the epoch -- fulfillment by the proletariat of its historical mission -- is entirely justified.

The authors of this collective monograph consider the place and role of the working class in global developments through the lens of two of its universal

historical accomplishments: the building of the first socialist society in the world and the decisive contribution of the working class, represented above all by the state of victorious socialism, to saving civilization from fascism. Such a methodological approach makes it possible to discuss the main trend of social development and the role which the various classes and strata played in it, and to reach the level of broad historical summations.

In the course of that 20-year period the Soviet working class fulfilled the grandiose and difficult constructive task of the socialist revolution: it built a socialist society.

Ever since the 1920s bourgeois historiography has concentrated mainly on belittling the international significance of the building and victory of socialism in the USSR. When the groundlessness of the predictions of the failure of building socialism became obvious, the bourgeois historians began to speak of the "local" nature of the Soviet experience and its inapplicability in other countries, the developed capitalist states in particular. These concepts penetrated into the social democratic and revisionist ideology as well.

The work under review offers a convincing scientific refutation of such bourgeois, reformist and revisionist concepts. The imagination is enthralled by the greatness of the accomplishments of the Soviet working class in the course of industrialization, collectivization and the cultural revolution. The authors, who vividly describe the heroics of the building of socialism, at no point ignore the fact that, as it resolved its specific problems, the Soviet working class opened for mankind new horizons of social development.

The real problems of socialist construction have nothing in common with bourgeois speculations on "dictatorial ruling methods," "forced labor," and so on. Quite the opposite, as a result of the historical social changes which were made, such as the elimination of the exploitation of labor and unemployment, "the influence of economic coercion as a factor of labor discipline was objectively weakened" (p 29). Coercion was replaced by the increased conscientiousness of the working people. The elimination of coercion as the main factor of labor discipline is a universal historical change in the organization of public production. Whereas previously economic progress was the result of spontaneous development and material incentive and coercion were its main motive forces, the Soviet working class made conscientiousness the base of the organization of public labor. It proved through its toil that "the victory of the conscious over the spontaneous creates both an insurmountable revolutionary and unparalleled constructive energy" (p 31).

At the same time, the elimination of the uncontrolled nature of the production process as a result of planning opened tremendous opportunities for economic development. In that sense the Soviet five-year plans proved the existence of a new type of socioeconomic relations based not on the interest of individual classes but on the needs of the entire society. Under socialism economic growth is determined not by rivalry and fear of unemployment but by socialist competition, extensive participation of the working people in production management and organization of labor and scientific and technical progress. Socialist competition harnesses not the energy, mind and inventiveness of a small entrepreneurial stratum in helping the production process but the

million-strong masses and, in the final account, the entire society. This is one of the reasons for which the successes of the Soviet five-year plans stunned the entire world. During the 1920s and 1930s new socialist production relations were being actively developed in the Soviet Union. In the course of building socialism the Soviet state was becoming "the organizer of the constructive activities of society, and the head of a mass forward movement and high labor productivity" (p 32).

The role of the communist party, whose influence is based on its high moral reputation among the working people, increased with the expansion and intensification of the building of socialism in the USSR. Persuasion is the principal method of CPSU work. The enhanced role of the party ensures the gradual growth of state into social management and that of the state into "no state," to use V. I. Lenin's expression.

The awareness which the overwhelming mass of Soviet working people acquired of the laws of social development and the historically inevitable victory of socialism was of universal historical significance. This guaranteed, in Engels' words, the transition "from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom."

The Soviet working class will remain forever the pioneer in the creation of the new socialist society. However extensively the bourgeois ideologues may write about the "unique originality" of Russian conditions, it cannot be denied that the content of the Soviet experience knows of no national barriers and is relevant to the working people of all countries.

It would be impossible to overestimate the role of the victory of socialism in the USSR in global developments and the course of the class struggle in the capitalist countries. When socialism became reality sociohistorical practice began to open new paths for the dissemination of Marxism-Leninism. This tremendously contributed to the development of the revolutionary movement and the increased influence of socialist ideas. The example of successful building of socialism had a most beneficial influence on all social processes in the world. In particular, it exerted heavy pressure on the ruling classes in favor of making concessions to the demands of the working class and the democratic strata. It was above all under the influence of the Soviet experience that the programs of the worker and democratic forces included demands for planning and nationalization of production facilities and expanding social rights and instituting worker and democratic control in industry. This contributed to the rapprochement between the general democratic and social trend in the struggle, thus preparing the grounds for the hegemony of the working class in the democratic movement. The authors' indisputable conclusion is that "At that time the transformation of socialism from an ideal into reality was the most significant result of its irreversibility and the most important factor in its forward movement" (p 8).

The situation of the working class in the capitalist countries during that time was particularly difficult. In converting from a policy of primarily frontal attacks against the entire socialist movement to a divisive policy, which presumes a merciless struggle against the communists, on the one hand, and energizing its efforts in organizing a cooperation with the social

democrats, on the other, the bourgeoisies committed fresh reserves to the preservation of its rule, which was undermined with the appearance of the Soviet Union. Carried away by real or imaginary benefits offered by class cooperation, the social democratic leadership took with increasing firmness the positions of supporting the bourgeoisie in its struggle against the revolutionary proletariat. The revolutionary proletariat was unable immediately to find efficient means of counteracting the new bourgeois strategy. Consequently, "when the world economic crisis broke out and the real threat of fascism arose, no decisive change in ensuring the then necessary minimum worker class influence on the course of events in the capitalist world took place" (p 9).

However, it was precisely during that crucial moment that the historical purpose of the Comintern and the communist and worker movements as a whole was revealed in its entirety. In the circumstances marked by the advent of fascism the democratic potential of the bourgeoisie declined sharply and so did its ability to head the democratic struggle. The crisis of bourgeois democracy affected the social democrats who, having become dependent on bourgeois policies, showed confusion and hesitation in the face of fascism. The Comintern was the only one to arm the working class with the policy of the Popular Front, consistent with the requirements of the time, when the working class assumed the main burden of the struggle for democracy and social progress. This policy presumed the defense of bourgeois democratic freedoms and institutions with means which exceeded the framework of bourgeois democracy. It called for the struggle of the masses united in the Popular Front.

Although the Popular Front involved bourgeois supporters of democracy as well, it was led by the working class. The creation of the Popular Front indicated that the working class had begun to replace the bourgeoisie in leading the democratic movement. The popular fronts in Spain and France, although having failed to achieve their final objectives, were of great historical importance, for they had inflicted the first major defeats to fascism by indicating to all antifascist forces the general direction of the struggle.

In Latin America, Asia and Africa the working class had, "on the one hand, to separate itself from the petit bourgeois masses as a separate political force and, on the other, to cooperate with the national bourgeoisie in the struggle against colonialism" (p 9). Although the social democrats sympathized with the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries and were in favor of reforms aimed at easing their lot, they rejected the revolutionary forms of struggle, for which reason as a whole they remained outside the national liberation movement which took the path of revolution.

At the same time the Comintern and the communist parties began actively to participate in the organization of a working class in these areas as an autonomous political force and to involve it in the national liberation movement. By joining the struggle for national liberation the worker organizations motivated the bourgeoisie to assume firmer positions against imperialism, enriched with social requirements the program of the national liberation movement and introduced into it proletarian methods of struggle. Thanks to these efforts the worker movement became a truly global movement; the proletarian and national liberation forces merged within a single stream, eroding the foundations of the world imperialist system.

The results of the entire period of confrontation between the working class and the bourgeoisie were summed up during World War II.

The most important one was the fact that not the bourgeoisie but the working class had a determining impact on the nature of the war, thanks to which the war which had been started by the imperialists as unfair and aggressive turned into an antifascist war of liberation. The main credit for this goes to the Soviet working class. To begin with, the participation in the war of the Soviet Union, which accepted the main strike of the fascist group, ensured the progressive content of the program of the anti-Hitlerite coalition. Secondly, the decisive contribution which the country of victorious socialism made to the defeat of the fascist Axis tremendously enhanced the prestige of the working class and contributed to the adoption of its strategy and tactics in the struggle against fascism by all antifascist forces.

Bearing in mind that not simply two countries but two socioeconomic systems clashed on the Soviet-German front, the victory of Soviet arms was of tremendous ideological and political importance. It proved the military, economic, political and ideological superiority of the socialist society over both fascism and capitalism as whole and helped the penetration of the socialist ideals among the broadest possible social strata and in even the most remote corners on earth.

The authors draw the profoundly substantiated conclusion that the "Vanguard role of the Soviet Union and the international working class in the anti-fascist war of liberation reflected a profound law governing the development of society in the new historical age" (p 725). On the one hand, the war revealed the noticeably reduced democratic strength of the bourgeoisie, only a certain part of which participated in the antifascist struggle. However, even the bourgeois faction which had joined the antifascist camp showed major hesitations, opposing, in particular, the waging of a broad popular war against the fascist occupation forces. On the other hand, the workers were the most active in the antifascist movement and the policy of their revolutionary vanguard -- the communist parties -- was highly consistent with the objectives of the antifascist liberation war. The leading position of the communist parties which supported this line strengthened with the growth of antifascist activities into a broad people's war against the aggressors.

The sober analysis of the activities of the communist parties includes elements of severe self-criticism which, however, makes their historical merits and the fact that it was precisely their general line which was fully consistent with the profound requirements of social development the more convincing. The building of socialism in the USSR, the course of working class unity, the strategy and tactics in the antifascist struggle and proletarian internationalism were all accomplishments of the land of the soviets, the Comintern and the communist parties, which made an invaluable contribution to the implementation of the proletariat's universal historical mission. "In this sense the policy of the Soviet Union and the communist movement reflected the main trend in the further progress of the international working class toward its great objectives..." (p 12).



The authors convincingly refute the fabrications of bourgeois and revisionist ideologues to the effect that the communist parties are responsible for the division within the international worker movement. The monograph convincingly proves that anticommunism is the result not of Comintern policy but of the reformist policy of class cooperation. The groundlessness of claims according to which the split in the worker movement was the main reason for the turn of the social democrats to the right, the purpose of which is to blame the communists for this development, becomes obvious in this light.

Particularly noteworthy is the study of the historical experience of the internationalist activities of the working class. It would be impossible to overestimate the credit owed the Communist International in the education of the working people in a spirit of proletarian internationalism and the exposure of the fascist menace long before the outbreak of World War II. The significance of proletarian internationalism became particularly clear during the war, when it not only helped the working class to preserve its unity on an antifascist basis but became a powerful unifying factor for the broadest possible antifascist masses, including the faction of the patriotic bourgeoisie. The communists in the colonial and dependent countries played an outstanding role in this movement in keeping the national liberation movement in the antifascist course and preventing the explosion of nationalistic feelings to obscure the main danger originating in Japan and Germany.

Said historical lessons prove that proletarian internationalism, which was born of the class unity of the workers, is consistent with the broader interests of social development. The socialist country was the reliable bulwark of all working people, democrats and forces fighting for social, political and national liberation and the communists' support of the Soviet Union was not based in the least on narrow party positions (as the bourgeois propagandists claim), but on a feeling of high responsibility for the fate of the revolution, democracy and mankind. The truly internationalist attitude toward the country of victorious socialism seriously prepared the communist movement for its role of vanguard in the antifascist liberation war: "...The decisive role which the Soviet Union played in the antifascist war of liberation proved the historical accuracy of the foreign policy course of the communist movement and inspired the antifascist forces to join in supporting the Soviet Union as a step consistent with the interests of the international proletariat and social progress the world over" (p 729).

This historically proven conclusion irrefutably confirms that proletarian internationalism has tremendous vitality and a great future as a powerful motive force in social development.

The publication of the fifth volume of this work adds to Soviet historical science a fundamental study which is a substantial contribution to the study of the history of the communist and worker movements and a powerful theoretical weapon in the ideological struggle against the enemies of socialism and in defending the revolutionary line in the international worker movement.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## COMMUNIST PARTY AND PEOPLE'S SOVEREIGNTY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83)  
pp 123-127

[Review by Candidate of Historical Sciences I. Rozhko of the following books: 1. "Partiya i Sovety" [The Party and the Soviets]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 255 pp; 2. "Partiynoye Rukovodstvo Sovetami" [The Party's Leadership of the Soviets], by G. B. Khakalo. Based on the materials of the the Belorussian Communist Party. Belarus', Minsk, 1981, 208 pp; 3. "Sotsialisticheskoye Obshchenarodnoye Gosudarstvo" [The Socialist State of the Whole People] (in the light of the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress), by A. I. Denisov and S. A. Radzhabov. Donish, Dushanbe, 1982, 355 pp; 4. "Sovershenstvovaniye Sovetskoy Gosudarstvennosti i Demokratii" [Advancement of Soviet Statehood and Democracy], by Ye. M. Kovesnikov. Mysl', Moscow, 1982, 216 pp]

[Text] Communist party leadership is the most important prerequisite for the implementation of the CPSU Leninist course of expanding and intensifying socialist democracy. The party directs the development of the Soviet political system and ensures its integrity, stability and efficient organization in the work of all of its components. It performs its tasks both directly and through the soviets and the other state organs and social organizations, comprehensively developing and encouraging their creative initiatives.

Many works written by historians, philosophers and jurists study the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party in the socialist society. They study and sum up its comprehensive historical experience in the creation, consolidation and advancement of the organs of people's sovereignty and the strengthening and development of socialist statehood and democracy. The publication of each such work draws the close attention of social scientists, party and soviet workers and broad public circles. For this reason books on this topic, published by some central and republic publishing houses on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the USSR are of unquestionable interest.

Based on the stipulations and conclusions of the founders of scientific communism, the resolutions of party congresses and conferences and Central Committee plenums, the new USSR Constitution and the latest achievements of Soviet historical, economic, philosophical and legal thinking, these books comprehensively analyze a number of basic problems of party and state construction of obvious political relevance and practical significance. Despite their comprehensiveness and differences in the level of scientific

summation and degree of saturation with factual data, they share a great deal of common features in terms of the creative intentions of their authors and the solutions of the problems they pose.

The study of the nature, forms and methods of party leadership of the soviets, the characterization of the Leninist principles governing the interrelationship between the party and the organs of the people's sovereignty and the other units within the Soviet political system, and their application and creative practical enrichment plays one of the main roles in these works. Such problems are most extensively discussed in (1), which was written by a group of scientists headed by Dr of Historical Sciences Prof B. M. Morozov, and in (2). The authors proceed from the basic stipulation that the leading role of the communist party is an overall law in the building of socialism and communism and a basic principle governing the functioning of the entire socialist political system. The party is the nucleus of this system. It guarantees the development of socialist democracy, the optimality of its forms and social efficiency and the efficiency of the entire mechanism of popular sovereignty. The historical experience of a number of socialist countries clearly confirms that any weakening or lowering of the party's leading role in a socialist society threatens the very existence of the new system.

The parts describing the outstanding role of the CPSU in the establishment of the organs of the new socialist state system and the party's activities aimed at improving the structure, style and means and methods of their work are very interesting. The authors accurately note that during the first years of the Soviet system the communist party lacked experience in running the country. Life itself was to develop the specific forms of organization of the socialist society. A wise and perspicacious policy, inflexible firmness and organization and firm faith in its own strength and the strength of the people were asked of the party. During those years the creativity of the party members, who awakened the initiative of the broad masses, created many valuable means and methods of soviet work, most of which are applied to this day.

The works offer comprehensive descriptions of the process of democratization of state and sociopolitical life in the land of the soviets during all the stages in its development. The authors emphasize that while improving and perfecting democracy in the course of building socialism and communism, the party follows a strict class line and takes into consideration specific historical circumstances, such as the level of development of production forces and culture, the historical and political traditions of the country, the material well-being reached by the working people, the level of their consciousness and education and the country's international situation (see (1), p 58).

The thought that unity between party and people is a prerequisite for the victory of socialism and the source of its invincible strength runs throughout the works under review. It is only the communist party, armed with progressive theory and tremendous historical experience in the struggle for socialism and communism, which can address itself directly to the toiling masses, be able to see the difficulties and unresolved problems which inevitably arise among the pioneers of the new society, and concentrate and direct promptly the energy and enthusiasm of the masses toward the successful solution of the

problems facing society and the state. The authors substantiate the thesis that the development of Soviet democracy is inseparately related to the greater leading role of the working class and its vanguard, the communist party. In describing the nationwide nature of the party today, the researchers accurately note that, after ensuring the creation of a developed socialist society, the CPSU became the party of the whole Soviet people as a new historical, social and international community. "This means," Ye. M. Koveshnikov writes, "that the social base of the party has broadened to the level of the entire society, the whole people; the ideology of the working class and its party -- Marxism-Leninism -- has become the ideology of the whole people, and the final objective, the building of communism, has become the objective of the whole people. This is not to say, however, that the party has lost its class nature. In terms of its essence and social nature and throughout its entire existence the communist party has remained the party of the working class" (p 114).

The books under review discuss in sufficient detail the specific nature of the party's leadership of the organs of socialist democracy, the basic principles of which were already drafted during V. I. Lenin's life. They emphasize that in Soviet society the party and the state, and the party and state organs cannot be considered one and the same. The party does not assume the function of the soviets, the trade unions and the other state and public organizations (as the foes of socialism claim), but directs them politically. The party's directives in the areas of improving socialist statehood and strengthening its legal foundations are based on science. They are profoundly national and have a tremendous organizing force. They do not restrict the realm of activities of the Soviet organs or stifle their initiative but, conversely, comprehensively contribute to their development.

Coordinated, purposeful and efficient activities and progress are impossible without party directives which provide clear guidelines, introduce political principles in soviet work and stimulate the activeness and creative initiative of the organs of the people's power. The party's leadership of the soviets is expressed also in the fact, the authors note, that the party is in charge of the selection, placement, training and upbringing of soviet cadres. The most experienced and authoritative representatives of the party are also members of elective state power organs. The CPSU considers the steady strengthening of the soviets with leading personnel in step with the new tasks and the growing scale of communist construction a necessary prerequisite for increasing the role and activeness of soviets on all levels (see (1), pp 8, 78 and 211-225; (2), pp 4-6 and 11-30; and (3), pp 179 and 207).

The authors discuss in detail the various stages of development of the Soviet state and socialist democracy, the specifics of the growth of the statehood of the working class into socialist statehood of the whole people, the nature, content, tasks, functions and objectives of the state of the whole people, and the ways leading to its further strengthening and development.

Real socialism leads to the universalization of democracy, i.e., it introduces it into all areas of economic, political, social and cultural life. Under socialist conditions, as the authors point out, democracy is exercised with the help of the entire socialist political system, above all through the

state, which act as an important tool in building socialism and communism. In the developed socialist society the state acts as the political organization of the whole people. The overall interpretation of the nature of the state of the whole people by the authors is accurate and of great interest. Thus, A. I. Denisov and S. A. Radzhabov substantiate the thesis that, as a component of the political system of society during the period of developed socialism, the state of the whole people is a class society. In other words the state has not lost its basic feature -- its specific class nature -- by becoming a state of the whole people (see pp 29 and 87-96).

The class nature of the state is determined by its ability and purpose of serving the ideals of a specific class and acting as an instrument in the implementation of its immediate and final objectives. Here again, as an expression of its class nature, the state of the whole people "expresses the interests and will of the workers, peasants and intellectuals, of the working people of all nations and nationalities of the entire country; relies on the sociopolitical unity of the people, based on the Marxist-Leninist ideology of the working class; wages a class struggle against imperialism and systematically implements the principles of proletarian internationalism; and sets as its end objective the building of communism, i.e., the implementation of the ideals of the working class" ((4), p 60).

An unquestionable merit of the works is their historical approach to the problems of the extensive participation of the working people in the administration of the state. They note that the political system in Soviet society, which embodies true democracy in our country, creates the necessary conditions for the initiative-minded, competent and continuing participation of the citizens in the management of governmental and social affairs. Worthy of support in this connection is the authors' view that the most important criterion of the level of development reached by socialist democracy is the level of active participation of the people's masses in social, governmental and production management (see (1), pp 11 and 41-42); (2) pp 73 and 104-105; (3), pp 172-173 and 187-200; and (4), pp 97-99). Such is actually the case.

Socialist democracy is a widening system of mass management and control. The authors acquaint the readers with the tremendous experience gained in the land of the soviets in involving the masses in the daily management of governmental and social affairs. This experience was summed up and legislatively codified in the new USSR Constitution. Today the Soviet state numbers some 2.3 million people's deputies, more than 31 million members of the public aktiv of the soviets and numerous activists in party, trade union, Komsomol and cooperative organizations, people's control organs and permanent production conferences at enterprises. It is thus, the authors emphasize, that in the course of building socialism and communism in our country, efficient methods for involving the toiling masses in management and control have been developed. All that is needed is their suitable utilization.

The further expansion and intensification of socialist democracy and the active involvement of the toiling masses in management is the principled course pursued by our party in the development of the political system of Soviet society. This course is steadily implemented. In his report to the joint ceremonious session of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet

and RFSFR Supreme Soviet on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the USSR, Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, noted that "The increasingly broader participation of the working people of all nationalities in the administration of social and governmental affairs is the most concise characterization of the leading trend in our political life."

The works discuss extensively representative and direct democracy in the USSR. Elections for state power organs are a mass form of direct participation by the citizens in administering the affairs of the socialist state. However, the holding of such elections, as the authors convincingly prove, does not terminate the connection between voters and representative authorities. This is one of the most important features of socialist democracy. The Marxist-Leninist concept proceeds from the fact that elections are the base of extensive governmental by the deputies in accordance with the will and under the control of the voters. In a truly democratic society, the voters are not petitioners and the deputies benefactors placed above the people. The voters issue instructions to their deputies. Soviet democracy offers all Soviet citizens the opportunity of loudly stating what must be accomplished.

Participation in state administration is not exclusively the occupation of people in elective or appointive positions. It also involves citizens' assistance and universal control. As the authors of the works under review convincingly prove, Soviet democracy involves a great variety of forms of citizens' participation in management. Our country is implementing Lenin's behest to the effect that "every representative of the masses and every individual citizen must be able to participate in discussions on state laws, elections of his representatives and implementation of state laws" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 157). Soviet democracy also presumes an active individual life stance: personal intervention and involvement with the common cause, individual initiative and individual responsibility for improving matters in the labor collective, the microrayon and the country. The Soviet people are interested in improvements in industry, transportation, trade, public catering, health care and communal services and in having proper order and organization everywhere and in all matters. This demands of every one a feeling of direct involvement in resolving social affairs. "Improving organization in all sectors of material and spiritual production and strengthening labor discipline," (3) justifiably points out, "is a mandatory condition for the successful implementation of plans for economic and social development and further growth of the population's well-being" (p 206).

Particularly interesting is the description of some trends in the development of the socialist statehood of the whole people into social communist self-administration. The authors justifiably point out that the main trend in this process today is the strengthening and development of the state of the whole people and the development of socialist democracy. What does the strengthening and development of the state mean? The answer to this question is found in Ye. M. Koveshnikov's book (pp 10-11 and 207-214). Researchers have substantiated the fact that those who believe that the characteristic feature of Soviet democracy at the present stage is a growing process of merger among state and social organizations and their organs, leading to social communist self-management and, consequently, the withering away of the state, are

anticipating events. During the period of developed socialism the need for a state and its specialized functions remains, for not every one has already learned to work for the good of society like a communist, without general mandatory labor and consumption norms. The necessary economic conditions to this effect are not present and stricter social discipline has not as yet become every one's habit and inner need. The state is needed also in order to protect the gains of the working people from imperialist infringements. The state, as the authors point out, will wither away only under full communism, having become socially unnecessary. The withering away process, however, is a lengthy historical period related to the creation of the necessary economic, social, political and spiritual prerequisites and the existence of favorable international conditions. The socialist state will play a most important role in the organization of the new society until the full and definitive victory of communism.

Unquestionably, the views expressed by the authors on the future development of Soviet statehood are noteworthy. It is true that it would be erroneous to shift to the state of the whole people at its present development stage the features which it may acquire only in the future. It is premature to speak today of the withering away of the Soviet state, something which can happen only in the distant future. Under contemporary conditions the process of development and strengthening of the state of the whole people is continuing steadily. In his speech at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said that "As to the more distant future, we, the communists, conceive of it as the gradual development of Soviet statehood into social self-management. In our view, this will take place through the further development of the state of the whole people and the broader involvement of the masses in the management of social affairs.

"Clearly, this process will not take place by itself or by virtue of one's good will. It will be based on the material possibilities of the society and the level of political consciousness and culture of the masses. It is very important to realize and remember this. We must proceed on the basis of life instead of inventing in the abstract further ways and means of democratic development. This guarantees the realistic nature of our programs."

The authors profoundly substantiate the thesis that the essence of socialist democracy and its humanism are most clearly manifested in the rights and freedoms of the citizens and their guaranteed observance. As we know, sharp discussions are taking place on the subject of "socialism and human rights," in the course of which our ideological foes are doing everything possible to misrepresent it. Suffice it to refer to the slanderous campaign of unprecedented scale and organization "in defense of human rights," mounted by U.S. imperialist circles. The books under review contain convincing data opposing the various falsifiers and substantiatedly refuting false claims on "the suppression of the individual under socialism."

The authors extensively describe the constitutional rights, freedoms and obligations of Soviet citizens, viewed through the lens of the interrelationship between the state and the individual in the mature socialist society. They emphasize that rights and freedoms, together with corresponding obligations and their real nature and guarantees, are a measure of socialist

democracy. Rights presume obligations, while freedoms presume discipline and responsibility. The greatest social advantages of the socialist regime and the guarantee of its successful development toward communism consist precisely of the organic combination of the rights and obligations of the citizens and the interests of society and the individual (see (3), pp 270-271, 307-308 and 346-352; (4), pp 203-206).

Improving the legal foundations of socialist society is an important aspect of its further development. This matter is discussed in detail in (4) (see pp 169-186). The author emphasizes that the further strengthening of the legal foundations of governmental and social life necessarily presumes the precise and firm observance of Soviet laws and all legal stipulations. The practice of building socialism and communism convincingly proves that the broader and more complex are the tasks facing society, the more important it is for this society to be organized and to maintain efficient order and discipline. No violations of legal and communist morality norms in Soviet society can be tolerated. Any violation of socialist law and order, rules of socialist community life and discipline radically violates the principles of the Soviet way of life. Exceptionally important in this respect is the implementation of the stipulations of the November 1982 and June 1983 CPSU Central Committee plenums and the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU Decree "On Intensifying work for Strengthening Socialist Labor Discipline." This is an urgent demand of life.

These interesting books are not, however, deprived of some shortcomings. Thus, not all questions are discussed with the same depth and thoroughness. Some of the authors' ideas are incomplete and debatable. Topics are frequently discussed merely as formulations of problems. For example, much greater attention should have been paid to the study of the general functions of the socialist political system as an integral social feature during all its historical development stages and the correlation between the functions of the Soviet political system and those of its individual units (party, state and social organizations, and labor collectives). The new efficient methods for involving the working people in the administration of governmental and social affairs, which have evolved in recent years, should have been described more extensively, particularly those used on the local level. These isolated remarks, however, do not lower the scientific value of these books in the least. As a whole, they are a noteworthy contribution to the development of the topical problems of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state and help us to understand better the unquestionable advantages of socialist democracy.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2



#### SHORT BOOK REVIEW

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 2] Sep 83)  
pp 127-128

[Text] "Ot Marksa do Nashikh Dney. (Istoricheskiye Traditsii Proletarskogo Internatsionalizma)" [From Marx to the Present. (The Historical Traditions of Proletarian Internationalism)]. In two volumes. Mysl', Moscow, 1982. Vol 1, 292 pp; vol 2, 284 pp.  
Reviewed by Dr of Historical Sciences B. Ayzin.

Proletarian internationalism is the most important motive force in the world revolutionary process and one of the decisive factors of human progress. The materials of the two-volume monograph written by a group of authors most clearly confirms the concept that proletarian internationalism, the aspiration of the workers for unity and combat solidarity, nationally and internationally, is the basic characteristic of the worker movement and its objective law. The reader will find in this book almost or totally unknown facts and vivid and impressive examples of the international worker unity, cohesion and fraternal mutual support in the course of the gravest class battles of the 19th and 20th centuries. The deep historical roots of proletarian internationalism and its principles are traced step by step.

At the very dawn of the international worker movement, K. Marx and F. Engels, who armed the workers with the knowledge of the laws of the class struggle, comprehensively substantiated the conclusion of the need for international proletarian unity. Their slogan "Workers of the World, Unite!" has not lost its revolutionizing and mobilizing force to this day. This Marxist tradition was adopted and developed under the conditions of the new historical epoch by V. I. Lenin, the bolshevik party and the contemporary communist movement.

The authors have paid close attention to describing the great internationalist exploit of the Russian proletariat and the Soviet people, and to their invaluable contribution to the global revolutionary process.

The book cites facts confirming the tremendous international impact of the October Revolution, the fraternal solidarity shown by the working people abroad, their help to the young state of workers and peasants and the inspiring ideas of the October Revolution and the powerful upsurge of the revolutionary movement in the world. The contemporary communist movement and the Communist International were born on the crest of this upsurge. Several

chapters deal with the tremendous role of the Third International in the establishment of the international communist movement and the elaboration of its internationalist strategy and tactics.

The authors emphasize the greatness of our country's exploit in World War II. Today as well the Soviet people are making their decisive contribution to the preservation of peace, while the aggressive imperialist circles headed by U.S. imperialism are starting a new round in the arms race and leading the world to the brink of nuclear war. The antiwar internationalist traditions of the worker and communist movements become particularly relevant under contemporary conditions.

The authors cite extensive data on the content of the Marxist-Leninist policy of proletarian internationalism today. This policy is purposefully aimed at the comprehensive strengthening of the unity of the world communist movement and unifying the members of the socialist commonwealth on the basis of the principles of socialist internationalism, support of national liberation and revolutionary democratic anti-imperialism movements and the close unification of the three currents of the global revolutionary process. Proletarian and socialist internationalism, the authors stress, covers today increasingly broader toiling masses and social strata. This is a clear manifestation of the leading role of the working class in contemporary society. A necessary and valuable work has been added to our literature with the publication of this two-volume book which recreates the overall picture of the development of the theory and practice of proletarian internationalism.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83) p 128

[Text] 1. "Ocherki po Istorii 'Kapitala' K. Marksa" [Essays on the History of "Das Kapital" by Karl Marx]. Edited by V. S. Vygodskiy, A. I. Malysh, M. P. Mchedlov et al. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 380 pp.

2. "Leniniana." Bibliographic index of V. I. Lenin's works and works about him. Vol 6. "Literature on V. I. Lenin's Life and Activities, 1968-1971." Part 1. April 1870-October 1917. D. I. Antonyuk et al. editors. Kniga, Moscow, 1983, 453 pp.

3. "Radi Mira na Zemle" [For the Sake of Peace on Earth]. The Soviet Peace Program for the 1980s in action. Materials and documents. A. M. Aleksandrov responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 496 pp.

4. "Spravochnik Partiyogo Rabotnika" [The Party Worker's Reference Book]. Issue No 23. Edited by K. M. Bogolyubov, P. G. Mishunin, Ye. Z. Razumov, Ya. V. Storozhev and N. V. Tropkin. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 623 pp.

5. "Ateisticheskiy Slovar'" [Atheistic Dictionary]. By a group of authors, M. P. Novikov general editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 559 pp.

6. Amendola, D. "Vybor na Vsyu Zhizn'" [Lifetime Choice]. Recollections. Abridged translation from the Italian by G. P. Smirnov and L. B. Filatova. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 367 pp with illustrations.

7. Demin, V. N. "Osnovnoy Printsip Materializma" [The Fundamental Principle of Materialism]. The principle of materialness and its role in scientific knowledge. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 239 pp (On what philosophers work and argue).

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2

OBITUARY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 83 (signed to press 21 Sep 83) p 128

[Text] The editors of KOMMUNIST, theoretical and political journal of the CPSU Central Committee, announce with deep sorrow the death, after a severe illness, of

Yakov Mikhaylovich Borisov

Great Patriotic War veteran, oldest worker at the "Pravda" Publishing House of the CPSU Central Committee, who worked for almost 30 years as KOMMUNIST technical editor, and express their sincere condolences to the family and relatives of the deceased.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/2

END