

075040

JPRS-UKO-84-004

23 JANUARY 1984

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 16, NOVEMBER 1983

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19990916 103

F B I S

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.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

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

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

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

23 January 1984

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 16, November 1983

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

CONTENTS

Our Strength Lies in Unity	1
Yu. V. Andropov Replies to Questions From the Newspaper PRAVDA	12
Intraparty Democracy in Action (D. Kunayev)	16
Karl Marx and India's Rebirth (Hiren Mukerjee)	28
Effect of an Initiative (V. Petrov)	37
Incentives for Innovation (L. Gol'din)	51
Battle for the Dnepr (K. Moskalenko)	64
Worker's Deputy (V. Arkhipenko)	78
Remarkable Son of the British Working Class (V. Zaytsev)	90
Party of Patriots and Internationalists (Alvaro Cunhal)	98
In the Interests of Peace and Cooperation in Europe (Yu. Rakhmaninov)	110

Fifty Years of Many Difficulties (Yu. Molchanov)	120
Grenada--Victim of U.S. Imperialist Aggression (D. Murav'yev)	125
Main Motive and Mobilizing Force of the Revolutionary Struggle (V. Bushuyev)	130
On the Path Laid by the Great October (I. Mel'nikova)	142
At the Sources of a Young Scientific Trend (V. Andreyev)	145
Publicists' Quest	150
Short Book Reviews (I. Mochalov)	156
Bookshelf	158

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 16
November 1983

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R.I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : November 1983

Signed to press : 4 November 1983

Copies : 835,000

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

OUR STRENGTH LIES IN UNITY

PMO11430 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (Signed to Press 4 Nov 83)
pp 3-12

[Editorial]

[Text] This year, which has been celebrated in the political calendar of communists and all progressive people of the world as the year of Karl Marx, we have with enhanced exactingness and responsibility been measuring our activity and our every step against the immortal Marxist-Leninist teaching.

It is with particularly heightened feelings and intellect that communists are turning to the military political behest of Marx and Engels: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!"

Capitalism is an international force, and it can be vanquished only by uniting the strength of the working people of different peoples and countries, Lenin taught. This truth is more typical than ever now. Losing in the historical competition with real socialism, imperialism has declared a "crusade" against it and is pushing mankind toward the point at which the question of the very existence of civilization and life on earth is being resolved.

Today there is nothing more important than eliminating the threat of war and keeping the world from sliding into the nuclear abyss. The leading force in the struggle for this is world socialism.

And its response to the aggressive intrigues of imperialism is the further consolidation of the socialist community's unity and economic and defense potential. "The prime concern of our party," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov stressed at the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "will continue to be the consolidation of the socialist community. In unity lies our strength, the guarantee of ultimate success even in the gravest ordeals."

The community of socialist states is a powerful organism playing a tremendous and beneficial role in the world today.

The unity of the fraternal socialist countries and their readiness to act together to avert nuclear war have been graphically reflected in a number of their recent joint actions and initiatives. They have included in the 1983 annals a number of large-scale actions to normalize the world political climate. At the January conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative

Committee in Prague these states' top leaders, comparing their views of the internationalist situation, jointly mapped out their line for the future and, in their political declaration, put forward a real alternative to the drift toward nuclear catastrophe. Special importance attaches to the socialist countries' proposal to conclude a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations between the two military-political groupings--the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

The Political Consultative Committee conference took place in the spirit of the fraternal traditions that have formed between the socialist countries. It was fruitful and frank and its work was dominated by the desire for cohesion and for the intensification of mutual understanding and the coordination of foreign-policy actions. The Political Consultative Committee conference showed that under present conditions there is an increase in the role of the socialist states' all-round cooperation, their joint struggle for common aims in the world arena, their exchange of socialist and community building experience, and the coordination of their efforts in economy, science, and technology.

The meeting of leading party and state figures of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and the CSSR in Moscow in late June confirmed the assessments and conclusions of the Prague political declaration. The joint statement adopted at the meeting reaffirmed the unity of the approach of the fraternal parties and states to assessment of the present international situation and their desire to pool their efforts to avert the threat of war and consolidate peace and the peoples' security. That is particularly important now that the United States and several of its allies are openly seeking military superiority over the socialist countries. It was emphasized that, proceeding from the interests of peace and their own security, the community states will in no circumstance allow military superiority over themselves. They have no right to risk the gains of socialism and the peoples' constructive labor by making them dependent on the "peace-loving" statements of the instigators of the nuclear arms race. The true worth of imperialism's policy and its attitude toward socialism is well known and the tragedy to which the "appeasement" of the fascist aggressor led will never be erased from the peoples' memory. The socialist community countries have been able to achieve military equilibrium with the United States and NATO. And any attempts to break this equilibrium by deploying new U.S. missiles in Europe are futile and will meet with appropriate retaliatory measures.

In connection with the completion of preparation for these missiles' deployment the Soviet Union has been obliged to take additional steps to safeguard both its own security and that of its Warsaw Pact allies. Under an accord between the USSR, GDR and CSSR governments, preliminary work is being initiated on the territory of the GDR and Czechoslovakia for the deployment of tactical operational missile complexes.

For over 25 years now the socialist countries have been reliably defended by their defense and political alliance--the Warsaw Pact. It is worth recalling once more that it was signed 6 years after formation of the NATO bloc and that its emergence was generated by the need to organize a reliable system

for collective defense and safeguarding of the security of the socialist states. The development of world events obliges them to be seriously concerned about maintaining their defense capability at the proper level and enhancing the Joint Armed Forces' combat capability and combat readiness. To this end the military cooperation between the allied states and their armies is being comprehensively developed and coordination of efforts is being improved on questions of military buildup and the pursuit of a unified military-technical policy.

The fraternal parties attach great importance to the coordination of their political, ideological, and information and propaganda work aimed against the arms race and at the safeguarding of peace. Thus, the September conference of Central Committee secretaries for international and ideological matters discussed further steps to implement the ideas and proposals of the Prague conference and the Moscow meeting. It emphasized the need to reveal in depth and comprehensively the meaning and significance of the socialist states' peace initiatives. Those taking part in the meeting drew attention to the importance of joint or parallel actions by all socialist countries and of expanded dialogue between different political and social forces aware of the reality of the threat of a nuclear conflict.

The past few weeks have been marked by the further buildup of the fraternal countries' efforts toward all-around consolidation of their cooperation. Sessions of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee and Defense Ministers Committee have been held in Sofia and Berlin. The latest CEMA session, the 37th, was held in the GDR capital. The statement adopted by the heads of government of the countries belonging to that organization analyzed the pernicious consequences of the unprecedented arms race for mankind and reaffirmed the unaltered line of the fraternal socialist countries toward preventing further escalation of the arms race and preserving peace and developing cooperation among the peoples.

New, bold, and constructive decisions indicating a way out of the deadlock in which the Geneva talks have found themselves through the West's fault were formulated in Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's replies to PRAVDA's questions.

The broad package of proposals put forward in the Prague Political Declaration, the Moscow conference statement, and other joint and individual statements by the Warsaw Pact states is a real program for preventing a nuclear catastrophe and returning the world to the path of the relaxation of the international tension. That is how they are assessed by the peoples and all progressive and peace-loving forces.

The development of world events attests that the importance and topicality of the socialist community countries' proposals and initiatives are retained in full.

Imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism, is taking ever new steps in the arms race, is toughening its policy of strength and diktat, is fanning old embers of tension and creating new ones, as is borne out by the U.S. warmongers' recent bandit attack on independent Grenada, is resorting to provocative acts with a view to poisoning the international atmosphere still

further, and is building up interference in states' internal affairs. In particular it is casting doubt on the territorial and political results of World War II and postwar development, which directly affects the interests of a number of European socialist countries.

To realize his "ideal dream"--to weaken and if possible split the socialist community, sowing discord among its peoples and parties--our class adversary is mobilizing a broad arsenal of weapons: from hostile actions of a political and economic nature, boycotts and sanctions, acts of ideological subversion, and propagandist aggression to direct subversive actions and other methods impermissible in the practice of interstate contact.

Imperialism's counterrevolutionary policy appears in its finished, graphic, or what we may term "laboratory" form with respect to Poland, which it has chosen as a kind of cold war test area. This country is being "penalized" for not deviating from the path of socialism and for increasingly developing and strengthening its fraternal allied relations with the USSR and other states of the community of which it has been, is, and will be an inalienable part. This latter fact has frequently been stressed by the Polish leadership and stated on behalf of its allies--the Warsaw Pact countries.

By its words and deeds the socialist community has frequently proved that it can successfully tackle everything preventing its advance and menacing socialism's values and gains. No one may repeal the laws of social development and reverse the movement of history. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and socialism as a social system live and will live and develop, and the future belongs to them. The place for those who are encroaching on socialist gains is the ash heap of history. This reminder of great political force and scientific profundity is contained in the statement by Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Filled with realism and profound responsibility for the destiny of peace, it instills faith in reason and in the ability of our planet's people to pool their efforts in the struggle for man's existence.

Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's statement gave a clear class analysis of the situation which has taken shape in the world, a principled assessment of the present U.S. Administration's militarist course, and a fitting refutation of the crude fabrications and malicious attacks on the USSR and the other socialist community countries. In the fraternal countries the statement was welcomed as a document of enormous importance revealing profoundly and comprehensively the foreign policy course of all world socialism, and it has met with broad response and support from the working people.

Socialism's powerful peace offensive is the result of the strenuous efforts of the ruling communist and workers parties and their tireless concern for improving and enhancing the effectiveness of the fraternal countries' all-round cooperation.

The multifaceted mechanism of our community's cooperation encompasses the Warsaw Pact Organization, CEMA, and the system of bilateral treaties on

friendship, cooperation and mutual aid. Bilateral and multilateral summit meetings are held regularly during which the most important questions of relations between the socialist states and topical problems of international politics are examined and resolved. International, ideological and party organizational questions are discussed at conferences of the fraternal parties' Central Committee secretaries. The in-depth consultations held in the Foreign Ministers Committee are aimed at coordinating the allied states' foreign policy activity. The Defense Ministers Committee acts vigorously in defense of the interests of safeguarding the security of the Warsaw Pact countries.

A determined factor in all this work is the close collaboration of the fraternal communist and workers parties. It is characterized by mutual trust, fundamental unity of views on all the most important present-day questions, and the desire for further consolidation of our people's friendship and the all-round strengthening of their fraternal alliance based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism.

The new social system creates every opportunity for harmonious relationships between countries, and the history of world socialism has accumulated very rich experience of their successful implementation.

Having actually assured the state sovereignty and right of every people to resolve their country's destiny independently and to make their own contribution to building a new society, socialism has at the same time rallied the peoples into a powerful community and created a perfectly new type of international relations which have become relations between nations in the direct sense of these words. They are based on ideological unity, common goals, and comradely cooperation--with full respect for each country's interests, features, and traditions.

Socialism has generated a new, previously unknown, natural law of countries' gradual rapprochement. In a little more than 3 decades the problem of equalizing the European CEMA countries' economic development levels has been basically resolved and the countries of this region have become industrially developed states. On the agenda is acceleration of the progress of the non-European CEMA states--Cuba, Vietnam, and Mongolia.

There is no sphere of party, state, economic, or cultural life in which our countries have not collaborated most closely. The regular, comprehensive contacts between the ruling parties--from their leaders down to their local party organ and party organizational workers--which constitute the pivot of this collaboration are supplemented by the steadily growing and intensifying friendly ties between state organs, collectives of enterprises and scientific and creative institutions, and public organizations, and between millions and millions of citizens. This fraternal cooperation among citizens of the new world is a very great gain for the peoples and it serves as an important factor in their social and economic progress, their spiritual rapprochement, and the consolidation of their sense of unity and common historical destiny.

World socialism has at the same time also accumulated considerable experience attesting that the potential for harmonious relations between countries is not realized spontaneously.

The development of the socialist community has its own complexities and contradictions. To close one's eyes to this and in general to the difficulties and contradictions arising on the path of socialism's development, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov reminds us, is to deviate from the reliable, albeit sometimes harsh, foundation of reality and break with the fundamentals of Marxist dialectics.

The establishment and consolidation of new social relations are effected on the national soil of individual states. The socialist countries are different in their natural and geographical conditions, development, levels, and economic structure, and they also differ in their methods of resolving tasks in socialist building. That is perfectly natural, although it used to seem that the world of socialism would be more homogeneous. Understandably, the interests of individual countries cannot be absolutely identical either, and they cannot in all cases fully coincide with the community's common interests.

For instance, if we take the economic aspect of national interests, we cannot fail to consider the fact that each socialist state, acting as the sovereign owner of its own resources, seeks to obtain the maximum effect during economic cooperation. Indeed, the very structure of national economic interest is complex. In it we can highlight an aspect linked with satisfying current, "immediate" needs and an aspect directed toward satisfying long-term needs.

This may be the source of different approaches toward individual problems concerning several countries. After all, the desire to satisfy today's needs, so to speak, frequently prompts us to take decisions different from the ones needed from the long-term viewpoint.

Nor can we fail to consider the fact that different national departments take a direct part in the countries' economic cooperation. It is through these departments' activity that economic interests are realized. Yet the departments' representatives sometimes approach cooperation questions from narrow positions, and current departmental advantage obscures national economic interest and the community's interests so far as they are concerned.

This must all be taken into account. Inattention to the contradictions that really exist can cause grave difficulties. All the more so because under certain conditions, given deterioration in the overall economic situation, for instance, differences in interests may be enhanced and there may be an increase in selfish national aspirations and a desire to put matters right at your partner's expense. The actions of our class adversary also affect the state of contradictions.

The contradictions that sometimes arise as a result of the discrepancy between the individual specific interests of a particular country in a particular sphere and the interests of other countries of the socialist community are transient contradictions and are not of an antagonistic nature. These contradictions are resolved by the efforts of the ruling communist and workers parties, which jointly develop the correct political line of collaboration with one another. The truest tuning fork for this line is socialist internationalism, whose principles proceed from the Marxist-Leninist tenet that correctly understood, truly national interests coincide organically with international interests, that truly national ideas...are at the same time

truly international ideas" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 33, p 374).

That is why the CPSU, which views consolidation of the cooperation and cohesion of the fraternal socialist parties and countries as the prime direction of its international activity, attaches such great importance to the further improvement of their political collaboration, of which the Warsaw Pact Organization serves as the most important instrument. "We see our cooperation in this sphere becoming increasingly close," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov noted at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. "Of course, it will continue to develop in the light of the peculiarities of the situation and the specific interests of individual states. At the same time the jointly determined common course will be an increasingly firm fusion of the fraternal countries' opinions and positions."

Life demands not simply the expansion of cooperation but also the improvement of its quality and effectiveness. This common opinion shared by the socialist community countries with regard to their economic collaboration assumes the shape of a demand to intensify the economic integration process.

Economic cooperation within the CEMA framework is a convincing example of the harmonious combination of international and national interests and the solution of urgent problems in the light of each country's requirements. It is no accident that, having emerged as a regional organization of six European states, CEMA has become an intercontinental organization uniting 10 socialist countries of Europe, Asia, and America. The number of states cooperating with it is increasing.

A new, higher state of the CEMA countries' economic collaboration was opened up by the Comprehensive Program of Socialist Economic Integration which they adopted. Its implementation made it possible in the '70s to considerably intensify the complementary nature of national economic complexes and to embark on large-scale production sharing and construct a number of very important projects by joint efforts.

The importance of resolving key problems on the basis of integration is tremendous. It is impossible now to imagine the fraternal countries' provision with energy resources without the Soyuz gas pipeline and the Mir power grid. Our countries' national economies would not have many of the acutely necessary computers and peripheral devices for them without the joint production of the Ryad computer system. The same thing applies to the collective program in the sphere of nuclear power. Integration today determines the technical and economic level of many of the most important sectors of industry, agriculture, construction, and transport.

The significance of the pooling of efforts and of integration factors is increasing substantially in the current decade. This is determined by the transition of the USSR and the European CEMA countries to the path of comprehensive intensification of production.

The CPSU, together with the other fraternal parties, is striving for a qualitative new level of economic integration. This integration will become even deeper, even more all-embracing, and even more efficient, reliably ensuring

further development and consolidation of the national economies of the CEMA countries. Having determined a long-term strategy of economic development, the 26th CPSU Congress and the congresses of the other fraternal parties submitted a number of new proposals for deepening socialist economic integration. This line is being concretized and translated in the the language of practical measures.

Considerable work in this direction was done by the 37th sitting of the CEMA session. The decisions taken at the session will help the further intensification of production, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the rational utilization of fuel and raw material resources in CEMA countries, and the fuller satisfaction of the population's food requirements.

Special significance now attaches to joint advancement in key sectors of scientific and technical progress. For this the socialist community possesses large material and creative potential and qualified cadres of scientific personnel, specialists, and workers. There has been worldwide recognition of the collective studies by scientists from the fraternal countries in the sphere of nuclear physics and space research. This valuable experience must be used more widely in other sectors. In this connection it is urgently necessary to pool the efforts of scientific research, planning and design, and production organizations in our countries in order to resolve the most important problems of science, the development of advanced equipment and technologies and new structural materials, and their speediest utilization in production. The stepping up of exchanges of advanced scientific and technical achievements and the strengthening of cooperation in license purchase comprise another important reserve.

Orientation toward the maximum deepening of scientific and technical links between the CEMA countries sets responsible tasks for the appropriate Soviet departments and primarily the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, which must step up its activity in organizing scientific and technical cooperation and accelerate the elaboration of specific proposals for this purpose.

The '80s must be a period of the development of intensive production and scientific and technical collaboration.

This is the agreed conclusion of the 26th CPSU Congress and the congresses of the other fraternal parties. It is founded on the CEMA countries' actual achievements in production specialization. The fruits of this specialization are now noticeable in practically all sectors of material production. The provisions of the multilateral and bilateral cooperation programs adopted during the last five-year plan are now being embodied in specific actions. For example, about 120 multilateral and over 1,000 bilateral agreements on production specialization and sharing are currently in effect. The proportion of the exchange of specialized output in mutual trade turnover is steadily growing.

The utilization of mutual economic ties in order to speed up comprehensively intensified production is becoming the general task of cooperation. And what is important is not only the growth of the volume of deliveries but also the profound qualitative improvement of the entire system of cooperation among

the fraternal countries' economies. All efforts are now aimed precisely at this. The program for the coordination of national economic plans for 1986-1990 provides for stepping up the multilateral approach toward resolving the main tasks of cooperation and expanding the coordination of capital investments in agreed spheres and projects. Special attention will be paid to elaboration of proposals for the development of production sharing which will help accelerate the introduction of the latest scientific and technological achievements in key sectors of the national economy. It is necessary to take immediate measures to ensure improvement in the quality of products and commodities that are subject to reciprocal deliveries. It is in the common interest of all CEMA countries to enhance the responsibility of suppliers and consumers for the constant renewal and improvement of output. A firm barrier must be created in the way of deliveries of obsolete products.

In the coming years the higher production potential of the socialist countries will make it possible to observe the principle of mutual advantage and balanced trade-and-payment relations more fully. Such an approach is an important prerequisite for the steady growth of mutual economic relations.

Sharing in the production sectors that ensure improvement in the national economy's efficiency--nuclear machine building, electronics, and robot technology--is increasingly becoming the foundation of the further deepening of economic ties. The CEMA countries have concluded general agreements on cooperation in the development wide utilization of microprocessor technology in the national economy and in the development and organization of specialization and sharing in the production of industrial robots. These are comprehensive agreements providing for joint scientific research and and planning and design work and for organization of the specialized production of automated industrial processes, machines, instruments, and control systems equipped with the latest electronic means. Broad cooperation in the production of electronic technology is also envisaged by the intergovernmental agreement on specialization and sharing in the production of basic microelectronic components for computers and of materials and technological equipment for the microelectronic industry.

Implementation of the planned measures creates opportunities for the transition from individual automated control systems to the mass automation of production processes, machines, and equipment, and instruments on the basis of microprocessor control equipment and microcomputers. It is necessary that the obligations stemming from these agreements be fulfilled in good time and in full.

A most important economic task for the CEMA countries is to reduce the energy- and materials-intensiveness of production. All-round reduction of material expenditures per unit of end product--this is the goal of their structural policy, planning, and economic incentives. This is also the goal of their economic cooperation.

It is a question of utilizing opportunities offered by integration for the more economical-expenditure of fuel and raw materials on the basis of the joint production of materials-saving technology and the introduction of progressive industrial processes, a question of certain rationalization in the structure of production and consumption.

CEMA has now approved the basic directions for the expansion of cooperation on the thrifty and rational utilization of fuel, energy and raw material resources, including secondary resources. With this in mind it is planned to develop the sharing of production of energy-saving and resource-saving equipment and to expand the exchange of information on advanced experience to ensure its speediest utilization. Along with measures that will be implemented in the next few years and during the next five-year plan, it has been deemed necessary to develop a long-term cooperation program in this sphere for the period through the year 2000.

A coordinated approach has been elaborated in the solution of one of the most important problems of our time--the energy problem. First, measures are being implemented here to ensure the most economical utilization of all types of energy; second, the structure of the energy balance is changing. The CEMA countries have created, on a coordinated multilateral basis, major capacities for the production of equipment for AESes. This has made it possible to undertake the large-scale construction of AESes. Even during the current five-year plan electric power generation in the European CEMA countries will increase mainly through nuclear power generation.

Another specific feature of the process of deepening the international socialist division of labor in the '80s is the fact that, along with the further expansion of intersector exchange, production sharing and the exchange of assemblies and components within sectors are increasing in scale. Component and assembly specialization is the most profound form of division of labor. Its development creates favorable conditions for the concentration of production, the elimination of small production facilities functioning parallel with one another, and the widest development of the most economically advantageous methods of production--series and mass production. Considerable significance also attaches to the fact that the deepening of specialization within sectors is feasible within the framework of the existing sectorial structure of machine building. This makes it possible to utilize production capacities already existing in the countries, thus reducing the costs of production specialization.

The further deepening of integration processes requires the fuller utilization of reserves for production sharing at the enterprise level and the involvement of enterprises in the solution of questions for production, scientific, and technical cooperation. Measures are being taken in our country to expand the rights and raise the interests of sector ministries and economic organizations in the development of integration, including the establishment of direct cooperation ties with their partners in CEMA countries.

While attaching paramount importance to the development of their all-round cooperation, the CEMA countries do not cut themselves off from the world economy. They seek to utilize the advantages offered by participation in the worldwide division of labor for the benefit of their peoples. The fraternal countries firmly adhere to the view that active international trade constitutes the material foundation of detente, helps preserve peace, and assists the economic growth of developing countries. This is why their immutable policy is to develop trade and economic relations with all states that are prepared to cooperate on a basis of equality and mutual advantage.

At the same time the socialist countries cannot fail to take into account the adventurist policy of U.S. imperialism, which is striving to use trade as a means of political pressure. But the economic blackmail of the socialist community countries is pointless. The community has at its disposal everything it needs for confident onward development and for solving economic tasks of any complexity. One example of this is the ahead-of-schedule completion of construction work on the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod gas export pipeline, despite all the U.S. attempts to frustrate the construction of this major project of international cooperation.

The aggressive policy of the United States and its allies requires the adoption of additional collective measures to consolidate the technical and economic invulnerability of the socialist states. In this connection, it was unanimously decided at the CEMA session's 37th sitting to accelerate the development of the production and reciprocal deliveries of items whose import is hindered by the policy of discrimination followed by some capitalist countries. Over the past few years Soviet enterprises have organized the production of many types of chemical, metallurgical, and machine building output previously purchased from the United States and countries supporting discriminatory actions. Additional targets for the production of products to replace imports from the West have been set for the period 1984-1990.

The agenda for the '80s contains the task of achieving an even higher level of cooperation between the CEMA countries' economies. In this connection the 26th CPSU Congress, the congresses of the other ruling parties, and the subsequent meetings of the CEMA countries' leaders have deemed it necessary to take measures for the closer coordination of economic policy and for improving the entire integration mechanism. The CPSU and the other fraternal parties have reached the conclusion that there is an urgent need for collective discussion at a conference of CEMA state leaders of the tasks set by the present stage of the socialist community's development. The preparation for such a conference is now complete. There is no doubt that the forthcoming economic summit conference will make it possible to enhance the efficiency of cooperation between the fraternal states, to raise socialist economic integration to a qualitatively new level, and to make it even deeper, more all-embracing, and more efficient. This will strengthen the national economy of all the CEMA countries and will help their further socioeconomic progress and the strengthening of the socialist states' unity and cohesion.

Shoulder to shoulder with their friends and brothers, the Soviet people will continue to show tireless concern for strengthening the socialist community's political, economic, and defense might and consolidating its unity and cohesion. Let no one doubt the common unshakeable determination of the fraternal countries to defend the inviolability of their borders, ensure the reliability of all the community's component links, and protect the gains of socialism. They cherish as the apple of their eye and will continue to cherish in every possible way their unity, which is the decisive precondition for consolidating socialism and preserving peace on earth.

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

CSO: 1802/4

YU. V. ANDROPOV REPLIES TO QUESTIONS FROM THE NEWSPAPER 'PRAVDA'

PM261720 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83)
pp 13-15

[PRAVDA, 27 October 1983]

[Text] [Question] What is the state of affairs at the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe, under way in Geneva? Is any progress at all being made there?

[Answer] Unfortunately, there is no progress in the direction of an understanding at the talks. The impasse situation there continues. Why this is so is now clear, it seems to me, even to the most faithful U.S. allies, and only bloc loyalty prevents them from acknowledging this openly.

During the 2 years of talks the Soviet Union has proved convincingly that it is ready to resort to bold solutions for the sake of diverting the nuclear danger from Europe and strengthening security on our continent and throughout the world. The proposals we have made provide for a wide range of possible measures: from substantial reductions in medium-range nuclear means to the complete elimination of both tactical and medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. They contain all the necessary elements for a mutually acceptable understanding infringing no one's interests--neither those of the USSR and its allies, nor those of the United States, nor those of the West European states.

Numerous statements have been made in Washington recently to the effect that the United States also favors an understanding and that it has begun demonstrating great flexibility at the talks. We have carefully analyzed all these statements as well as what is being said by the American delegation in Geneva. It proves on examination that the American flexibility is no more than verbal. The substance of the U.S. line in fact remains unchanged; it aims at securing significant military superiority for itself over the USSR by deploying the new American missiles in Europe.

As long as the United States adheres to its unrealistic, one-sided position according to which the USSR is supposed to reduce its medium-range nuclear arms while the United States and its North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies increase theirs, it is of course impossible to count on progress at the talks.

[Question] Are all possibilities for achieving an understanding exhausted?

[Answer] That depends above all on the United States, and on whether it is prepared to embark on a businesslike discussion. The Soviet Union will not give up the search for an understanding as long as the United States does not make that impossible by its action.

We have displayed and are displaying flexibility in finding specific solutions, given the observance of a single but immutable demand: The balance of forces in Europe in terms of medium-range nuclear armaments must not be violated. The level of these armaments on both sides can and must be radically lowered, but in such a way that the correlation of forces between them remains unchanged.

This means, first, that the new American missiles must not be deployed in Europe, inasmuch as this would sharply alter the entire military-strategic situation in NATO's favor. Second, all the nuclear means of the relevant range on both sides must be taken into consideration--with no exceptions.

We will not retreat from this fair demand. But within the framework of this principled approach we, I repeat, are displaying flexibility and constructiveness. I can mention now certain additional steps of ours in this context.

First. The Soviet union, as is known, has voiced its readiness to negotiate a reduction in medium-range nuclear armaments in Europe down to identical levels for both sides in terms both of delivery vehicles (missiles and aircraft) and of the charges on them. Some people are asking: But how will the Soviet Union act if, in order to ensure equality in warheads on the missiles of the USSR on the one hand and of Britain and France on the other, it would have to have fewer missile launchers [puskovyye ustanovk raket] than the NATO side already possesses?

Well, we are prepared to agree to this too. We are not troubled by the fact that with such an approach--and bearing in mind the number of warheads on the British and French missiles at present--the USSR could have approximately 140 SS-20 missile launchers in Europe, that is, appreciably fewer than the medium-range missile launchers possessed by Britain and France.

Second. Not so long ago we stated that, given the achievement of a mutually acceptable agreement--including the abandonment by the United States of the deployment of the missiles in Europe--the Soviet Union would eliminate all its missiles subject to reduction in the European zone instead of relocating them in the east. And again some people ask: But will it not happen that, parallel with the elimination of the missiles in the European part of the Soviet Union, the number of such missiles will be built up in the Soviet Union's eastern regions, which could subsequently be redeployed [perebrosheny] from east to west?

There are no grounds for such fears. But to eliminate altogether any doubts on this score I can state unequivocally: Soviet missiles will not be moved

from east to west; in the event an agreement is reached on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe and it is implemented, from that moment there will be a halt to the deployment of SS-20 missiles in the eastern regions of the USSR. And we will proceed firmly from this, provided there are no substantial changes in the strategic situation in the Asian region. This means primarily that the United States does not deploy new medium-range nuclear means in regions from which they could reach the eastern part of the USSR's territory.

Third. It is sometimes said that with our proposal that each side would retain, after reduction, no more than 300 medium-range nuclear weapon carriers very much curtails [podrezayet] American airborne means with a corresponding range of action.

Our objective is not to restrict [ushchemlyat] the United States. Although in fairness it is worth recalling that Soviet medium-range aircraft are not based in other countries from which they could reach U.S. territory.

But here too we are prepared to display additional flexibility: To establish for the USSR and NATO equal total levels of medium-range carrier-aircraft in a mutually acceptable quantitative range which could be substantially different from the range proposed by us previously. The specific size of these levels could be agreed upon, and also the composition of the carrier-aircraft subject to limitation could be specified.

There is a way out of the impasse in which the Geneva talks have found themselves. It is only necessary to make use of it. If the United States were to display a real desire to proceed to a mutually acceptable accord it would not take much time to formulate an agreement.

[Question] Some people in the West express the view that, as a display of goodwill, the Soviet Union could proceed right now to reduce its missiles in Europe unilaterally. What would you say on this?

[Answer] Yes, appeals of this kind are known to us. Sometimes they even come from people who are truly concerned about preserving peace in Europe.

It is not for us to show goodwill. On our side there has been no shortage of steps, including unilateral steps, aimed at creating the most favorable situation for achieving success at the talks.

I would remind people that 1.5 years ago the USSR imposed a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in its European part. And, despite all the slanders, this moratorium is being unswervingly observed. The additional deployment of missiles beyond the Urals was also stopped--in regions from which they could reach West European countries.

Moreover, during the period that the talks have been in progress the Soviet Union has removed from its armory several dozen [ne odin desyatok] of its medium-range missiles in Europe. SS-5 missiles which were previously deployed in the European zone and which, incidentally, had a range no less than

that of the SS-20 and were greatly superior to them in terms of size of charge, have now been taken completely out of commission.

Those who are calling on the USSR to reduce unilaterally the number of its medium-range missiles may not know that in fact we are already doing this. But of course, both the U.S. government and the governments of the other NATO countries are well informed about the true state of affairs. However, they are concealing the truth from their own people and are deceiving them.

Meanwhile, Washington is stubbornly working toward embarking on the deployment of its Pershings and cruise missiles in West Europe in the very near future. Nothing indicates that the United States would be prepared to renounce this deployment if the Soviet Union were to continue in the future unilaterally to reduce its missiles. On the contrary, everything indicates the reverse. Therefore the Soviet Union naturally cannot and will not risk its own security and the security of its allies.

It would be another matter if the United States were to renounce the deployment of its missiles in Europe at the announced time and were thereby to provide an opportunity to continue the talks and the quest for mutually acceptable solutions. Then we could embark right now on the reduction of our SS-4 missiles (and we have over 200 of them) and complete the elimination of them in 1984-85. And if it were possible to conclude an agreement in Geneva on the fair basis that we have repeatedly mentioned, a considerable proportion of the existing SS-20 missiles would also be eliminated, of course.

[Question] Statements are being made in the Western capitals to the effect that the talks will receive fresh impetus and will become more productive with the start of the deployment of the American missiles. How do you assess such statements?

[Answer] They are sheer deception aimed at abating the intensity of the West European people's struggle against the appearance of American nuclear missiles in Europe.

There must be total clarity on this point: The appearance of new American missiles in West Europe will make it impossible to continue the talks now being held in Geneva. On the other hand, the Geneva talks can be continued if the United States does not embark on the actual deployment of the missiles.

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

CSO: 1802/4

INTRAPARTY DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83) pp 16-26

[Article by D. Kunayev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee first secretary]

[Text] The tremendous tasks set to the party and the country by the 26th CPSU Congress, the November 1982 and June 1983 Central Committee plenums, and Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, mark a new stage in the life of our society--the stage of the planned and comprehensive advancement of developed socialism.

The Soviet people justifiably relate all their accomplishments to the creative and comprehensive activities of the CPSU--the leading and guiding force in Soviet society and the nucleus of its political system. The unity between party and people, which has undergone the stern trial of time, was and remains the source of the further blossoming of our socialist homeland.

The numerous meetings and demonstrations by the working people in the country in support of the 28 September 1983 declaration by Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, remain a vivid manifestation of this unity. This document is of tremendous political importance. It expresses profoundly and comprehensively the course charted by the CPSU and the Soviet government toward lifting the threat of nuclear war and strengthening universal peace. The declaration offers a clear class analysis of the global situation and a principled assessment of the militaristic course pursued by the current U.S. administration in international affairs. It provides a proper rebuff of the gross fabrications and malicious attacks on the Soviet Union and the members of the socialist commonwealth.

The arms race planned by Washington is costing the world more than \$1 million every minute. Such huge, senseless and extremely dangerous expenditures are particularly striking if we consider that more than 500 million people on earth are undernourished. More than ever before today we need a decisive change for the better in the international situation, for the sake of the lofty objective of preserving peace on earth, to which Lenin's party is dedicating all its efforts.

In following Lenin's behests, the party members are honorably fulfilling their vanguard role. At the Second RSDWP Congress, the 80th anniversary of

which was extensively noted in our country and by the progressive public the world over, Lenin called for enhancing "the title and significance of party member higher, higher and higher" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 7, p 291). The CPSU remains loyal to this behest to this day. During the past 80 years it has changed from a small organization to a powerful and united party of the whole people, with currently more than 18 million members. Under CPSU leadership the Soviet people achieved tremendous successes in the revolutionary reorganization of their multinational fatherland and are continuing to win new universal-historical victories. At the present stage the role of the communist party in resolving the major and complex problems of internal development and international life becomes even greater.

In guiding society, our party considers as its objective the extensive development of democracy which, as Lenin wrote, means that "the mass itself must express its conscious opinion on the essence of the most important problems" (op. cit., vol 14, p 259). That is why the June 1983 Plenum noted that the task of shaping the Marxist-Leninist outlook and political consciousness of the masses was, is and will remain topical.

Under developed socialist conditions the CPSU is ensuring the strict observance of the principle of democratic centralism as codified in its bylaws. It is improving its qualitative structure and promoting unity within party ranks and the militancy of primary organizations and their enhanced influence in labor collectives. The solution of these problems would be inconceivable without strengthening and improving the political guidance provided by party committees in all fields of life of the Soviet people. The party, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasizes, "itself sets the example of democratic organization through all of its activities; it formulates and develops the democratic principles which are found in all areas of our socialist way of life."

The republic's party organizations are promoting the further development of intraparty democracy and the observance of the Leninist norms of party life. They are creating the necessary possibilities for the strict and efficient exercise of rights and fulfillment of obligations by all party members and their active participation in the implementation of party policy.

In implementing the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the 15th CP of Kazakhstan Congress, the republic party organization--one of the combat detachments of the CPSU--is engaged in efficient organizational and political work for the further implementation of the Food and Energy programs and the development of the republic's production forces, economy, science and culture, on the basis of the strict observance of intraparty democracy.

The Pavlodar-Ekibastuz, Karatau-Dzhambul, Mangyshlak and other one-of-a-kind territorial-production complexes are developing successfully. Kazakhstan is increasing its contribution to the all-union division of labor. Since the beginning of the five-year plan industrial commodities worth in excess of 660 million rubles have been produced above the plan, nearly 280 million of which are from this year. The volume of industrial output has increased by 9 percent. Some 200 new enterprises and large shops and production facilities have been commissioned.

Kazakhstan is developing a powerful energy base--the Pavlodar-Ekibastuz power junction; Western Kazakhstan is becoming a new energy area. Here petroleum and natural gas deposits have been discovered and are being actively put to use. The republic plays a leading role in the production of nonferrous, rare and precious metals. The fuel, chemical, petrochemical, machine-building, metal-processing and microbiological industries are developing at a faster rate.

As elsewhere in the country, the republic is systematically implementing the party's course of improving population services, enhancing its well-being and increasing the production of consumer goods. In the first 2.5 years of this five-year plan, capital investments in excess of 400 million rubles have been channeled into the development of the material and technical facilities of sectors related to their production. The production of consumer goods increased by more than 400 million rubles (in wholesale prices); this includes tens of millions of rubles' worth of goods for consumer and economic purposes. All in all, this year the republic's industry will produce commodities worth more than 10.5 billion rubles. This will enable us to meet population demand better.

Currently the republic party organization is promoting further increases in commodity output by involving new enterprises, accelerating the development of the local industry and folk art crafts, and ensuring the more efficient utilization of available mineral and vegetal raw materials, production by-products and functioning capacities.

Increasing commodity output at heavy industry plants, which have a powerful production potential and trained worker cadres, is a major reserve. Their share in the overall output of consumer goods in the republic remains insignificant. The share of such output at ferrous and nonferrous metallurgical and machine-building enterprises ranges from 1 to 3 percent. However, the republic's suggestion regarding the construction of specialized shops for the production of such commodities are not always supported by the USSR ministries of ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy and the ministries of construction, road and municipal machine building, machine building for animal husbandry and fodder production and tractor and agricultural machine building.

Our agroindustrial complex is developing in accordance with contemporary agrarian policy. As a result of the development of the virgin and fallow lands, the 30th anniversary of which will fall next year, Kazakhstan's role as one of the most important granaries and large-scale animal husbandry base in the country has been greatly enhanced. The republic successfully fulfilled its 10th Five-Year Plan for grain production and procurements. The Kazakhstan billion poods of grain are well-known to everyone. The republic has increased its animal husbandry output. This year fodder procurements have been increased, which offers favorable prospects.

The weather conditions were quite difficult during the last harvest. Nevertheless, the grain growers did everything possible to provide the homeland with as much grain as possible.

Considerable successes were achieved by the farmers in the Ural, Aktyubinsk, Chimkent, Kzyl-Orda, Dzhezkazgan and other oblasts, which overfulfilled their grain sales plans. These oblasts have already fulfilled the assignments for the first 3 years of the five-year plan, while the sovkhozes and kolkhozes in Aktyubinsk Oblast have completed their five-year grain procurement plan. The republic's agricultural workers overfulfilled their plans for sales of rice and corn to the state.

The republic is engaged in large-scale hydroengineering construction. It is building the Irtysh-Karaganda canal to Dzhezkazgan and the Bol'shoy Alma-Ata canal which will bring to life new areas and will contribute properly to the further economic upsurge of the republic's capital oblast.

Our cities, settlements and villages are visibly improving. In the first 2.5 years of the five-year plan more than 14 million square meters of housing have been completed and more than 1.5 million people have either moved into new apartments or improved their living conditions.

The numerous visitors of our republic sincerely admire the beauty of its capital. Alma-Ata has become a site for union and international meetings of progressive personalities in literature and the arts, scientists, medical workers, and so on. Representative meetings have been held of late on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Fifth Conference of Writers of Asian and African Countries, the Mendeleev Congress of Chemists, the Conference of the World Health Organization, geological and metallurgical symposia, and a meeting of the country's ophthalmologist, with the participation of world-famous scientists. Students from many European, Asian and African countries are attending our higher educational institutions.

The republic party organization is achieving successes and practical results in implementing measures on a broad scale with a feeling of high responsibility. All of this has become possible thanks to the tremendous help of the party and the government and the fraternal republics of the land of the soviets. We know that the further upsurge of the republic's economy and culture and its comprehensive spiritual blossoming are possible only within the unbreakable family of Soviet peoples, on the basis of growing friendship and mutual aid and the further organization and political strengthening of the republic's party organizations.

The CP of Kazakhstan Central Committee ascribes prime importance, strictly in accordance with CPSU bylaws, to the development of party democracy as the most important means of enhancing the efficiency of all party work. After the 26th CPSU Congress, the CP of Kazakhstan Central Committee considered and discussed various aspects of activities of all obkoms, 12 party gorkoms and raykoms and 13 primary party organizations. The decrees summing up the experience of the party organizations at the Pavlodarskiy Traktorny Zavod imeni V. I. Lenina and Karagandagormash associations, the Aktyubrentgen Plant, the silk fabrics combine in Ust-Kamenogorsk, the Balkhash Ore Mining-Metallurgical Combine, and the Order of Lenin Alma-Ata Sovkhoz substantially influenced the strict observance of intraparty democracy. Dozens of steps and initiatives approved by the oblast, city and rayon party committees became widespread in the republic.

The network of collegial party organs is expanding within the republic party organization. During the past 15 years more than 950 party committees have been created within the primary party organizations, including 22 with raykom rights. More than 120 party committees have been elected within the party organizations of industrial enterprises, 14 in railroad transportation and more than 50 in construction. The number of party committees in these economic sectors has doubled.

The party committees must always concern themselves with the practical development of party democracy and create the necessary prerequisites to this effect. However, proper concern for this project is not visible everywhere. After the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Presnovskiy Raykom, Severo-Kazakhstan Oblast, considered a report by the party committee at the Pobeda Kolkhoz on the condition of intraparty democracy. Party meetings here took place within the statutory deadlines. The party members were issued assignments, work with the people was carried out, proposals and remarks were submitted, and an effort was made to implement promptly adopted resolutions and party directives. However, the main feature--universal activeness--was lacking. By no means all party members within the party organization were issued specific assignments. Frequently dull reports and addresses written in advance were delivered at meetings. Aware of their impunity, the violators of discipline, who were ignored, worsened their behavior even more. What kind of democracy could this be if just about half of the membership of a party organization remains passive? Is the party raykom aware that no one needs such completely emasculated meetings?

The party raykoms which condemned such an approach to party meetings acted properly, for they have no positive influence whatsoever but, conversely, artificially narrow the range of intraparty democracy and teach the people to think in stereotypes and to act formally.

Unfortunately, practical experience indicates that these obvious truths are not clear to many party workers, for which reason party meetings become over-organized: presidium memberships, lists of attendants and the content of debates are drawn up in advance. The party members are assigned the role of passive observers. Naturally, all of this lowers the level of party meetings and triggers justifiable complaints.

The familiar CPSU Central Committee decree on accountability and election meetings in party organizations points out that we must not tolerate meetings based on a prepared scenario, without interested and frank discussions, in which speeches are edited in advance while initiative and criticism are muffled. We consider increased reciprocal exigency among party members, principle-mindedness and intolerance of shortcomings and the development of criticism and self-criticism a reliable means for strengthening organization and discipline in all party units and in the activities of party committees. The accountability and election conferences in the primary party organizations took place and the rayon and city party conferences are currently taking place in the spirit of the strict observance of these requirements.

The accountability and election campaign proved that the overall mood of the party members and the extent of their personal participation in the

preparations for and holding the meetings and conferences are quite different from previous years. The activeness of the party membership has increased noticeably and so have the maturity and independence of their judgements and substantiation of conclusions. The number of party members who feel themselves responsible for the entire party and for the successful implementation of the increasingly difficult assignments it sets is increasing. The political and social activeness of the party members are confirmed by the fact that one out of three party members spoke out at the accountability and election meetings in the primary party organizations and that some 100,000 critical remarks and suggestions were made, one-fourth of which have already been implemented while others are in the stage of their practical implementation by the party committees, executive committees of local soviets of people's deputies, and republic ministries and departments.

The increased responsibility of the party members may be judged also by the content of many of their addresses. At the accountability and election meeting of the party group and the dairy complex of Trudovoy Sovkhoz, Tselinograd Oblast, the experience of which was approved by the party obkom, N. Bedyukh, the party group organizer, analyzed the activities of the party organization, discussed the strong and weak points of every party member and indicated the work bottlenecks. Her report was answered by emotional and practical statements. The party members spoke with concern of what remained to be done not only in the complex but in the sovkhoz, the rayon and the oblast. In a word, no one remained indifferent.

The collective of the Kokchetav Instrument Manufacturing Plant was among the lagging for quite some time. Here the moral and psychological atmosphere was worsened by the high cadre turnover and low labor discipline. With the help of the aktiv the plant party committee and R. Gaynullin, its secretary, were able to improve the situation. For the sixth consecutive quarter the enterprise has earned the banner in the city socialist competition and has been ensuring the stable implementation of its plans.

The plant party members are trying to consolidate these positive changes and are becoming real promoters of scientific and technical progress. Here claims-free delivery has reached 90 percent and the share of goods with the Emblem of Quality has increased from 26 to 38 percent. Its instruments are exported to 32 foreign countries.

The meetings and conferences concentrate on problems of strengthening technological, planning and labor discipline, production organization and order and improvements in the organization of the socialist competition and the movement for a communist attitude toward labor. Tasks are formulated on upgrading quality indicators, strictly observing contractual obligations by suppliers, ensuring the prompt installation of production capacities, improving working conditions and labor safety and housing and consumer services and educational work. The party organizations in sovkhozes and kolkhozes and the rayon party conferences engage in extensive and self-critical discussions on how successfully to ensure the implementation of plans and socialist obligations in selling to the state all kinds of agricultural commodities; the activities of party committees under the conditions of the agroindustrial

complex are analyzed and steps are contemplated for the organized wintering of the cattle, the development of auxiliary plots and other topical problems of contemporary rural life.

Our economic and cultural construction suffers from many shortcomings. The problems which arise are specifically addressed to the party, soviet and economic managers and specialists who are more than anyone else responsible for providing competent solutions. This approach is virtually comprehensive and is largely ensured by the active participation of secretaries and senior party obkom, gorkom and raykom personnel in the life of the party organizations. Obkom secretaries have attended more than 150 meetings of primary party organizations. As a rule, they attend party conferences as well. V. Demidenko, first secretary of the Kustanay party obkom, addressed the party members at the fourth raw material pellets sector of the Sokolovsko-Sarbayaskiy Ore Mining-Concentration Combine; M. Iksanov, Ural Obkom first secretary, addressed the party organization at the Hide Treatment Plant imeni Zemlyachki; Ye. Auyel'bekov, Turgay Obkom first secretary, addressed the party organization at the Gornyak Sovkhoz.

The party members properly rate the close ties between leading party workers and party organizations and contacts with the party members as the extension and development of the best Leninist traditions, concern for the increased militancy of the party organizations in labor collectives and clear example of intraparty democracy.

Practical experience proves that after the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum fruitful work was done to improve the style of party work, which is creative and scientific and which ensures high efficiency, concreteness and exigency and intolerance of all manifestations of formalism, bureaucratism and ostentatiousness.

The party obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms are focusing the efforts on the broad long-term problems of socioeconomic and cultural construction and improvements in intraparty work. The number of repeated and duplicating decisions has declined. Control and verification of execution and the study of the situation on site have improved substantially. The number of various conferences and sessions has been reduced and the paper flow is diminishing.

A comprehensive approach is being developed in managing the state and economic organs and public organizations by the Kustanay Party Obkom. The experience gained in formulating and implementing long-term target programs on the most topical problems of socioeconomic development is noteworthy. Comprehensive obkom, gorkom and raykom brigades are assigned to the primary party organizations of lagging enterprises to give practical assistance. Working groups among members of elected party organs are set up to draft problems to be discussed at plenums and bureau meetings. Control over previously passed decrees is lifted only after a thorough study of their implementation with mandatory on-site visits.

The Kustanay Party Obkom has substantially reduced the number of items submitted for consideration by the bureau and regulated the summoning of enterprise managers and party committee secretaries to the party obkom, gorkoms

and raykoms. As a rule, plenums, aktiv meetings, rallies and conferences here take place on Saturdays. The number of obkom decrees passed jointly with soviet and economic organs has been reduced substantially. This has enabled the party workers to visit the local areas more frequently and to meet with the people, which has had a beneficial influence on the further development of the oblast's economy, education and intraparty relations and has enhanced the responsibility of cadres for assignments. Extensive work has been done to improve the structure of the party organizations and to strengthen party influence in labor collectives. The practice of confirming party organizers at industrial enterprises, brigades and livestock farms has become widespread. Councils of primary party organization secretaries are being set up in agroindustrial associations.

The Chimkent Party Obkom is providing long-term purposeful party leadership in economic and cultural construction. The party committees profoundly study the life and activities of labor collectives, of lagging enterprises in particular, and persistently help them to surmount difficulties. They arm the cadres with economic knowledge and develop in them a new type of economic thinking. The party organizations have active party commissions in charge of supervising administration activities.

This five-year plan 60 percent of all associations and enterprises, which account for more than 80 percent of the overall output, are working on the basis of a comprehensive system for upgrading production efficiency. The association for the production of hammer-press equipment has increased its volume of output 25.2 percent and labor productivity 17.5 percent. The goods produced by the enterprise meet the best world standards. Output at the Chimkent Chimkentshina Association increased by a factor of 1.8 following the installation of new capacities. The lead plant and the excavators plant in Kentau, which were lagging during the first years of the five-year plan are working rhythmically. During the first 9 months of this year the installation of productive capital was higher compared to the corresponding period in 1982 by a factor of 1.4; the volume of completed housing increased by a factor of 1.3.

Compared with the previous five-year plan, the average annual amounts of state purchases increased considerably, as follows: grain, 17 percent; potatoes, 59 percent, cattle and poultry, 22 percent; and milk, 14 percent. The plans for the first 2 years of the 11th Five-Year Plan were fulfilled for state purchases of a number of agricultural commodities, including vegetables, melon crops, fruits, grapes, silkworm cocoons, wool and astrakhan pelts.

With a view to ensuring the fuller utilization of available reserves, the party obkom and oblast executive committee drafted special programs for the development of the sectors within the agroindustrial complex and are steadily and persistently supervising their implementation.

The Tselinograd, Ural, Kokchetav, Dzhabul and other obkoms and many party gorkoms and raykoms are engaged in purposeful and systematic efforts to improve the style of party management.

The workstyle of the party organizations and party committees largely depends on the competence of the cadres heading them. We see to it that all sectors of party activity are headed by politically mature and highly moral people, who possess initiative, organizational abilities and a feeling for the new. That is why questions of selection, placement, training and education of cadres remain a most important party concern. We try to improve and perfect such matters. Let us consider the rayon and city levels. Currently all party gorkom and raykom secretaries are graduates of higher schools; 65 percent are economic specialists and almost half of them have a second higher training---party-political; one-quarter of them are under 40 and almost 40 percent of them have been in this work between 5 and 10 years.

Never before has the republic party organization had such high-quality cadre structure in all its units. Cadres are a reliable guarantee for the successful implementation of even the most complex problems facing the republic.

The extensive development of intraparty democracy is inconceivable without principle-minded and efficient criticism and self-criticism, which have always been and remain the most important feature of the political health of party organizations and their proper understanding of their assignments. The Gurev, Karaganda, Kokchetav, Mangyshlak, Severo-Kazakhstan, Semipalatinsk and Taldy-Kurgan party obkoms discussed the reports submitted by party gorkoms and raykoms and primary party organizations on the development of criticism and self-criticism.

However, not all party organizations make full use of criticism and self-criticism in upgrading the efficiency of party and economic work and training cadres in the spirit of strict observance of party and state discipline. Some party committees occasionally display liberalism toward workers who allow negligence and abuse their position, which was pointed out to the party committees by the CP of Kazakhstan Central Committee Bureau, based on the report submitted by the Leninogorsk Party Gorkom.

Extensive work is currently under way in the republic to implement the resolutions of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The tasks related to the further enhancement of ideological activities in the light of the stipulations contained in the plenum decrees and conclusions in the speech by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov and the report by Comrade K. U. Chernenko "Topical Problems of Ideological and Mass-Political Party Work," were discussed at a CP of Kazakhstan Central Committee Plenum, at plenums held by all party obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms and meetings of primary party organizations. Trade union and Komsomol committees, local soviets of people's deputies and ministries and departments earmarked and are carrying out a wide range of practical steps to implement the plenum's resolutions.

Extensive work is being done to implement the party's stipulations on ideological problems. Last September the CP of Kazakhstan Central Committee held a 3-day republic seminar with heads of political education houses and offices. They exchanged experience in ensuring the effectiveness and quality of Marxist-Leninist education.

Stereotype, formalism and red tape are being firmly uprooted in all areas of political education; the close ties between it and life are being secured and the scientific standard, relevance and aggressiveness of propaganda and agitation are being enhanced. Unity among ideological, organizational-party and economic work is being strengthened and so is the struggle against the penetration of bourgeois ideology and recurrences of petit bourgeois mentality. Ideological cadres--propagandists, lecturers, political analyzers and agitators--are being carefully selected and trained and so are the personnel in the mass information media--the press, radio and television--and the creative organizations and establishments, such as republic publishing houses, unions of writers, composers, cinematographers, architects and others.

The system of party training of the communists, which is essentially based on the profound and creative mastery of the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin and the most important documents of the CPSU, plays a special role in the entire system of political work conducted by the party committees. Efficient training methods such as reports, papers, communications by students, seminars and conferences, which are radically changing its style and making it very relevant, are being used. Talks on theory, group consultations and reports by party members and candidate members on enhancing their ideological and political standards are being extensively used. The economic training of the working people, the political education of Komsomol members and young people, policy days, open letter days, lectures, talks and work in residential areas are becoming systematic and are being directed by the party committees on a planned basis.

As we know, in his meeting with the party veterans at the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov highly rated their activities, efforts and deep party convictions. He noted the creative and innovative approach taken by the veterans in resolving important problems of our social development and emphasized that they are the bearers of unique experience in building the new life.

The brilliant, profound and future-oriented speech by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, the statements made by the veterans at the CPSU Central Committee meeting, known to the entire country, the realistic and weighed assessments and the creative approach to the matter could not fail to trigger a broad social response. Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized that "...any kind of disorder, negligence, violation of the law, grubbing and bribe-taking depreciate the efforts of thousands of agitators and propagandists."

The accuracy of these words is obvious. Actually, it has long been noted that in the progressive farms and best enterprises and organizations the people feel themselves as the true makers of full-blooded life. Here the tone is cheerful and life-asserting; the moral-psychological climate is good and labor returns are high. Conversely, in a lagging collective most frequently the atmosphere is unhealthy. As a rule, it is here that abnormal phenomena such as drunkenness, lack of principles and protectionism grow, against which the party organizations and party committees must wage an irreconcilable and decisive struggle. Such negative phenomena have a particularly adverse effect on the youth. Yet it is well-known that the situation

which the young person will encounter on the threshold of his maturity will frequently determine his attitude toward surrounding reality, customs and socialist principles.

These problems, like other topical matters in the various areas of social and spiritual life, were sharply raised at the meeting with veterans of the republic party organization and representatives of the youth, held by the CP of Kazakhstan Central Committee last September. Grave omissions in the upbringing of young men and women, the veterans emphasized in their addresses, can be largely explained by the fact that some Komsomol organizations work in a stereotype fashion, ignoring the specific features of young people, and the party organizations do not correct them promptly.

"...To be a communist," Lenin taught, "means to organize and rally the entire growing generation and set the example in education and discipline..." (op. cit., vol 41, p 314). Reality offers many vivid examples proving that wherever the party members, party veterans and tutors thoughtfully undertake to work with the youth things go well. The young people gain confidence in themselves and in attaining the noble party ideals.

Tutorship has become widespread in the republic. More than 160,000 tutors are participating in the movement. Hundreds of thousands of young men and women are experiencing the beneficial influence of such tutorship. The CP of Kazakhstan Central Committee approved the tutorship experience at the Balkhash Ore Mining-Metallurgical Combine. Here it has long exceeded the framework of purely production training and has become an efficient method for the ideological-political, labor and moral upbringing of the young generation of the working class.

Thousands of rural youth tutors warmly supported the appeal of Hero of Socialist Labor Zh. Demeyev, the noted virgin land worker, to "pass the experience of the fathers to the sons!" His virgin land fellow worker Hero of Socialist Labor V. Dityuk has educated in his brigade more than 40 young mechanizers in whom he has instilled love for the land and the work of the grain grower and has given professional knowledge and practical experience.

"Sheep raising for the young!" Everyone in the republic is familiar with this initiative which was born at the Tulpar Komsomol-youth brigade in the Sovkhoz imeni Chokan Valikhanov, Semipalatinsk Oblast, headed the past 12 years by Hero of Socialist Labor Zh. Shulembayev, the noted sheep breeder. His instructive and noble practical course has been attended by 80 young men and women, 20 of whom graduated from VUZs and tekhnikum without leaving their jobs, and 24 became party members.

The problems of intensifying the education of the young people as a worthy replacement of the senior generations in the spirit of the revolutionary, combat and labor traditions of the party and the people are on the agenda of all republic party organizations. The old party members, the communists, inspired by the meeting between Comrade Yu. V. Andropov and CPSU veterans, are sharing the most important thing with the young men and women--their communist convictions, loyalty to the ideals of Marxism-Leninism and ability to defend the interests of the party and the people in all circumstances.

The experience of the Kazakhstan party organization in the further development of intraparty democracy is a convincing refutation of the false claims of our ideological opponents to the effect that in the communist parties the activity of the party masses is "suppressed" by centralism, while democracy is of a purely formal nature. Through a variety of fabrications, forgeries and open slander, they try to present intraparty relations within the CPSU as a one-sided process of "diktat" from above, as relations the distinguishing characteristic of which is "extreme centralism combined with extreme mistrust of the rank-and-file party membership and the local organizations."

It is easy to note that this merely proves the frank unwillingness or inability on the part of our opponents to acknowledge the true party democracy of Marxist-Leninist intraparty relations and their aspiration to impose upon our party the type of "democracy" which would contribute to its transformation into a shapeless union deprived of the possibility of guiding the revolutionary struggle and building the new society.

The futility of such efforts is not worthy of special mention. The Leninist party--the mind, honor and conscience of our epoch--is distinguished by the organic and unbreakable unity between democracy and centralism. It is precisely democratic centralism that the CPSU has always considered the most important source of its strength and ability to act. It is a reliable and tried foundation of purposeful and organized work by all party units and the enhancement of their leading influence in building communism.

Sixty-two years ago Lenin wrote that "...today the gains of the revolution cannot be the same as in the past. They inevitably change their nature depending...on the conditions which demand, above all, higher labor productivity and stricter labor discipline" (op. cit., vol 44, p 122).

These words constitute an entire program for action. The developed socialist society offers a reliable, balanced and dynamic economic base and a fruitful system of social relations founded on communist principles and trains a new, highly educated intellectual person, internationalist and patriot. This is the guarantee for all of our accomplishments and for upgrading the militancy and organizational activeness of each party cell and the role of each party organization in the communist upbringing of the people.

Loyal to the ideals of the party, the communists and all working people of Kazakhstan are honestly coping with the responsible assignments formulated by the Leninist CPSU Central Committee at the present stage in the economic and social development of our great socialist homeland.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

KARL MARX AND INDIA'S REBIRTH

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83) 27-34

[Article by Hiren Mukerjee; reprinted from the newspaper NEW AGE, central organ of the National Council of the Indian Communist Party, published on 13 March 1983]

[Text] The centennial of the birth of Karl Marx was noted 6 months after the birth of the first state of the workers in the history of mankind--Soviet Russia--whose predecessor was the heroic Paris Commune, which "stormed the skies" in 1871. The centennial of Karl Marx's death was marked by the existence of a global socialist system encompassing more than one-third of mankind. Real socialism is frightening the capitalist world which continues to cling to its plans for domination. This too is proof of the steadfast development on all continents of the greatest revolution of all time, a revolution which bears high the banner of Karl Marx.

In extensively noting the centennial of Marx's death, it would be proper to study the experience of the struggle and to begin this by recalling the tremendous importance of the appeal launched by K. Marx and F. Engels "Workers of the World, Unite!", with which they appealed in their "Communist Party Manifesto" in 1848. The comprehensive genius of Marx is the property of all mankind. In an article published in MODERN REVIEW in 1908, Har Dajal, the famous fighter for Indian freedom, in a typically Indian way described Marx as the "modern Rishi," i.e., as a prophet who had a third eye with which he could see the future.

Even today the hordes of "Marxologists," who are nothing more than the court ideologues of the bourgeoisie, are continuing their campaign, with the enthusiasm of schoolboys, which has been waged by many "authorities," starting with Bem-Bawerk and ending with John Maynard Keynes. In an effort to prove that Marxism has become "obsolete," they bemoan the fact that "such an illogical and boring theory" could have interested mankind.

However, the "contemporary historical period is Marxism in action," R. Palm Datt wrote. The great Lenin emphasized that Marx's theory, as a key to the interpretation and transformation of the world is "omnipotent because it is true" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 23, p 43).

In their efforts somewhat to belittle the significance of Marxism, "scientific circles" in the West claim that Karl Marx related directly to Europe.

According to their logic, the Great October Revolution of 1917, which took place in a country accounting for almost one-sixth of the globe and located both in Europe and Asia, was "Asiatic." Hence the conclusion that by its very nature it cannot be considered the embodiment of Marx's ideas on the society of the future. These "learned men" express their admiration for the correspondence between Marx and Engels exclusively because "these letters were written simultaneously in English, French and German and are an event in the history of European thinking and spirit."

Anti-Marxist Baseness

Almost at the very end of his "Rejected Prophet" (a trilogy about Trotskyism and its founder), Isaak Deutscher writes the following about Marxism and real socialism in saying that Marxism as established in "Mother Russia" "triggered disgust in the Western countries." "The West was to adopt an entirely different attitude toward Marxism, which would be cleansed of barbaric encrustations. In such a Marxism the West would finally acknowledge its own offspring and own concept of the fate of mankind." It was precisely then, in his view, that history "would make a full circle" and that hope could be resurrected only on the ruins of its collapse.

Clever variations are played frequently and loudly on the same theme. However, the ideological "barrage" of "Marxologists" such as Raymond Aron, Walt Rostow and the likes, who claim that they allegedly "stand on Marx's shoulders" and can see more clearly the nature of problems, are less irritating than the once rather boring scarecrow of "Eurocommunism" which delighted the enemies of socialism and which they are still treacherously trying to "rejuvenate." One such "rejuvenation" belongs to the renegade Leszek Kolakowski, who moved from Poland to the Western "scientific centers." In his luxuriously published "Works," he "discusses" the "basic Marxist trends" and moans that "Marxism is an illusion and that the USSR is an illustration of the omnipotence of the lie" (!).

Living Socialism

However, not all of them are so crude. Thus, Jean Ellenstein, who rejected communism in France, deigns to acknowledge that socialism in the USSR is "the first and most important socialist experiment in history." However, he immediately rejects everything achieved by the Soviet Union by daringly stating that "we must build socialism on the basis of the economically developed Western capitalism."

The aspiration toward socialism is praiseworthy. It could correct the historical error which the West made in 1917 by rejecting the appeal to revolution which backward Russia heard and accepted exclusively thanks to the bolsheviks. It is to be hoped, however, that statements similar to those made by the Spaniard Carrillo to the effect that the USSR is allegedly "not a truly socialist state" will no longer be voiced and that such trends will not be developed further.

Despite the brilliant package of knowledge, experience and creative capabilities of the West, Marx, the powerful genius of mankind, never considered

that it is precisely Europe that must play the main role in world history. In developing together with Engels the theory and practice of the revolutionary struggle, it did not even occur to Marx to think in such categories as "Asian," "African," "American," or "European communism."

Thanks to his perspicacity, as early as the 1850s Marx began to pay increasingly close attention to the development of events in the United States, India, China and Russia without interrupting his profound and gigantic scientific study which reached its peak in its famous "Critique of Political Economy," and his greatest classical work "Das Kapital."

In his 8 October 1858 letter to Engels, unhesitatingly Marx expressed his doubts concerning the possibility of making a socialist revolution "in this small corner" (i.e., Western Europe), for "bourgeois society is continuing its ascent on an immeasurably larger area" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 29, p 295).

The profound and substantive study which Marx made of the development of the entire huge world reinforced immeasurably his faith based on knowledge in the social forces which, and which alone, could change the life of the people.

In 1853 the New York press published brilliant articles by Marx about India. Earlier, in 1850, he had written about China, noting that those who consider that country the most reliable bulwark of reaction will eventually read on the Great Wall of China the words "Republic of China. Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 7, p 234).

From distant Europe, without a shade of condescension as a representative of the civilized world, without a shade of indifference or scorn for the increased sensitivity of those who were described by Rudyard Kipling, the bard of imperialism, as a "low breed," Marx tried to analyze and understand the nature of such sensational events as the officially described 1857-1859 "mutiny," which he preferred to describe as the "uprising in India," and in which, in his words, the uprising of the army "coincided with the manifestation of a general discontent...with British rule" (op. cit., vol 12, p 241).

It was this event as well as many others, particularly in Russia, that enabled Marx to draw the following conclusion in his 27 September 1877 letter to Sorge: "The revolution will begin this time in the East which has remained so far the inviolable citadel and reserve of the counterrevolutionary army" (op. cit., vol 34, p 230).

Five years later, in the preface to the Russian edition of the "Communist Party Manifesto," Marx and Engels prophetically wrote that "...Russia is the advanced detachment of the revolutionary movement in Europe" (op. cit., vol 19, p 305). These were not simply nice words, something which the founders of Marxism did not tolerate. It meant that the socialist revolution, which was not taking place in the West, could take place in Russia.

Although history relies more on experience than logic, it too shows a certain "treachery," Marx frequently repeated. Our examples suffice, although there

is a mass of other statements by the Marxist classics on this matter, so that, without arguing, simply to note the malicious thrust frequently repeated by the anti-Marxists, to the effect that the Russian revolution was allegedly a historical whim and a strike against Marx's theory.

The chain of world imperialism was broken at its weakest link: tsarist Russia. This was accomplished by the Bolshevik Party headed by Lenin, which had matured in the course of many trials and which relied on the theory, ideas and program of Marxism.

Even the most dyed-in-the-wool enemies of Marxism in India liked to read the lines which Marx wrote on 22 July 1853:

"The Indian population will be unable to pick the fruits of the ripened elements of the new society, which were planted among it by the British bourgeoisie, until in Great Britain itself the current ruling classes have not been pressed out by the industrial proletariat, or until the Indians themselves have become sufficiently strong to reject once and for all the British yoke. In any case, we can confidently expect for the more or less distant future the rebirth of this great and interesting country, the noble population of which, even in its lowest classes, to cite Prince Saltykov, "is more refined and more skillful than the Italians," a country whose natives balance even their submission with some kind of calm nobility and, despite their natural slowness, have amazed British officers with their courage, a country which is the cradle of our languages and religions and which gives us the prototype of the ancient German in the Jat and the prototype of the ancient Greek in the Brahmin" (op. cit., vol 9, pp 228-229).

While living in working in Britain, Marx made a detailed study of the Irish problem and persistently, although unfortunately in vain, proved that the complete national liberation of Ireland (to this day this country is only partially free, suffering from its blood-letting wound--Ulster) was the "first condition" for the "social liberation" of the British working class headed by opportunists (op. cit., vol 32, pp 558-559).

Marx felt for the British working people (and for the workers of Paris) invariable respect and admiration, unquestionably justified. He seriously relied on their revolutionism, assuming that at that time it could be found only in the developed capitalist countries.

According to Marx, history was a "witch" who never forgave anyone anything and which made people pay dearly for their lack of understanding of the processes of social development and for cowardice in the face of difficulties.

In the preface to the English edition of the first volume of "Das Kapital," dated 5 November 1886, Engels pointed out that Marx considered Britain, at least in Europe, as "the only country in which the inevitable social revolution may take place through entirely peaceful and legal means. Naturally, he never forgot to add that one could hardly expect the British ruling classes to yield to this peaceful and legal revolution without 'rebellion in the defense of slavery'" (op. cit., vol 23, p 34).

As usual, Engels spoke not only on his own but also on Marx's behalf when he wrote in his 12 September 1882 letter to Karl Kautsky that "you are asking me what the British workers think about colonial policy? The same as what they think about politics in general: the same as what the bourgeois think about it" (op. cit., vol 35, p 297).

As early as 7 October 1858, Engels, who was in Manchester, wrote to Marx in London that "...the British proletariat is becoming increasingly bourgeois, for that most bourgeois of all nations apparently wants, in the final account, to have a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat side by side with the bourgeois" (op. cit., vol 29, p 293).

As we know, crumbs from the meals eaten on the imperial table and the cheap pastry from the parliamentary confectionery are thrown as a reward to the so-called "worker aristocracy," notorious in the capitalist world to this day, so that they may loyally serve their masters.

Perhaps in 1853 Marx may still have hesitated; subsequently, he expressed the belief that the Indians should not expect for the British rulers to start pressing their own workers but must become sufficiently strong to reject by themselves, once and for all, the British yoke.

The Study of India

Marx's belief was based on the study of the history of the huge masses of the oppressed Indian population, as is confirmed by the very fact of his "Chronological Excerpts from Indian History (664-1858)." He always ascribed great importance to the peasant uprisings (usually not mentioned in "proper" history books) such as, for example, the Taipei uprising in China and a number of peasant mutinies in the various parts of India.

In considering the situation in countries similar to ours, he emphasized that if the peasants were to unite with the working class the "proletarian revolution would acquire the chorus without which its solo in all peasant countries would become a swan song" (op. cit., vol 8, p 607). We remember Marx's words on "the possibility of supporting the proletarian revolution with some kind of second edition of the peasant wars. This would be an excellent turn of events" (op. cit., vol 29, p 37).

No one better than Marx was aware of the innumerable objective and subjective phenomena which complicated India's already difficult situation. However, he also knew that the harbingers of the future were being born in India, despite the disgustingly "destructive" British influence directed toward "hybrid" reforms.

All of this was taking place "with the lowest intentions" which, however, "coexisted" with a kind of "constructive role" which, like capitalism, which creates its own "gravedigger," the working class should mandatorily apply to the defeat of the British Empire and to the awakening of India.

It would be suitable to add that tales to the effect that British "good deeds" were the "historical means for the rebirth" of India should not be encouraged in any way.

In his work "India Today," R. Palm Datt firmly stated that if Great Britain was to be credited for India's progress, tsarist autocracy should have been thanked for preparing the conditions for the Great October Revolution!

Furthermore, no one before Marx had emphasized that the bourgeoisie has always and everywhere mercilessly extracted a huge payment for any kind of development. "Has it ever been able to make progress," he wrote in 1853, "without forcing individuals or entire nations to walk the hard road of blood, dirt, poverty and humiliation?" (op. cit., vol 9, p 228).

Stupid fabrications to the effect that Marx allegedly considered British rule competent should be scornfully rejected as a malicious lie.

During his work in Moscow, the modest Bengali scientist and communist Chinmohan Shehanobis learned that in 1871 the executive committee of the First International, which was founded by Marx and Engels, received a request from Calcutta for membership in the International Association of Workers.

A thorough study must be conducted to find something about the person who sent this petition and about his comrades. This event, to which "Dr Marx himself" paid attention as chairman of the meeting, is of great importance. It proves the tempestuous events occurring in India at that time, ignored by official historiography.

This fact will enable us perhaps to understand why Engels wrote in his letter to Karl Kautsky, dated 12 September 1882, that "India may make a revolution ... which, to us, this would be unquestionably the best thing that could happen" (op. cit., vol 35, pp 297-298).

No one better than Marx knew that despite a certain inertia due to the heavy burden of history there was strong unrest in India despite the seeming obedience of the Indians, that between 1757 and 1857 Great Britain was forced to wage steady blood-shedding and cruel aggressive wars in one part of the country or another, that the Sikh mutiny was the crowning and high point of a powerful upsurge in the popular movement, although frequently unnoticed by the outside observer, that despite the threat of most severe suppression, phenomena occurred such as the so-called indigo uprising (which, as Cumming, the viceroy, wrote in 1860, "caused more concern than any other event since the New Delhi period"), that in many parts of the country the various tribes were periodically in a state of unrest in 1855, 1871, 1898-1900 and at other times, that the movements of the Wahaabi and Pharas, despite their sectarian religious nature, awakened the aspiration for freedom and triggered the peasant unrest in such unrelated areas as Pabna (Bengal) in 1872-1873 and Decca, which lasted for many years, and where at the decisive moment the unforgettable Phadk assumed the leadership of the movement; uprisings also occurred in other Indian provinces during the same period.

Indian researchers have still not paid serious attention to looking for the documents which the so-called "father" (!) of the Indian National Congress Party, Alan Octovian Hume studied at the beginning of the 1980s. He realized that at that time an explosive unrest had developed in the country. His

Anglo-Saxon impartiality vanished when he learned that according to intelligence data, desperate because of their hopeless existence, the Indian "poor" were prepared "to do something and to support each other in this undertaking," and that "this meant violence." He also learned that a "horrible revolution" could take place, for "a certain number of members of the educated classes would join the movement, would head it in one case or another, and would rally and organize it as a nationwide uprising."

It was precisely on such events that Marx relied in terms of the plans for the future and the prospects of our ancient country. As always, thanks to his unique perspicacity he knew that modern industry, "reluctantly though it was being developed, starting with a network of railroads, would in time destroy the numerous and major obstacles "on the path of India's progress and might" (op. cit., vol 9, p 228).

None other than Marx exposed "the profound hypocrisy and barbarism inherent in bourgeois civilization," which Great Britain brought to its colonies, India in particular (ibid., p 229).

Even the Indian "enlighteners," who made their accommodations with the British authorities, were forced to acknowledge this. For example, during the second session of the Indian National Congress Party, which was held in Calcutta in 1886, in praising the declaration of the British queen of 1858 as the Great Charter of Indian Freedom, and emphasizing his profound loyalty, its chairman Dadabhai Naorodji said: "The former rulers struck, like butchers in all directions, while the British, with their fine scalpel, went into the heart itself. However, the wound was not visible and soon the plaster of lofty talks on civilization, progress, and so on, will heal the wound."

The truly infinite hypocrisy and cruelty of imperialism are the historical evil of mankind. Did Macauley not point out that John Stuart Mill, the famous supporter of "representative government" (we once learned his statement that "a good government cannot replace self-administration") said that "there cannot even be a question" of such a thing in India. Was Lenin not right a thousand times by describing the suppressors of Indian freedom, such as John Morley as 'liberal and radical' scoundrels?" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 17, p 178).

There is no such thing as "kind" imperialism in nature. There is not even an ounce of truth in the touching belief of some noted representatives of the Indian people that allegedly British rule had been "sent from above."

All the spices of Araby cannot cover the stench of the crimes committed by the British Empire in India or anywhere else on earth.

Any kind of "renaissance" that India may have achieved was exclusively the work of the Hindus themselves. As Marx pointed out, this could have occurred also if the British working class were to press the bourgeoisie in Great Britain (something which it did not do). The wide breaches in our "renaissance" are exclusively our own fault.

It is claimed, although no reliable data exist, that Marx intended to study Sanskrit and Arabic but was unable to do so for some reason. Even without this, however, he was sufficiently familiar with India's past to doubt what Rabindranat Tagore described as the "inflexible mountain," or the religious-social system under which man becomes a humiliated, enslaved, forgotten and pitiful being, "untouchable," in accordance with a disgusting caste system in which, Marx exclaimed with great indignation, the monkey and the cow are also revered (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 9, p 136).

According to Marx, "man alone is a superior being to another man," and only he can "eliminate all relations in which man is a humiliated, enslaved, helpless and scorned being ..." (op. cit., vol 1, p 422).

The caste system in India, which can be traced back to the first man--Purush --praised in the hymn "Rigveda," in his various incarnations, is the straightest and most open manifestation of the concept found in all class societies which ensures that those in power can rest assured that the tremendous majority of the people will patiently suffer privations as something inevitable, objectively existing and predetermined from above.

Most perspicaciously, in following Manu, the legendary legislator of ancient India and "father" of mankind, a "class" view developed in India, entirely consistent with the interests of the exploiting society. Thus, for example, it is claimed that the world and life are nothing but illusion and that reality is attainable only through contemplation aimed at individual self-liberation, and that the purpose of man in this valley of tears, on earth, is to aspire to the next world unconditionally and steadfastly. Such illusions, like the illusions related to the rebirth and reincarnation of the soul and other similar claims, are a powerful system for accepting the "mercilessness" of fate.

As though for this occasion Byron said that nothing can calm a rebellious spirit better than rum and religion.

To Marx, religion was not a target of mockery but a "general theory of this world, its encyclopedic compendium, its logic expressed in a popular form" as well as an "expression of the real narrowness and protest against this true narrowness," which converted it into some kind of consolation for the oppressed person, the "opium of the people" (op. cit., vol 1, pp 414-415).

Unquestionably, the study and understanding of the cunning stratagem of age-old suppression of atheistic materialistic thinking in India (suppressed, but surviving), which led to a phenomenon which still survives in India and according to which, starting with Ram Mohan Raj and Shah Valiulla and ending with Gandhi and Rabindranat Tagore there are neither atheists nor agnostics!

However, how happy Marx would have been to meet with Rabindranat Tagore, the philosopher-idealist, who praised humanism in his "Time Chariot." He said in it that despite the incantations of the priests and the prayers of the rich, the soldiers and the members of the other castes, the huge chariot with the divinity did not move until the untouchable, the most humiliated among the humiliated could reach it.

How warmly Marx would have welcomed the lines from the "Mahabharata," according to which "one cannot earn more money without breaking the heart of people, committing evil deeds or killing, the way the fisherman kills his catch." How he would have liked to tell us that our own history would inevitably be an incentive for our struggle.

In noting the centennial of Marx's death, we express our reverence to this great man who taught us so much and who, more than anyone else, was a true prophet, teacher and leader of the toiling masses and the true creator of what he himself described as the "rebirth of mankind."

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

EFFECT OF AN INITIATIVE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83) pp 35-46

[Article by V. Petrov]

[Text] The basics have already been accomplished, for the transcontinental Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod gas pipeline is a continuous pipeline, 1,420 millimeters in diameter and nearly 4,500 kilometers long, laid in the ground or along the bottom of rivers.

There were many difficulties. The fact that they were surmounted and that, from the very beginning, the laying of the pipeline considerably outstripped the schedule and planned deadlines, was largely the result of the consistent, purposeful, systematic and thought-out party leadership. Like other large construction projects, the communists headed the socialist competition. They organized the creative search for the best methods for working, mastering and spreading progressive experience. All of this applies not only to the 20,000-strong collective of pipeline layers, which include several thousand party members, but also the party organizations of hundreds of plants which met the orders of the builders of the transcontinental right-of-way, the party members working in transportation in the numerous scientific research and design bureaus, material and technical supply organs and other organizations. The right-of-way crossed the territory of 26 oblasts and autonomous republics in the RSFSR and the Ukraine. Everywhere the oblast and rayon party organizations deemed it their duty comprehensively to help the builders to complete their work faster and to organize their daily life. Indeed, the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod gas pipeline was built by the entire country. This circumstance was properly rated in the congratulations of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers to all builders of this project.

The ahead-of-schedule completion of this pipeline for export was the result of a number of factors which determined the success. This included the application of the most efficient trends of scientific and technical progress, improving the organization of labor and management, the creativity of innovators, the growing professional skill of workers and specialists, and so on. The construction of several parts of the pipeline within a single "corridor" made it possible to develop a good production base and a network of consolidated field settlements with sets of cultural-consumer, medical-sports and other equipment. In turn, this ensured conditions for highly efficient production activities and for successful political education work in the collectives.

The scale of the construction project itself, the inordinately compressed deadlines, the stricter requirements concerning the quality of the pipeline, its tremendous foreign policy importance and its outstanding role in the country's economy and in strengthening the international reputation of our state persistently called for the search for new and more efficient ways and means of organizational party work, never before applied in party construction practice. For example, the task of strengthening the ties and interaction in the work of the various subunits of the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises acquired exceptional urgency. The proper "synchronization" in the functioning of many sectors and economic management organs involved in laying the right-of-way and the organization of political and educational activities along the construction areas, which were frequently quite distant from industrial and cultural centers, had to be ensured. Reality faced the party members who participated in the "construction project of the century" with many other new and difficult problems the solution to which demanded creative searching, daring and a nontraditional approach. The party members working at this project fully displayed the quality which Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, described at the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee as the ability "to concentrate the activities of party, state and economic organs and all labor collectives along key directions."

Which ways and means enriched the arsenal of organizational party work in the course of the laying of the pipeline? What of the experience acquired by its builders is of interest to those involved in other great projects as yet to be carried out?

Field of Experimentation

The Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod gas pipeline is frequently described as an export pipeline, thus emphasizing its characteristic and main distinction from other man-made gas rivers under construction. Six such major rights of way for the blue flame will be built this five-year plan. In addition to the export one they are the Urengoy-Gryazovets-Moscow, Urengoy-Petrovsk and Urengoy-Novopskovsk and two Urengoy-Center. Five of them are already in operation and all of them were completed ahead of schedule. Although five of the six are shorter than the export right-of-way they are made of the same diameter pipes and equipped with the same pumping systems. Generally speaking, their complexity is the same as the mainline which will transport natural gas to Western Europe. Their overall length is some 20,000 kilometers; therefore, the export pipeline is no more than approximately one-quarter of the overall program for the building of large pipelines this five-year plan.

We make special mention of this for the following reason: the creation of other large pipelines will be continued during the subsequent five-year plans as well. Perhaps the experience gained in the course of laying this most important right-of-way will be useful in the future as well. In the course of time it will unquestionably be developed and enriched with new methods and ways and means of work. Actually, already now a great deal of this experience is being applied at other similar construction projects.

The April 1982 CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Work of the Ministry of Construction and Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises for the Technical Retooling and Application of Progressive Method in Construction Output" was of exceptional importance in the development of the sector. This decree became a long-term program of work for all working people in the sector; it directed the collectives laying the main gas pipelines to a more economical utilization of material and manpower resources and the extensive practical utilization of progressive experience.

The CPSU Central Committee earmarked a very extensive program of work aimed at the all-round improvement of the state of affairs in the sector. It made it incumbent upon the economic managers and party and trade union organizations of the ministry to improve the selection, placement and training of cadres, to take effective measures for the development of stable and skilled collectives and reduce cadre turnover. It was recommended to improve the system of vocational training of the workers, to provide them with the necessary conditions for highly productive work and to formulate and implement measures to improve the life of the construction workers. It was suggested to expand the production of mobile housing complexes by the ministry's enterprises, including consumer services to those working in the field, and to be always concerned with enhancing the standards of trade, public catering and services.

The CPSU Central Committee decree set specific assignments to the ministry's party committee, the party organizations in the construction subunits and enterprises, scientific research institutes and design bureaus. They were instructed to intensify organizational and educational work in order to develop within the central apparatus and in the labor collectives the creative activeness of all workers and specialists for the sake of accelerating scientific and technical progress, summing up and extensively disseminating progressive construction experience and ensuring the efficient and economical utilization of materials and manpower. The decree called for improving the organization and enhancing the effectiveness of socialist competition.

At this point let us note another circumstances. The Central Committee decree states that the ministry's party committee must concern itself with the development of the creative activeness "in the central apparatus and the labor collectives." This is of basic importance. The party committee of the ministry's apparatus is thus faced with tasks which go beyond the framework of intraparty work directly within the apparatus and demand the need to enhance the party's influence among the collectives engaged in laying the gas pipelines.

It was essentially the intraparty problems which were discussed at the memorable open party meeting called to discuss the CPSU Central Committee decree. It was a question of improving the workstyle and method, strengthening performing discipline and improving the management of subordinate collectives. More than that, the ministry has long practiced the rule that a party member officially assigned to any given sector along the right-of-way presents himself to the party committee and is given also the party assignment of determining how the party members of the construction trust or administration live, what are their problems and what problems are discussed at bureau

and committee sessions and party meetings. Sometimes he is assigned to investigate a reported matter of concern, address a meeting, simply talk with the people and hear their claims and wishes and, subsequently, report them to the party committee and to the immediate managers of the sector in charge of the specific subunit. This has been practiced for quite some time and although one may wish to qualify it as an effort to exercise "petty supervision" or even to "interfere" in the affairs of the primary party organizations, no complaints have been voiced on such grounds.

However, this apparently well-organized procedure had its weak side: a certain lack of system in the work. The leading specialists and party activities did not necessarily visit the areas which needed advice and help or prompting specifically "along the party line." Meanwhile, situations developed in one sector of the right-of-way or another which mainly required purposeful party intervention.

Many construction subunits work for months on end under rather difficult, one could say extreme conditions, far from the Big Land. Sometimes the upper hand in the collectives was assumed by people who professed views alien to us, and who were self-seeking and inclined to individualism. Problems were created also by the fact that the pipeline layers earned well. The worms of money-grabbing and "thingism" affected the people and the desire to "pile up money" became to some the only purpose in life.

How to act? Should one wait until a specialist who would also be a skillful educator, convinced party member and good organizer could visit such a trouble spot for strictly business reasons? What if no such opportunity presented itself?

The problem was resolved as follows: considering the particularly great importance of laying six transcontinental pipelines, the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod export above all--experimentally a position of deputy secretary for the coordination of political education at the most important construction projects was created within the party committee. R. V. Ovanesov, who was appointed to fill it and who was at that time one of the heads of the commission in charge of ideological work, was recommended to staff, together with the party committees, subunits which previously did not exist within the ministry: permanent operative party committee groups in charge of giving practical assistance in the organization of party political work at the laying of the West Siberia-Center and Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod pipelines. The groups included some 30 party members. They were selected among the most reputable and trained party members familiar with the organization of ideological and political education work--personnel from the ministry's central apparatus and its sectorial institutes and other organizations.

How are such groups operating? Every 6 months a "membership and schedule of trips of operative groups" is drafted and subsequently approved by the party committee secretary and commission chairman. For example, between July and December of last year nine such groups visited individual sites some 30 times, as a rule whenever the need arose to strengthen the party's influence, to help the economic managers to understand the situation, to draw up future

plans and to energize the competition. Operative groups visited virtually all such areas. Naturally, they always acted in close touch with the oblast, city and rayon party committees. It is important to point out that no case of misunderstanding or friction was noted. Furthermore, the oblast party committees drafted detailed joint measures covering the entire construction period. The ministry's party committee was able to influence the local situation through the party members within the apparatus. With factual data at its disposal and informed of the local situation, the party committee was able to influence the activities of the ministry apparatus subunits more efficiently.

The work of this subunit, acting as the ideological commission of the ministry party committee, is of great interest. Whereas operative groups are engaged in resolving specific local problems of current party work, the commission is a kind of organizational and methodical center for mass political work in the right-of-way organizations. For example, it initiated the organization of a group of party committee lecturers whose purpose is to propagandize the achievements of scientific and technical progress and progressive experience. It essentially consists of scientists and specialists from scientific research institutes and design-engineering organizations. Every year the group delivers some 200 lectures directly at the pipeline rights-of-way.

At one of its sessions the commission reviewed the implementation of the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Further Improving Ideological and Political Education Work" in the collectives of Main Siberian Pipeline Construction Administration. The materials of the discussion were subsequently distributed among the other main administrations and unquestionably helped to improve ideological work in the collectives as well. Incidentally, ideological work commissions have been set up also under the party committees and party bureaus of the main administrations, associations and trusts. Plans for ideological support at construction sites are passed annually at sessions of the collegiums of main administrations and association councils. The regional construction staffs also have associates in charge of organizing ideological work in the subunits. Therefore, it is a question of the development of a specific system of mass political and educational work in all sectorial subunits. The ministry intends to continue to improve matters in this sector, guided by the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum which called for the "systematic dissemination of the best practical experience and for upgrading the role of ideological commissions in this matter."

This does not mean in the least that the ministry's party organization is focusing its main efforts on resolving so to say "outside" problems; nor should we draw the conclusion that it has weakened its attention to matters within its own walls. In asserting the Leninist style in the work of the apparatus and implementing the statutory role of controlling economic activities of the administration, the party committee regularly discusses the work of the party members who are sectorial managers and closely studies the way they cope with their official obligations and implement the requirements of CPSU members.

The ministry's party committee has acquired interesting experience in cooperating with the party committees of customer and related ministries. For example, joint sessions conducted by the party committees of the ministries of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises, and Petroleum, Electrical Engineering and Chemical Industries have helped to improve the coordination of the work of the apparatus of these sectorial "industrial staffs," and to organize the more efficient delivery of electrical engineering equipment to the construction sites. The joint party meeting between the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises and the Ministry of Gas Industry was held with very great enthusiasm and exceptional activeness. Joint Komsomol meetings among related ministries were held as well. Party committee involvement on the sectorial level played a very positive role in upgrading the effectiveness of the "worker relay race" and strengthening the interaction among all the participants in this great construction project.

The ministry's press center--a special and rather "influential" subdivision--operates directly under the guidance of the party committee. In accordance with the regulation of the work, approved by the minister, its range of assignments is quite broad. It involves preparing for publication materials on the work of the sector and the construction of the pipelines, helping newspaper and journal correspondents in their work and organizing all kinds of press conferences. The press center, headed by press veteran worker B. L. L'vov, actively participated in the initiative of republic and oblast party organizations of sponsoring trips of oblast and republic newspaper editors to the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod right-of-way. Special issues of these newspapers came out with the help of the press center.

Fruitful relations have developed between the ministry's party committee and Izdatel'stvo Plakat of the CPSU Central Committee. The production of posters on the development of the sector and the role of the Urengoy gas deposits in the country's economy was organized. The publishing house produced models of "flashes," "alarm leaflets," "combat leaflets," "Komsomol beacon," and graphic materials for making honor roll and indicator boards. Posters entitled "Remember These Figures, Comrade!" were printed in a mass edition. They graphically and clearly describe the basic trends in the competition and the struggle for economy and thrift.

As we can see, the work done by the party committee directly within the ministry's apparatus is aimed above all at seeing that activities in the local areas develop better and more efficiently where the largest gas pipelines are being laid. Whenever the party committee hears reports by managers, organizes the work of the press center and meets in joint sessions with the party committees of other ministries the first question asked is how are matters there, at the right-of-way? However, intensifying the impact of the local line organizations and party committees is only one aspect of the party committee's activities.

The second aspect is seeing to it that initiative from below and innovations in the organization of production, labor and competition and in party and organizational work in the local areas is considered without delay and analyzed by the ministry, is given a full and comprehensive evaluation and is

disseminated within the sector. In other words, this means the organization of reliable and firm feedback between construction collectives and the ministry's central apparatus.

Feedback

What is the purpose of the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod gas pipeline? The answer seems simple: economic benefits, and strengthening mutually profitable international economic cooperation. However, there is more to it.

"Work at the pipeline requires high skills, the ability to surmount numerous difficulties, persistence, stubbornness, a highly developed feeling of comradeship and responsibility for everything," we were told by the ministry's party committee. "We are concerned not only with the completion of the project but with the type of people who will move from this right away to other construction sites of our or other ministries. The project educates. It is very important for this educational effect to be given a plus mark, and for anyone who has gone through the experience of the pipeline remain a good person, a reliable comrade and a disciplined worker."

An education with a plus mark.... Could it have a minus mark? Yes, it could. Wherever padding is practiced, where no concern is shown for creating good working and living conditions, and where moneygrubbers pursuing the long ruble set the tone. The party committee members and the party activists in the ministry consider their task as quickly intervening and immediately correcting the situation, should such a case arise. This calls for the feedback from the party committees at the right-of-way to the ministry party committee and its ideological commission.

Let us point out that on the production level such relations have been long extant. If a trust or administration fails to fulfill its plan not one or two but 15 or 20 leading ministry specialists are assigned to that area. However, what if everything is adequate with the plan but absenteeists and drunks blossom in the collective and rushing cannot be eliminated? In such cases the collective relies on its own forces, on the help of the local organizations.

Here again we come back to the work of the operative groups and ideological commissions of the ministry's party committee. We already told of sending such groups to give practical aid to collectives in an existing or possible case of breakdown in one sector or another. However, groups are sent out for other purposes as well, such as progressive experience which must be closely studied and summed up and, subsequently, extended to other subunits.

The record--220 kilometers of pipeline laid in one year (incidentally, by now this record has since been broken)--was achieved by the technological flow headed by L. V. Mikhel'son from the Kuybyshevtruboprovodstroy Trust. A group headed by party member Yu. P. Filippov, department head at the Main Pipeline Construction Administration, was sent to this leading collective. The moment the group returned to Moscow it was invited to a party committee session and asked to describe what it saw.

The specialists had seen a number of interesting things. The competition had been well and efficiently organized. Great attention was paid to improving the living conditions of construction and assembly workers. The settlement of the Kuybyshev workers at the right-of-way was like an urban microrayon with all communal conveniences, but mobile. All agitation-propaganda work was aimed at ensuring that each collective meet its weekly and daily assignments and their implementation was efficiently reflected on the competition boards within each brigade. Bonuses were closely related to this. The result was the best indicator in the sector.

The party committee did not restrict itself to the report submitted by Yu. P. Filippov. Specialists from many ministry subunits spoke at the same session on what was to be undertaken to popularize this accomplishment.

Subsequently, events developed as follows: the report submitted by the operative group and the recommendations of the specialists were included in a single document which was studied in detail and discussed at a joint session of the ministry collegium and the central committee of the sectorial trade union. An order was issued on disseminating the experience of the flow. The task of applying new labor methods, therefore, acquired the force of law. As a result, the following year a similar or even higher pace of work was achieved by many other flows.

Sometimes such operative groups accidentally come across important problems. Thus, one of them heard virtually identical complaints along different sectors of the right-of-way to the effect that designers had erred in the development of an automated assembly-welding bench for linking large diameter pipes: the internal centering device was designed as an attachment rather than being self-propelling, for which reason, because of the lack of roads, sometimes a powerful tractor had to be used to haul a very small appliance.

Strictly speaking, from the strictly official viewpoint, the party committee could have calmly readdressed the question to the respective ministry subdivision. However, the workers had turned to the brigade which had been sent to the right-of-way on behalf of the ministry's party committee. Could one act formally under these circumstances? Designers and engineers who are party members were summoned to the party committee to hear the voice of the workers. A new operative party committee group was assigned to the right-of-way, which included specialists. They became convinced that the welders were absolutely right!

The manufacturing plan changed the design of the benches and organized the production of modernized equipment. What about the already manufactured equipment which had been sent to the right-of-way? Here the help of the rationalizers was sought. They changed the equipment in a number of weeks. As a result, the labor productivity of the welders increased substantially. Once again, properly organized feedback proved itself.

Creative searches and numerous manifestations of innovativeness along the right-of-way unquestionably contributed to the special atmosphere which developed in the production collectives and the particular attention paid to

this most important construction project. In a number of cases new developments which had been merely "tried on for size" at previous projects became widespread.

The first comprehensive technological flows appeared in the sector long before the construction of the export pipeline began. These were collectives of a new type, consisting of a number of strictly specialized subunits; each flow did the entire work without exception, related to the construction and installation of the pipelines and submitted a fully completed sector of the right-of-way, ready for operation. For a long time, however, this innovation could not go beyond the experimental stage. It was only along the Urengoy-Western border right-of-way that virtually the entire work was done by technological flows.

Or else let us take as an example the comprehensive-block construction method. It consists of building structures for different purposes--industrial, residential or service, consisting of standardized mass-produced blocks. This has enabled us to exclude almost entirely digging, concrete and finishing operations which are exceptionally difficult in remote areas where the right-of-way settlements are located and maximally to reduce and simplify installation work. As a result, labor outlays per square meter of industrial or housing area has been reduced by a factor of 2-2.5 while construction material outlays have been reduced by a factor of 3-4. The group of construction workers responsible for this project was awarded the Lenin Prize.

Such are the large-scale new developments of intersectorial importance which were initially applied in laying our largest pipelines, the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzgorod one above all. Their development and mass application were assisted above all by the fact that the ministry's party committee and other party committees and organizations dealt with these problems on a daily basis and involved in their solution active and interested specialists and party workers. Naturally, the atmosphere of creative search and interest in developing new and progressive features helped.

Incidentally, the creation of such a climate, such an atmosphere was no easy matter. For example, a great deal of skepticism was expressed when the first sectorial progressive experience courses were organized. Such skepticism was understandable. It was no easy or simple matter to gather within a single sector or brigade, even for a short time, 20 or 30 highly skilled welders, for example. To begin with, these people have to cross distances of thousands of kilometers. Secondly, willy-nilly this stripped of personnel a number of important units in which every person counted. The ministry's party committee and the local party organizations had patiently to explain to the economic managers that the game was worth the candle and convinced them that both outlays and time losses would subsequently turn into a profit as a result of greater labor productivity. They managed to convince them and now, for quite some time, the ministry annually sponsors one all-union and five regional-sectorial progressive experience courses. A schedule for such courses has been drafted and a system for replacing brigade leaders and other specialists during the training time has been formulated.

It is true that the collectives which lose their most experienced masters face a difficult situation and that initially their productivity even drops. In the absolute majority of cases, however, such losses are greatly compensated subsequently, when the brigade leader or leading worker back on the job trains his comrades in the new labor methods learned at the course.

For example, Hero of Socialist Labor N. A. Tyunin, from the Stroymekhanizatsiya Trust, member of the Tatar CPSU Obkom, suggested a new organization of two-shift work with a single crew which would include excavators, bulldozer operators and other mechanizers, working on the basis of a regulated order. The result was a substantial increase in labor productivity: in 1.5 years the crew covered more than three annual assignments. An all-union leading experience course was held on the basis of this collective. More than 800 crews followed the example of N. A. Tyunin and his comrades.

About 150 collectives applied the labor method initiated by party members V. F. Kalenov, from the Surguttruboprovodstroy Trust and V. I. Satarov, from the Mosgazprovodstroy Trust, laureates of the USSR State Prize. The assembly line-split welding method they applied increased labor productivity by 50 to 100 percent. Equal results were achieved as a result of applying similar methods at insulation-laying work by the column headed by party member V. D. Madenov from the Severtruboprovodstroy Trust.

The ministry's party members are displaying a great deal of inventiveness in the dissemination of progressive experience. The agitation machinery has become extensively involved in such work of late.

What is the agitation machinery? It is a type of agitation center on wheels, the crew of which consists of members of the operative groups of the party committee and journalists from the sectorial press center. A huge trailer connected to a KamAZ truck includes a movie lecture hall for 30 people, a television set, sound recording equipment, a photographic laboratory, and a mobile exhibit on production and political topics. Following is the itinerary of one of four such trucks, which covered more than 18,000 kilometers (five more are being made and the minister has signed the order for raising the number of such machines to several dozen in the next few years): Moscow-Gorkiy-Bor-Cheboksary-Novocheboksarsk-Yoshkar-Ola-Kazan-Ulyanovsk-Syzran-Almetevsk-Ufa-Chelyabinsk-Tyumen-Yarkovo-Kuybyshev-Penza-Ryazin-Voronezh-Rostov-na-Donu-Surami.

The effectiveness of propaganda of the new with the agitation trucks is exceptionally high, for they can reach areas visited neither by mobile movie theaters nor exhibits and where information materials are supplied irregularly and with great delays. Here is what happened to the agitation truck which went to the sector of Hero of Socialist Labor I. G. Shaykhutdinov from the Tatnefteprovodstroy Trust located on the border between the Tatar and Mari ASSRs. The people here listened with great interest to the lectures and talks. The next morning the crew...was short two document cases. It took some time to find out that the sector's mechanizers had become interested in the experience and the new method in laying pipelines across swamps, developed by scientists from the All-Union Scientific Research Institute for the

Construction of Main Pipelines (VNIIST) and had decided during the night, while the equipment was idling, to transcribe the data which described the method. The mechanizers did not know that photocopies of the documents could be made in the trailer. These labor methods subsequently helped the collective substantially to accelerate the pace of its work. Twelve kilometers of swamps were covered in less than 1 month, or triple the planned figure. At the same time, some 300,000 rubles were saved.

If we were to ask for a graphic representation of the ties between the ministry's party organization and the party organizations of trusts, administrations and local brigades, a diagram crowded with arrows from the ministry to the peripheral organizations and back to the center would be the result. In a number of cases, however, these arrows would not be straight but go through a third link: the oblast, city and rayon party committees and the trade union and social organizations. They have played a very great role in speeding up the construction of the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod gas pipeline. Cooperation between them by the party members of the apparatus and organizations of the ministry is another topic. On the basis of the experience in laying the Siberian pipelines we can also assert that the close interaction between the ministry's party committee and the oblast, city and rayon party organizations, with the participation of the mass information and cultural institution bodies was the reliable foundation for completing the great construction project and a guarantee for its success.

In the Center and the Local Areas

Let us recall that the right-of-way of the export gas pipeline crosses a territory of 26 oblasts and autonomous republics. Although the construction workers spent a relatively short time in each area, a number of related problems were faced by the local authorities. Naturally, the sectorial ministry supplied the collectives with the equipment, the pipes and construction materials and resolved problems of organizing production, labor and material incentive and assumed the bulk of concerns for organizing the life of the people and their recreation. Nevertheless, the local party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organs also assumed great responsibility for the situation along the right-of-way.

The specific and effective nature of organizational, ideological-educational and all party-political work both directly at the right-of-way and in the collectives of related and procurement enterprises depends to a decisive extent on the party kraykoms, obkoms and raykoms. Problems such as food supplies, mail, medical and cultural services, interaction with kolkhozes, sovkhozes and forestry farms, condemnation and recultivation of the land and the rebuilding of transportation mains and communications facilities crossed by the pipeline could not be resolved without the closest possible daily cooperation with the oblast and rayon organizations. Finally, the new collectives had to adopt the system of political-educational work developed in the specific oblast--they had to have the same policy days as the other collectives and organize contacts with the local mass information media--the editorial boards of oblast newspapers, and the radio and television broadcasting facilities; the party members and all construction workers of the

pipeline had to be informed of the problems encountered by the party organizations in the area and participate in their solution to the extent of their forces and possibilities.

Here again the "lessons of the right-of-way" and the experience acquired in laying the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod pipeline are of unquestionable interest. In sending its detachments to the next area, the ministry, the central committee of the trade union of the petroleum and gas industry workers and the oblast party committee jointly drew up a list of "measures to coordinate organizational-party and political-educational work at the construction of the pipeline on the territory of...(name) oblast."

In order to organize the management by the party organizations of construction collectives and line-production administrations, party committees were created at the large construction sites as decided by the local party organs. They rallied the party members of subunits under different departmental jurisdictions. Whenever the creation of party committees was considered inexpedient, in order to coordinate the actions of the party organizations on problems of party management of construction councils of secretaries were set up. In a number of links, based on specific conditions, temporary party groups rallying the party members of the construction and installation organizations, who had come from various parts of the country with their subunits were created. The task was to develop a structure and to organize the work of the party organizations in such a way as to make them most consistent with the specific conditions at the given sector along the right-of-way and to contribute to strengthening the influence of the party members in all sectors and in production activities above all.

At the earliest stage--during the preparatory construction period--11 party committees rallying the party members working in technological flows and at the sites of the compressor stations were created in the trusts deployed in the construction areas. The party committees of Tatnefteprovodstroy, Kuybyshevtruboprovodstroy, Severtruboprovodstroy and Shchekingazstroy worked quite productively. Extensive efforts were made in establishing the new party organizations and improving the style and methods of party leadership of the construction project by the Transcarpathian, Ivano-Franko, Mordovian, Perm, Poltava, Sverdlovsk, Tatar and Tyumen party obkoms.

The main task facing the pipeline-laying collectives was the strict implementation (faster if possible) of assignments on the delivery for exploitation of the individual sections along the right of way and upgrading work quality. The temporary party groups played a major role in its implementation. They acted as the binding principle which rallied and directed the collectives toward the main objective.

Party organizations and temporary party groups were created on the basis of unifying the party members in the areas where the construction and installation subunits had been deployed, by technological flow. The organization of temporary party groups made it possible to eliminate the barriers of departmentalism and to avoid the feeling of separation of party members from their party organizations located sometimes thousands of kilometers away from the projects.

At the peak of the work more than 100 primary party organizations and groups operated and actively influenced the economic activities of collectives through political education work in the trusts and administrations.

In their activities the party organizations at the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod pipeline construction used both traditional and well-recommended forms of work as well as new methods which, after being tested at the pipeline, could be adopted by other collectives. A spirit of experimentation and creative search, inherent in a number of collectives participating in building the right-of-way, was characteristic of most "party staffs" at the construction project and the party organizations on site.

Thus, on the initiative of the party organizations of Glavsibtruboprovodstroy and Glavyuzhtruboprovodstroy, special coordination councils were set up at these main administrations to energize political education work and the socialist competition and to improve amenities. The councils included representatives of party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations and prestigious workers from the main administrations. The councils were given the right to allocate traveling cards at lower rates, motor vehicles and commodities in greater demand as rewards to the champions of socialist competition and the best engineering and technical workers.

Oblast and rayon staffs in charge of coordinating the work of the construction workers operated in the local areas. Each of them had its own style of work and main unit. For example, the style of the Transcarpathian Oblast staff, headed by A. T. Dolgopyatov, obkom secretary, CP of the Ukraine, clearly showed the aspiration to relieve the construction workers from unnecessary correspondence and to facilitate the solution of numerous current problems. For example, the construction workers at the Transcarpathian sector of the pipeline repeatedly complained to the railroad workers that the insulation of the pipes was frequently damaged during transportation. The staff got in touch with the Zhdanov port, to which the pipes were shipped, the party gorkom, the People's Control Committee and the Zhdanov section of the Donetsk Railroad and the situation was corrected.

The Cherkassy Oblast staff, headed by G. P. Kuz'michev, obkom secretary, focused its attention on organizing business contacts and developing reciprocal understanding between construction workers and the personnel of the local organizations. With the help of the staff the Leningrad builders somewhat changed the direction of the right-of-way in Zolotonoshskiy Rayon in order to save a few hectares of valuable gardening land. In turn, the party raykom did everything possible to place in children's institutions in the small rayon center 56 Leningrad children. The resolution of the party group of the SMU-1 of Lengazspetsstroy will be long remembered in the rayon: to complete the work on the arable land before the beginning of the autumn sowing.

The laying of transcontinental gas pipelines will continue. New pipelines will be built. Possibly even more powerful rights-of-way will appear in our country. There are plans for further increasing the pressure in the pipelines and the power of the compressor stations. Toward the end of the century it is possible that powerful pipelines will stretch toward the Far East

as well--to the Pacific. However, the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod gas pipeline will forever remain to us a special project, not only because it is of outstanding importance in increasing the economic power of the country and strengthening international economic cooperation. This gas pipeline became a laboratory for new methods of party work, a field for a series of experiments of great sociopolitical importance. It was precisely through the efforts of the party members and the party organizations--of the ministry and the local areas--that the numerous difficulties which usually arise where sectors and regions meet could be surmounted. The unquestionable merit of the builders of the right-of-way is their ability to organize under exceptionally complex conditions the competition among collectives and the exchange of progressive experience. Finally, the project set a model for achieving synchronization in the interaction among numerous collectives from different sectors.

Here the party members, the party organizations and the party committees and bureaus played first violin, as they harnessed thousands and thousands of people to creative searching. It was precisely they who ensured the success of this project of the greatest importance to the country.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

INCENTIVES FOR INNOVATION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83) pp 47-58

[Article by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences L. Gol'din, head of the Chair for Scientific Foundations of Management, Institute for Upgrading the Skill of Managing Workers and Specialists in the Chemical Industry]

[Text] The communist party pays constant attention to the dissemination of the experience of the best collectives and production innovators and leading workers who are in the vanguard of socialist competition. It is the party's duty, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, noted at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, to note promptly and to support and disseminate all useful and life-bringing initiatives.

In order to meet this party assignment--achieving a qualitative shift in production forces, converting our economy to intensive development and combining the advantages of the new social system with the achievements of the contemporary scientific and technical revolution--a radical reorganization is needed, among others, of existing ways and means of determining, ensuring the socioeconomic assessment and applying progressive experience in the socialist organization of labor.

The topical nature of this assignment is quite clear in the light of the recently passed CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures To Accelerate Scientific and Technical Progress in the National Economy," which emphasizes the need to be strictly guided by the resolutions of the November 1982 and June 1983 CPSU Central Committee plenums on matters of radically improving labor productivity on the basis of extensive and accelerated practical utilization of the achievements of science, technology and progressive experience.

Important Advantage of the New System

The possibility of disseminating progressive experience extensively and without hindrance, which has been acquired in literally all realms of social life, is one of the most important advantages of socialism. In the new society not only the economics but the social, the educational function of progressive experience plays an important role. Its daily dissemination, as it strengthens the interrelationship among workers, collectives and the entire society, and as it opens extensive opportunities for the manifestation of the social activeness of the working people and offers the possibility of

better satisfying their interests, helps to establish the social integrity of socialism.

The social and economic significance of high-level accomplishments was convincingly revealed in the competition slogan "Today's Level of the Innovator is Tomorrow's Level of the Collective." The innovator, the production front-ranker, is the first to react most suitably to the imminent social problems. With his personal example he points out the way and the lines of further progress. His ideas and practical accomplishments play an important mobilizing role. Manifestations of creativity have a great attractiveness and, with proper conditions, trigger a kind of reproduction chain reaction. Creative accomplishments rise to a higher level and yield even more tangible results. This process determines the nature and socioeconomic significance of the dissemination of progressive experience. It performs construction functions both on the interpersonality and broad social levels, firmly linking the creative work of the individual worker to the entire system of social relations. The extensive use of progressive experience is consistent with the very nature of socialism, which is an innovative society deeply interested in exposing all citizens to high achievements of material and spiritual culture.

The most important centers of progressive experience are pointed out at our party congresses and plenums, in party documents and in congratulations by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers to collectives which have achieved outstanding labor successes. Our press, radio and television are actively participating in the dissemination of progressive experience. Today the entire country is familiar with the labor accomplishments of the builders of the BAM, the Sayano-Shushen and Ust-Ilim hydraulic power plants, the machine builders at the VAZ and KamAZ and the Kaluga turbines plant, the Shchekino chemists, and the miners in Ekibastuz, the Kursk Magnetic Anomaly, Urengoy and Central Asia. In continuing the great traditions of A. Stakhanov, P. Krivonos, P. Bykov, F. Kovalev and M. and Ye. Vinogradov, today A. Gitalov, V. Golubev, N. Zlobin, V. Serikov, M. Chikh and many other production innovators are generously sharing their experience.

The best labor accomplishments of front-ranking collectives are made available to the members of the socialist commonwealth. In Bulgaria, for example, the Soviet experience of the brigade organization of labor is gaining increasing acceptance; in the GDR it is the Saratov method of claim-free deliveries. The Shchekino method has been accepted in a number of socialist countries, and the achievements of GDR chemists in its utilization are today carefully studied in our country. The USSR is showing a great deal of interest in the new forms of labor rationalization and incentive, and the application of a scientific organization of labor in the fraternal socialist countries. Particularly noteworthy is the experience of these countries in the fields of economy and thrift which, unfortunately, we are as yet insufficiently applying.

Frequently, the working people in the socialist countries share the secrets of their mastery directly at the work bench. For example, GDR chemists regularly visit to this purpose the Khimvolokno Production Association in Kursk, the Polimir Production Association (Novopolotsk), Svema in Shostka,

the Plastpolimer Scientific Production Association in Okhta, Uralkaliy and other enterprises. Their Soviet colleagues reciprocate such visits and show particular interest in resource- and energy-conservation technologies, labor organization in auxiliary services and "minor" mechanization facilities which considerably reduce manual labor outlays.

Every year the AUCCTU, the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, the ministries, the sectorial trade union central committees and the local party and social organizations bring to life hundreds of innovative initiatives and persistently promote their extensive dissemination. Some are even complaining of their abundance, for sometimes it is indeed difficult to determine which precise experience is the most relevant. This creates the complex problem of selecting from the huge flow of information on leading experience that which is most fully consistent with the conditions and requirements of each collective and individual worker.

However, the increased volume of information on labor accomplishments is a reflection of the objective needs of the scientific and technical revolution. Creative labor is the source of the scientific and technical revolution, for which reason in order to accelerate its development we must have a wide and inexhaustible flow of information on innovative initiatives in all realms of socioeconomic development. This triggers an objective contradiction which must be considered not only in theoretical research but in resolving actual practical problems; the increased volume of information is accompanied by a reduction of the share of that part of it which finds a practical application. It is no secret that in recent years the pace of application of leading experience has slowed down. The central press cites worrisome data: only 10 percent of the enterprises share their accomplishments with others but even such information is not fully used.

The Shchekino method is making its way slowly and with difficulty. Few enterprises make comprehensive use of the possibilities it contains. Suffice it to say that it is applied by no more than 4 percent of RSFSR industrial enterprises, although many of them are experiencing constant personnel shortages. Yet it is well-known that if the experience of the Azot Production Association in Shchekino and the basic production shops at the Polimir Association, where from 15 to 25 percent of the personnel was released, had been used comprehensively, the manpower situation in the country could change radically.

It appears that the contracting methods of labor organization and wages are being applied more successfully, for the figures confirming the increased number of brigades working on the basis of collective contracts is quite impressive. The most important prerequisite for the efficient work of such brigades, however--a total cost accounting, stability of production assignments and use of the labor participation coefficients--are hardly used in all cases. Or else let us take the VAZ labor management and incentives system: how much of it is used in full without splintering it into poorly interrelated elements?

Each national economic sector has its own labor records. However, as surveys of workers, economic managers and competition organizers prove, they hardly

ever show the meaning of even those innovative initiatives which were approved by ministry collegiums. And even when they become familiar, quite frequently no haste is being shown in ensuring their practical utilization.

Usually cited among the reasons for this situation are insufficient information, lack of profound and thoroughly studied data and, above all, real economic incentive. All of this is correct. The following question, therefore, legitimately arises: what should be the incentives and conditions which ensure universal support of progressive experience and its dissemination?

Major Condition for Labor Progress

We find in Lenin's works specific and profoundly scientifically substantiated answers to these questions. V. I. Lenin foresaw that "the force of the example, which could not show itself in a capitalist society, would become of tremendous importance in a society which has abolished the private ownership of land and factories, not only because here the good example will perhaps be emulated but also because the best example in the organization of production will be accompanied by the inevitable easing of labor and increased volume of consumption for those who have achieved this better organization" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 150).

V. I. Lenin directly related dissemination of the progressive experience in the organization of free labor to the real social and economic advantages which it gives the working people. Facilitating and improving labor is a powerful incentive for its progress, the effect of which can be manifested only under a socialist organization of production and social life. Shortening the working time and eliminating particularly difficult and health-harming labor through industrialization played a most important role in the development of a new attitude toward it. This new attitude toward labor triggered unparalleled labor accomplishments during the first five-year plans and ensured their mass support.

The steadily rising level of spiritual culture and the intellectual development of the working people call for relating even more closely the application of progressive experience in labor organization to the all-round improvement of labor conditions. In accordance with the party's social policy, a tremendous amount of work is being done in the country to reduce the amount of unattractive types of labor activities. At the same time, a qualitatively new problem is being purposefully resolved: the creation of conditions for a creative and intellectually saturated labor in all jobs.

Indicative in this respect is the VAZ experience, where a system of professional promotion from simple activities to more meaningful ones, requiring greater skills, is applied. The attractiveness of the brigade organization of labor is largely determined by its influence on enriching the nature of labor and strengthening collectivistic relations.

The decisive stimulating factors in the application of the Shchekino method are not only additional earnings but the new labor conditions and expansion of functions. The average addition to wages for work on the Shchekino method

is about 20 rubles monthly. Studies have indicated, however, that in order to create an interest in substantially increasing the volume of work through material incentives alone, a wage supplement of 50 to 60 rubles is necessary. It is characteristic that at many enterprises where the Shchekino method was applied the workers actively supported it even before they began to receive their supplements, for the work they were doing became more interesting and meaningful. At the Polimir Production Association in Novopolotsk, for example, the share of the intellectual functions of those using the Shchekino method almost doubled. This was contributed by the total interchangeability of jobs, collective forms of equipment servicing, and removal of the workers from areas harmful and dangerous to the health. If in the application of the Shchekino method the workers are offered only an automatic increase in the volume of unattractive labor functions, few would volunteer.

The most essential changes in labor take place among those who master new jobs. In the sectors most closely related to the scientific and technical revolution, 60 to 70 of every 100 released workers go to sectors requiring higher skills. It is precisely the higher skill and the transfer to more meaningful types of work based on new equipment that determine the attractiveness of the Shchekino experience.

The category of workers-intellectuals, whose labor comes very close to engineering activities, is increasing in the country. For example, modern technical knowledge in handling control panels for heavy machine units for the production of ammonia, methanol and polyethylene are used more extensively than in the work of many categories of engineers. Thanks to his engineering knowledge (he is a graduate of an evening school institute), V. Galkin, a machine operator at the Azot Production Association in Severodonetsk, was able to restructure the standard labor organization system in such a way that, although working without an assistant, as required by the table of organizations, he was able to achieve record-setting earnings. Together with his comrades, A. Posvezhinnyy, senior operator at the Azot Production Association in Novomoskovsk, submitted a number of suggestions which made it possible to master the first domestically produced heavy-tonnage ammonia production machine unit 7 months ahead of the normed deadline, thus ensuring the additional production of many thousands of tons of chemical fertilizers. Let us note that his creative thoughts successfully "competed" against the ideas of the collective of the State Scientific Research and Design Institute of the Nitrogen Industry and Products of Organic Synthesis, which developed the plan for the machine unit and determined the time needed for its industrial mastery. It is not a question here of poor work done by the institute but of the tremendous potency, of the very logic of innovative searches, which are boundless.

It is not surprising that V. Galkin and A. Posvezhinnyy have many followers who are persistently studying their experience which has now been made available to all related enterprises. Specialized centers for training workers in higher skills, the curricula of which call for the comprehensive study of the experience of workers-innovators, have been opened in the chemical industry.

The attitude toward labor accomplishments which are based less on increased knowledge than on the physical load carried by the worker is developing

differently. Our country has experienced difficult periods, when it was precisely this path that was the only possible one in rapidly increasing the production of goods. Today, however, under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution, records set at the price of higher labor intensiveness are increasingly considered anachronistic and enjoy no active support.

Let us take as an example workers in mass skills such as weavers in light industry, and twiners and reelers in the chemical fibers industry. Their path to higher labor accomplishments still goes above all through enlarging their service area. Here records frequently exceed average sectorial norms of output by a factor of 1.2-2. In order to reach such a volume of work one must service more machines than called for by the norm and correspondingly increase the flow. It is easy to assess the size of record-setting flows when the norm frequently calls for 5 to 10 kilometers per shift. The work of this worker category demands constant physical efforts and stress: a break in the thread means irreparable production losses.

It is no secret that veterans in such jobs are not very willing to see their children continue with the family tradition. Front-rankers in these sectors earn very well and enjoy extensive social recognition. However, the hope that their achievements can be comprehensively duplicated remains in most cases unjustified today. It is not only a question of the fact that mastery, as well as the physical and mental possibilities of multiple-loom handlers are unique, but of the low appeal of their work and its stress. Let us point out for the sake of justice that production organizers are doing a great deal to rationalize these types of work and lower the worker load through improvements of local significance. It is also clear, however, that without converting to essentially new technological processes, which would free the workers from many kilometers of runs between noisy and dusty looms and machines and would enable them to engage in creative intellectual activities the solution of the basic problems of labor organization in such sectors would be impossible. Finding manpower for such jobs is becoming increasingly difficult, particularly given the current demographic situation.

Our country has already developed basically new technological processes which relieve such workers from their long runs and radically change the nature of their work, which becomes essentially one of supervision and observation. However, the production of the new equipment is being extremely slow, as a result of which tens of thousands of workers in the chemical fibers industry will have to use the old methods for years on end.

As a rule, the economic managers try to compensate for adverse labor conditions by paying higher wages and increasing benefits. However, as a rule, increased material incentives yield only local results which, in the final account, coincide neither with the interests of society nor those of the worker. Such practices, which were born of the fact that some production sectors have fallen behind in their technical development, narrow the possibility of doing creative work, hinder the comprehensive development of the individual and objectively act as an inertial factor which counters scientific and technical progress.

This contradiction will be resolved by the extensive use of robots, as stipulated by the 26th CPSU Congress. The use of industrial robots in industry has already made it possible to release more than 100,000 workers this five-year plan. Currently robots are being developed essentially with a view to eliminating heavy and health-harming labor. However, it is also important to make use of robotics in reducing monotonous, creatively impoverished and unskilled labor which cannot always be eliminated with production automation.

In a number of cases, as we know, automation limits the labor functions of the worker to that of a passive observer and controller. By inertia, many researchers continue to this day to admire jobs in which the workers wear white smocks and, relieved from physical work, spend hours watching instrument readings. However, the monotony of intellectual functions could trigger as many problems as monotonous physical work. Wherever conversion to full automation is impossible, the scientific and technical revolution calls for the use of microprocessors which enable us not only drastically to increase labor productivity but which relieve the workers from routine, meaningless operations.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures To Accelerate Scientific and Technical Progress in the National Economy" stipulated as one of the main directions in the work the extensive automation of technological processes on the basis of the use of automated machine tools, machines and mechanisms, standardized equipment modules, robot complexes and computers.

It is precisely the contemporary scientific and technical revolution which offers increasingly new opportunities for the comprehensive implementation of Lenin's instruction that the best example of production organization should be accompanied by an inevitable easing of the work. The task is to make use of such opportunities far more completely than has been the case so far.

Preferential Shock Work

A great deal remains to be done also to ensure the fuller implementation of the other mandatory conditions for the extensive dissemination of the best labor examples, as pointed out by Lenin: increasing the "sum total of consumption by those who have achieved a better organization."

The need to use special incentives for production front-rankers is based both on the social significance of their accomplishments as well as the features of their creative efforts. The production front-ranker is an innovator, a pioneer, a scout for the future and a beacon for those who follow. The fulfillment of this role requires considerably greater efforts than progress, even if very successful, down a trodden path. Achieving high results in labor after such an opportunity has been provided by the innovator becomes considerably easier. S. G. Strumilin has pointed out that "innovators are workers of a qualitatively different type. These people use a new labor yardstick." It is entirely legitimate for this qualitatively new and higher labor yardstick to be consistent with an adequate measure of consumption.

Experienced production workers remember when the prestige of the front-ranker was reliably supported with both moral and rather substantial material advantages. His earnings frequently exceeded the average enterprise wage by several hundred percent. The home and resting conditions of the front-ranker were frequently better than those of the director. This situation was considered natural by the financial organs as well. But even today, as was most emphatically stressed at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, we cannot forget the fact that we live in a socialist society in which everyone has the right only to the type of material goods which are consistent with the quantity and quality of his socially useful labor. The principle of distribution under socialism should be fully taken into consideration in rewarding the labor of innovators.

Practical work here is dominated by a trend of equalization. The view of the financial worker who believes that the worker has received "too much," reached frequently without any additional study whatsoever, proves to be sufficient for the subsequent monthly payments to be substantially reduced and the output norm increased.

This frequently occurs in progressive collectives as well, which have achieved the best labor results. Various pretexts are used for reducing their incentive funds while steadily increasing their assignments. A. Voss, CP of Latvia Central Committee first secretary, mentioned the collective of the Daugavpils Khimvolokno Production Association which, after applying the Shchekino experience and releasing nearly 2,000 people, tripled its production volume and achieved the highest earnings in the sector, after which its social fund was substantially reduced. One can easily imagine the impact of such practices on the attitude toward the use of progressive experience.

The existing system of labor organization and competition presumes the possibility of a relatively simple assessment of the real labor contribution of every competitor and, on this basis, rewarding those who have produced more and better-quality goods with less outlay. In highly automated production traditional approaches to labor organization and incentive and in competition prove to be inapplicable and clash with the logic of the scientific and technical revolution. Automated production hinders the individual assessment of labor results and results of participation in the competition. End results are so remote from the individual worker that he can even not always be aware of his participation in them. Meanwhile, low quality and shortcomings in the organization of the work, inefficient use of equipment, raw materials and energy, irresponsibility and violations of labor and technological discipline result in this case in irreparable losses.

With strictly controlled work, based on a number of technical instructions, the activities of the operator who considerably overfulfills his planned assignments in terms of quantity indicators and sets individual labor productivity records, is as a rule impossible. In this case creating the necessary conditions for innovative initiative is far more difficult than in traditional production facilities. That is why the approach to assessing progressive experience in the organization of the competition and developing incentives for highly productive labor must be different in such cases.

Collective responsibility for labor results under the conditions of automated production should, in our view, parallel the joint formulation by the members of the collective of decisions on the level of incentives and, if necessary, penalties imposed on the individual worker. Experience has indicated an acceptable organizational form--the brigade contracting method. A brigade which fulfills its planned assignments and observes the stipulated norms should receive the maximal bonus and decide alone how to distribute it. However, losses caused by equipment idling or raw material and energy over-expenditures should be paid for by the specific culprit, also named by the brigade. The labor of the repairmen should be reorganized as well. It could hardly be considered normal for repair workers to earn more when the equipment operates properly but during periods of breakdowns.

Using the labor participation coefficient, labor incentive would reflect more completely differences in worker skills and levels of their responsibility and creative returns. We must significantly increase the efficiency of bonuses for innovation, creativity and initiative shown by the worker and the director. It would be only just for such incentive to lead to a certain reduction in the volume of material goods obtained by those who prefer to work as in the past and who seek a tranquil life for themselves during the tempestuous century of the scientific and technical revolution. Our society is highly interested in reducing the number of such workers in our country, which is also the purpose of achieving better consistency between the measures of labor and consumption.

In perfecting today the developed socialist society, it is exceptionally important to take fully into consideration Lenin's instruction that "we can and must see to it that the force of the example is first moral and then a mandatorily applied model of labor structure..." (op. cit., vol 36, p 148). In applying leading experience under contemporary conditions, we should be oriented not only toward administrative but toward effective measures of economic incentive and coercion.

The time has come to compensate for the outlays made by front-ranking production workers and labor collectives who disseminate their experience. Let me cite a typical example. Together with the sectorial trade union Central Committee, and with the participation of the Ivano-Frankovsk Obkom, CP of the Ukraine, the Ministry of Chemical Industry sponsored an all-union course-seminar on the study of new forms of application of the Shchekino experience at the Khlorvinil Production Association in Kaluga. The Karpathian chemists were able to make efficient and innovative use of this experience, as a result of which in a few years they were able to release more than 1,600 workers and staff new production facilities, which account for a considerable share of the output of this very large enterprise, with skilled and properly trained cadres. A system of standards was developed here, efficiently regulating labor outlays at each sector and job and determining means to reduce them. Naturally, the experiment triggered broad interest and more than 500 people attended the seminar. The achievements of the Kaluga chemists were rated highly and, above all, the Shchekino movement gained new followers.

What were the economic consequences of the seminar to the enterprise? Some 300 association workers were engaged in organizing and holding it, for 4-5

work days. Naturally, the time outlays of economic, party and trade union managers were substantially higher. Automobile expenditures alone (the guests had to be met and taken back to the airports and the Ivano-Frankovsk, Lvov, Kalusha and Stryya railroad stations) were in the thousands of rubles.

No single association worker complained of the difficulties and financial outlays. All of them were proud that their accomplishments had been recognized and that they had been useful. However, the question of compensating for outlays for such projects nevertheless remains. Bearing in mind the current situation, this is a rather difficult matter. Neither the enterprise nor the ministry had this kind of money, it had simply not been contemplated.

Obviously, the borrowing and sharing of front-ranking experience should be based on cost accounting. The same system is followed by enterprises and organizations in the case of measures sponsored by the Exhibition of the Achievements of the National Economy or the scientific and technical propaganda houses operating on a cost-accounting basis. Obviously, it would be expedient to pay a fee to those who share their experience. This would make it possible not only to increase the incentive of the carriers of progressive experience to disseminate it but will also upgrade the responsibility of the guests: back from such seminars, they would seriously help to undertake the application of the innovations in order to justify the cost of the trip.

More than 20 years ago, when I worked at the Zaporozhe Scientific and Technical Propaganda House, I had the occasion to tour all machine-building plants in the oblast together with a then-famous Leningrad turner-innovator. We took with us dozens of attachments developed by the innovator who described them in detail and demonstrated them to interested Zaporozhe people. A payment voucher for a demonstration lecture was filled and it seemed to some that the Leningrad guest had earned a great deal of money. However, a computation of the results of his innovations made it clear that outlays were redeemed a hundred times over. This system is still applied today in the case of technical innovations. However, although the end results of modern production are determined as much by the objectiveness of economic and managerial decisions as by technical developments, in terms of encouraging the dissemination of progressive experience the approach retained in the organization of labor is the same as when the main attention was paid to technical production factors only.

Furthermore, it is important to realize that progressive experience in the organization of labor does not have a strictly economic side. The educational aspect of labor experience and its components, such as responsibility, discipline, persistence, collectivism and mutual aid, is of tremendous importance to us, particularly when it is a question of young people.

In addressing a meeting of the party-economic aktiv of the Khimprom Production Association in Kemerovo, I. Pomytkin, chairman of the Tutors' Council, said that today we frequently come across parasitism and money-grubbing in young people. Some young workers are concerned most of all with finding a "lucrative" profession. One of the main reasons for this is that many young people do not remain long at work in the same enterprises. "Quite quickly,"

the cadre worker sadly noted, "the young people realize that there are manpower shortages and that, consequently, one could engage in both absenteeism and drinking. Their tutors bear some responsibility for this, for it means that they had been unable to develop in their pupils the best traditions; they were unable to find the approach and, perhaps, they themselves did not set the type of example worthy of emulation."

In discussing the dissemination of progressive experience and encouraging innovation, we must always remember the attractiveness of the positive example. An experience recommended for emulation should be consistent with the value orientation and expectations of those who we expect will support it. In defining their attitude toward the achievements of a front-ranker, his followers take into consideration not only his production indicators but the labor conditions under which they were attained, the benefits and advantages which they provide and the personal qualities of the bearers of leading experience.

Some people display a skeptical attitude toward record-setting achievements, which they consider the result of artificially created "greenhouse" conditions for the work of the front-rankers. We must admit that this skepticism is frequently based on real grounds and proves justified. Sociological studies have indicated also that not all production front-rankers willingly share their experience and that some of them display lack of modesty, make excessive demands and ignore the interests of the other members of the collective.

Particularly complex moral clashes occur when the results of the intensive work of the individual front-ranker or collective are depreciated because of gross errors in planning, procurements or marketing, or sometimes even because of obvious negligence and in responsibility of superior workers. For example, the personnel at the Azot Production Association in Novomoskovsk launched a competition for the fastest possible reaching of planned norms and further lowering them in the areas of raw material, material and energy outlays. However, it is easy to imagine the impact which shortcomings in the organization of the transportation and storage of the fertilizer and its improper application as a result of which millions of tons are wasted every year, as is universally known, has on the dissemination of this experience.

The members of the collective at the Apatit Production Association, where dozens of initiatives of national economic significance have been launched, bitterly complain about the dumping of most valuable raw materials which could be used to produce millions of tons of cement, soda and alumina annually. Let us frankly say that the enterprise's management and party committee finds it difficult to convince the people of the need to save kopecks and kilograms.

A suitable moral atmosphere which will show no disparity between slogans and reality and between words and actions is necessary in order to have highly productive and conscientious work and to ensure mass support of superior labor accomplishments.

We can no longer tolerate a situation in which appeals to the workers' conscience, enthusiasm and conscientiousness are used to hide the inability or unwillingness of some managers to promote the organized and uninterrupted work of the collective by providing the necessary technical and organizational conditions.

At the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum Comrade Yu. V. Andropov formulated new requirements concerning the organization of the socialist competition. Its participants today must concentrate on upgrading the quality of output, improving the use of production capacities, raw materials, energy and working time, and strengthening conservation measures.

The turn of the economy to intensive management methods and to production growth based on quality factors presumes the orientation of the socialist competition toward the comprehensive development of science and technology. If the collective and its managers know that with the existing technical facilities and the labor conditions they offer no positive assessment of the work could be hoped for, and if a most serious consideration is made of the price at which quantitative indicators are met, the attitude toward scientific and technical progress would change substantially. The implementation by industrial ministries and enterprises of assignments related to the installation of new equipment and the reduction of manual labor is not included as a rule among the basic assessment indicators in summing up competition results which are oriented toward steadily increasing production output.

The activeness and extent to which competition relations are developed depend on the level of development of production forces and the scientific and technical potential of society. The higher this level becomes, the more efficiently will the competition possibilities be realized and the more significant should its influence be on the course and results of socioeconomic progress. The appearance of superior socialist competition methods and the birth of the movement for a communist attitude toward labor, the 25th anniversary of which we celebrated this year, are legitimately related to and coincide in time with the extensive development of the scientific and technical revolution in our country.

The integration of the scientific and technical revolution with competition comprehensively intensifies their overall impact on social progress. The use of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution enables us not only radically to change the organization of labor but significantly to upgrade on a scientific level the organization of the competition itself and the substantiated selection of progressive experience. Modern computers ensure the efficient processing of competition data and enable us to improve the publicity and comparability of its results.

The experience of the progressive enterprises has indicated that the use of computers enables us to sum up competition results daily, to keep strict data on the implementation of plans and obligations by the individual worker or subunit and not only to determine the winners but to assess the results of the work of every competitor. The unified nationwide system for data gathering and processing, which is being developed in the country, should obviously cover the most valuable data on progressive experience in the organization of the work and make it available to all economic sectors.

Millions of workers and kolkhoz members could become actively interested in the use of progressive experience only if it truly contributes to changing the nature of their work, filling it with an intellectual content, strengthening the material and spiritual foundations of the socialist way of life, and molding the new man. These are precisely the tasks which determine today

the end results of the socialist competition and the comprehensive application of progressive experience in the organization of the work.

Unfortunately, so far in both practice and theory most of the attention has been focused on intermediary results. Most frequently, to this day success in the dissemination of progressive experience is determined on the basis of figures on the overfulfillment of the production plan, underestimating problems of the social development and upbringing of the worker of a new type. The use of progressive experience is insufficiently directed toward the solution of the main problem: completing the reorganization of all social relations on a collectivistic basis internally inherent in socialism. Yet the dissemination of progressive experience in the organization of the work should contribute to such a restructuring in the material and spiritual areas more energetically than is the case today. Contemporary labor organization methods should comprehensively contribute to the implementation of Lenin's requirement of "working in such a way that the rule 'all for one and one for all' become part of the awareness and a daily habit of the masses..." (op. cit., vol 41, p 108).

The system of measures aimed at improving the economic mechanism, which is being applied in our country, creates favorable economic prerequisites for the comprehensive utilization of all reserves for upgrading labor efficiency, which is the main factor of socioeconomic progress. The extensive dissemination of progressive experience in the organization of the work is one of the most important prerequisites for the utilization of such reserves.

The recently passed CPSU Central Committee decree "On Improving the Organization and Practice of Summing Up the Results of the Socialist Competition and Rewarding Its Winners" pays great attention to supporting and disseminating progressive experience. Work is currently under way to refine the competition conditions and so is a search for new competition organization methods consistent with current requirements. Such a search is legitimate. Many previously established competition methods prove to be ineffective and sometimes simply unacceptable at the present stage of production and labor socialization, development of collective labor organization methods and the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution. When organizing the competition, it is very important to take more fully into consideration the real labor motivations of the contemporary worker and the changes in his interests and requirements. It is only on this basis that we can find the most effective incentives which would motivate a person to engage in creative and initiative-minded work and adopt a suitable attitude toward it.

It is also clear that we must substantially reduce the flow of requests, instructions and demands for information and reports "from above," which sometimes consume the lion's share of the forces and time of the local competition organizers. The main attention should be focused on promptly noting and supporting the shoots of new and progressive developments in labor collectives, created by the competition, and provide the necessary socioeconomic and organizational conditions for their comprehensive dissemination.

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

5003
CSO: 1802/4

BATTLE FOR THE DNEPR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83) pp 59-69

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union Twice Hero of the Soviet Union K. Moskalenko, USSR deputy minister of defense, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the radical turn in the Great Patriotic War]

[Text] The military exploit of the Soviet forces in the battle for the Dnepr in August-September 1943 is an outstanding page in the Great Patriotic War. As we know, the main and decisive event in the summer campaign of 1943 was the battle for Kursk. As a result of the defeat of the German-fascist forces at the Kursk arc, a crushing blow was struck at Hitlerite Germany. The strategic initiative, which had switched to the Soviet command after Stalingrad, was now definitively in the hands of our armed forces. Taking into consideration the existing situation, the communist party's Central Committee and the Soviet government set the troops the task of increasing their strikes at the enemy, tirelessly expelling him from our land and freeing from fascist oppression millions of Soviet people.

The aggressors' level of military potential was dropping. Signs of exhaustion of his manpower were becoming increasingly apparent. In July and August 1943 the German land forces had lost as many as 538,000 people on the Eastern Front. Reinforcements compensated for such losses by less than one-half. After the battle for Kursk the Hitlerites were no longer able to mount broad offensive operations and were forced to convert to strategic defense.

Conversely, the Soviet Union and its great army were gathering a victorious pace. Thanks to the labor upsurge of workers, kolkhoz members and intellectuals, the country's national economy was successfully surmounting the difficulties of the first war years and supplying the front with everything necessary. During the second half of 1943 our war industry produced 12,900 tanks and self-propelling artillery systems and more than 16,000 combat aircraft. The army in the field was being steadily reinforced with new reserves. Thus, another 456,700 men were sent to the front in July and August. On 1 September the forces of the Central, Voronezh and Steppe fronts numbered 1,580,000 people, more than 30,000 guns and howitzers and about 1,200 tanks and self-propelling artillery systems. The Red Army was increasing its strength in the course of its capital offensive and retaining its offensive might. The major strategic victories it had won were contributing to the growth of the international prestige of the Soviet Union. The peoples of Europe, enslaved by fascist Germany, intensified their struggle for freedom

and independence. The resistance movement was energized. The entire freedom-loving world looked hopefully on the socialist state which was rescuing mankind from the brown plague.

The antifascist coalition strengthened thanks to the efforts of the Soviet Union. With increasing insistence the working people in the United States and Great Britain demanded the opening of a second front. Under the influence of the successes achieved by the Red Army and public pressure, the American and British staffs began to draw up plans for landing their troops in France.

The moral spirit of the Soviet people was becoming even stronger. After the battle for Kursk everyone expected new victories at the front. The patriotic and labor activeness in the country and the unification of the working people around the Leninist party increased. Our people had a deep and infinite faith in the fact that the party will lead it to victory. The troops at the front felt with every passing day the warm and decisive support of all Soviet people and courageously, sparing no strength or life itself, performed their military duty. The military skills of the Soviet armed forces increased and the moral and political unity among the peoples of the USSR strengthened even further in the course of the trials of this blood-shedding war.

The battle for the Dnepr involved several operations by the Group of Fronts, conducted on the basis of an overall plan drafted by Supreme Command Headquarters. The combat operations involved can be divided into two stages. During the first stage (August-September 1943) the Red Army routed the German-fascist forces on the Left Bank Ukraine and the Donbass and reached the middle reaches of the Dnepr, between the estuary of the Sozh River near Zaporozhe and the estuary of the Molochnaya River. During that period our troops captured a number of bridgeheads on the right bank of the Dnepr. During the second stage (October-December) the Soviet armed forces routed the Hitlerites in the middle and lower reaches of the Dnepr, liberated Kiev, established a strategic bridgehead and threw back all enemy attempts to restore his defenses on the Dnepr.

These assignments were carried out by the forces of the Central, Voronezh, Steppe, Southwestern and Southern fronts. On 20 October they were renamed, respectively, the Belorussian, and the First, Second, Third and Fourth Ukrainian fronts. The command of these fronts was assumed by the experienced military leaders K. K. Rokossovskiy, N. F. Vatutin, I. S. Konev, R. Ya. Malinovskiy and F. I. Tolbukhin. The fronts included 24 combined-army (including eight guard), three tank and five air armies. Headquarters assigned the coordination of combat operations on the Central, Voronezh and Steppe fronts to Marshal of the Soviet Union G. K. Zhukov and the Southwestern and Southern fronts to Marshal of the Soviet Union A. M. Vasilevskiy.

As early as 11 August, during the battles for Kursk, the fascist command had ordered the construction of a defensive line in the rear, the so-called "Eastern Wall," the base of which was to be a water obstacle--the Dnepr. The defense line was to be completed by 15 November. Under those circumstances, it was extremely important for the Soviet command to gain time and to begin

to cross the Don earlier, before the retreating Hitlerite forces could take firm defensive positions along the entire length of the "Eastern Wall."

The task was incredibly difficult. The offensive had to be prepared in the course of fierce battles in the directions of Orel and Kharkov. Personnel losses of units and formations had to be replenished for the forthcoming operation, material facilities had to be stockpiled and their delivery had to be planned under combat conditions and the total devastation by the enemy of the territory he abandoned, including the destruction of the railroad tracks.

In the area from Orel to Taganrog, which accounted for 32 percent of the length of the Soviet-German front, the Soviet command concentrated as much as 50 percent of the personnel, 40 percent of the artillery, more than 50 percent of the combat aircraft and about 70 percent of the tanks.

The first stage in the general strategic offensive by the Red Army to the southwest began on 13 August with the liberation of the Donbass. The fascist leaders ascribed exceptional importance to holding the Donbass. However, in the course of the battles for Kharkov the command of the Group of Armies South was first to transfer from there four tank divisions. This weakened the Donbass enemy group and Supreme Command Headquarters made immediate use of this circumstances. It assigned the forces of the Southwestern Front to strike at Barvenkovo, Pavlograd and Zaporozhe and block the retreat to the west of the enemy forces.

The forces of the right wing of the front began their offensive on 13 August. In assisting the Steppe Front in routing the Kharkov enemy group, they crossed Severskiy Donets and captured Zmiyevo, thus blocking the enemy forces which had been moved from the front on the Mius River. The artillery barrage of the assault group began 3 days later at the center of the front, where the battles became intensive and blood-shedding. As a whole, no offensive was developed in that area but this helped the Steppe Front to defeat the Kharkov group and the Southern Front to breach the Mius defenses.

The forces of the Southern Front launched their offensive on 18 August. They breached the Mius defense lines which the Hitlerites had spent almost 2 years building and considered unbreachable, repelled enemy counterattacks and, widening the breach, cut off and crushed the Taganrog enemy group. As a result, the fascist forces in the Donbass were threatened by encirclement from the south. The enemy's situation became even more critical following the liberation of Kharkov. As the forces of the left wing of the Southwestern Front began their offensive, the battles developed along the entire semi-circle, in the north, east and south.

Hitler's supreme command intended to assign 12 divisions from the front held by the Groups of Armies North and Center to hold the Donbass. However, the rapidly increasing danger in the direction of Kiev forced him to abandon these intentions. However stubbornly the fascist forces resisted in the Donbass, they were unable to stop the advance of the Red Army and their uninterrupted withdrawal behind the Dnepr and Molochnaya rivers began during the first half of September.

How were events developing in the direction of Kiev?

The forces of the Central Front began their offensive on 26 August. Their main strike was in the direction of Novgorod-Seversk. However, they were unable to develop their success. Meanwhile, in the sector of the auxiliary strike, south of Sevsk, the 60th Army of Gen I. D. Chernyakhovskiy achieved great success. It breached the enemy's defenses and by the end of 31 August had advanced 60 kilometers and widened the breach to 100 kilometers. Headquarters and the front's command made maximal use of this success. In this sector the 13th Combined-Army and Second Tank Army were hastily transferred from the front assault group on the right flank. Covered by the 16th Air Army, they irrepressibly advanced toward Konotop.

The Hitlerite command committed several infantry and tank divisions in the battle against the forces of the Central Front as well as large air forces. However, they proved insufficient to stop our offensive. No other enemy reserves could be found nearby. Generally speaking, the enemy was unable to determine the scale of his error also because the offensive of the left wing of the Central Front merged with the offensive of the right wing and the center of the Voronezh Front in the direction of Kiev.

Following the liberation of Kharkov, the forces of the Steppe Front advanced and applied pressure on a large enemy group which was retreating toward Poltava and Kremenchug.

Therefore, the general strategic offensive mounted by the Red Army, from Velikiye Luki to the Sea of Azov during the first half of August developed and involved within its orbit an increasing amount of forces, means and territory. Seven fronts were already advancing by the end of August and the beginning of September. They formed an inevitable wave of retribution, which had started at the Kursk arc and which fascist Germany and its satellites were unable to stop for the duration of the war.

The most favorable circumstances for developing the offensive were in the sectors of the Voronezh and left flank of the Central fronts, i.e., in the directions of Kiev and Gomel. These armies were to strike at the junction of the Groups of Armies Center and South and could deeply split the enemy's strategic front, ensuring the immediate reaching of the left bank of the Dnepr by our forces, crossing it in the Kiev area and creating a real threat to the Hitlerite flanks and rear.

These events are well-remembered by this author who commanded first the 40th and subsequently the 38th armies of the Voronezh Front which were operating in the center of the battles which developed.

The operational plan drafted in accordance with headquarters instructions by Marshal of the Soviet Union G. K. Zhukov and Army Gen N. F. Vatutin was of decisive importance. The overall objective of the operation was to destroy the enemy on the left bank of the Dnepr, reach the Dnepr and seize bridge-heads along the Rzhishchev-Cherkassy sector in order to continue subsequently the operations along the right bank.

The main strike was dealt by the front's right flank with the forces of the 38th, 40th and Third Guard Tank armies, the Second and Fifth Guard and 10th Tank armies, the First Guard Cavalry Corps and the Seventh Artillery Corps which were to open a breach with the task of deeply encircling from the north the Army Group South, moving the direction of Kiev toward the Dnepr and cross it with the main forces in the Rzhishchev-Kanev sector. The auxiliary strike was to be dealt in the center with the forces of the 47th, 52nd and 27th armies, the immediate task of which was to cut off the enemy's communications between Kiev and Poltava and emerge in the direction of Cherkassy.

The pace of the offensive was high. Thus, the right flank formations of the 40th Army, interacting with the troops of the 38th Army had not only met their assignment by the end of the third day, but even moved 20 kilometers beyond the stipulated line. We crossed the Khorol River rapidly and quickly advanced to the Sula line.

The main attention was concentrated on crossing the waterways on the run. The army press described how rivers were crossed with the help of the available means on hand. The "Memorandum to the Troops on Crossing" was extensively disseminated among the troops. As we approached the Dnepr, we located soldiers who had participated in crossing rivers and their experience was shared with those who were the first to resolve this problem. Agitators' seminars were held at the front's formations. The question of the role and tasks of the party members in obeying the order of crossing the Dnepr was discussed at party meetings.

The Dnepr was a powerful obstacle facing our troops. Its right bank--high and steep--offered a broad view of the low river land. It was as much as 3.5 kilometers wide and as much as 12 meters deep and in some places the speed of the current was as much as 2 meters per second. It was no accident that the fascists had chosen the Dnepr as their main defense line after the failure of their offensive strategy. They hoped to stop here the Red Army offensive, to bleed it white and resume their offensive.

As far as we were concerned, we had to cross the Dnepr at all cost, seize bridgeheads, dig in there and then liberate the Right Bank Ukraine. This had to be accomplished without delay, using available means and absolutely within a short time, before the enemy forces which were retreating behind the Dnepr had been able to assume their defensive positions along the entire bank and to dig in.

The first to reach the Dnepr was the advance detachment of the 309th Infantry Division of the 40th Army. This took place on 20 September at 2200 hours, in the area of the Bukrinskaya-Dnepr Salient, south of Pereyaslav, Khmel'nitskiy. The main army forces began to approach the Dnepr between 21 and 23 September. Despite a lack of regulation crossing facilities, they immediately undertook to cross the river. The mass crossing began on 23 September. At the same time, advanced attachments of the Third Guard Tank Army commanded by Gen P. S. Rybalko, and Gen N. Ye. Chibisov's 38th Army reached the Dnepr and began to cross it.

By 29 September the forces of the Voronezh Front had seized nine bridgeheads on the right bank of the Dnepr, the most important of which in terms of subsequent events were the Bukrinskiy, held by the 40th Army to the south, and the Lyutezhskiy, held by the 38th Army to the north of Kiev. Within that period the forces of the Central Front approached the Dnepr, crossed it between 22 and 30 September and captured bridgeheads from the estuary of the Pripyati to the Teterev rivers. The forces of the Steppe Front reached the Dnepr in the Kremenchug area between 25 and 30 September and seized five bridgeheads. The forces of the Southwestern Front reached the Dnepr south of Dnepropetrovsk, crossed it on 25 September and seized small bridgeheads.

The success of crossing the river and capturing and holding bridgeheads depended above all on the activities of the advanced detachments. They consisted of experienced, daring and initiative-minded commanders and carefully chosen personnel. Party and Komsomol members were assigned to them.

The troops ardently wanted to liberate Kiev and expel the enemy from the Right Bank. The working people of the Ukraine intensified their activeness in the struggle against the occupation forces. The CP of the Ukraine Central Committee, Supreme Soviet Presidium and Sovnarkom of the Republic address to the Ukrainian people played a noteworthy role in this. It stated the following: "People of the Ukraine, engage in the decisive battle! We are not alone in the struggle. Shoulder to shoulder with us are Russians, Belorussians, Georgians, Armenians--the sons of all the peoples of the Soviet Union. Forward in the offensive on the enemy!" By the end of September the Soviet forces had reached the Dnepr along the front from Loyev to Zaporozhe, along a 700-kilometer-long line, and had seized more than 20 bridgeheads.

Many heroic exploits were committed by the Soviet troops, the partisans and the local population, including those of guards-Komsomol members V. N. Ivanov, N. Ye. Petukhov, I. D. Semenov, V. A. Sysolyatin, armored troops soldier S. P. Laptev, engineers Sgt V. D. Chernomorets, submachine gunner P. P. Nefedov, Capt V. S. Petrov, deputy commander of a fighter-antitank artillery regiment, kolkhoz member G. P. Tregub, tank men, fliers, etc.

The second stage of the battle for the Dnepr was characterized by stubborn fighting for bridgeheads on the right bank and for widening them. Although the forces of the Second and Third Ukrainian fronts had achieved substantial successes in October and had liberated Dnepropetrovsk, Dneprodzerzhinsk, Zaporozhe and Melitopol, the center of gravity of the battles remained in the Kiev area, the strategic importance of which was well understood by the fascist command. Starting with the beginning of October it had concentrated 30 divisions against the forces of the Voronezh Front (seven of them tank), i.e., almost half of the divisions of the Group of Armies South.

The forces of the Voronezh Front faced a difficult task. In October the front strike group twice mounted an offensive from the Bukrinskiy bridgehead, the purpose of which was to capture Kiev. However, it was unable to achieve a decisive success. Then, I remember, on 23 October Gen N. F. Vatutin, the front commander, came to the observation point from where P. S. Rybalko and A. A. Yepishev, member of our army's Military Council, and I were conducting

the battle. As we were reporting the situation to him, there was a call from Moscow via high-frequency radio for Nikolay Fedorovich. Following is the content of the conversation with J. V. Stalin, supreme commander in chief, as subsequently told to us by N. F. Vatutin.

"Clearly, the troops of Comrades Moskalenko and Rybalko are finding it very difficult to advance on Kiev from this bridgehead," the supreme commander in chief said. "The topography is very rugged which hinders the maneuvering of large tank masses. This suits the enemy who is also holding higher positions dominating ours. Furthermore, he has brought up major forces, tank and motorized divisions and a large number of antitank weapons and aviation. You know all of this. The conclusion is that you will not take Kiev by striking from the south. Consider now the Lyuterzhskiy bridgehead, which is north of Kiev and is being held by the 38th Army. It may be smaller, but the area is flatter and makes it possible to use large tank masses. It would be easier to capture Kiev from there. I suggest to you to consider the question of the lateral movement of the Third Guard Tank Army and reinforcement detachments of the 40th Army to the Lyuterzhskiy bridgehead. They should be moved secretly, under cover of darkness, from the Bukrinskiy to the Lyuterzhskiy bridgehead. The 40th and 27th armies should continue their offensive from the previous direction. Our operations should be such as to mislead the enemy."

We thought about it and realized that we had lost the operative surprise. The enemy had brought up reserves and been able to strengthen his defenses and our tanks had been deprived of the possibility of maneuvering.

The next day a headquarters directive addressed to G. K. Zhukov and N. F. Vatutin was received from Moscow. It detailed the instructions issued the previous evening on the redeployment of the troops and gave the time for starting the offensive from the Lyuterzhskiy bridgehead.

These changes affected me as well. On 27 October, based on the headquarters' decision, I was ordered urgently to yield the command of the 40th Army and take over the 38th which was scheduled to deal the main strike at the enemy Kiev group from the north. Together with A. A. Yepishev, who was appointed member of the Military Council of the 38th Army, and A. G. Batyun, who became my deputy in my new command, I moved to the Lyuterzhskiy bridgehead.

According to the directive, the straight offensive to Kiev was to be carried out by the 38th and Third Guard Tank armies. With the help of a mobile group consisting of the Third Guard Tank Army and First Guard Cavalry Corps, the 38th Army was to make a breach and develop the strike toward Vasilkov. The mobile group was to develop the offensive to the southwest. Its target was to reach the area of Fastov and Belaya Tserkov. R. D. Chernyakhovskiy's 60th Army was ordered to advance initially to the south, in the area between the Zdvizh and Irpen rivers and secure the operations of the striking front group from possible threats from the West.

The 40th and 47th armies, commanded by F. F. Zhmachenko and S. G. Trofimenko, were to initiate their offensive from the Bukrinskoye bridgehead 2 days earlier than the front strike group in the direction of Kagarlyk and Belaya

Tserkov, to paralyze the enemy forces and thus to facilitate the tasks of the armies of the right flank of the front. The Second Air Army commanded by S. A. Krasovskiy was supporting the offensive of the 38th and Third Guard Tank armies. The troops moved at night only. A large number of tank and gun dummies were deployed on the Bukrinskoye bridgehead. Radio stations and artillery-howitzer fire remained unchanged. Smokescreens were extensively used.

Despite the difficulties, the regrouping of considerable front forces was completed roughly within the stipulated deadlines and, most importantly, in secrecy. It was only on the morning of 3 November, i.e., before the offensive from the Lyuterzhskiy bridgehead began, were the Germans able to determine the purpose of the regrouping of the Soviet forces. However, the command of the Group of Armies South was still unaware of our intentions. Even when we mounted the offensive, the Germans, as Field Marshal Mannstein subsequently recalled, were still unaware of what kind of an offensive this was--with far-reaching objectives or merely an effort to widen the bridgehead.

The secret regrouping and movement of such a large number of forces on such a small bridgehead unquestionably were major accomplishments by the Soviet command and played a very important role in ensuring operative surprise.

The 38th Army (21st, 23rd, 50th and 51st Infantry corps), the Fifth Guard Tank and Seventh Artillery corps were to breach the enemy defenses along a 14-kilometer-wide sector from the Moshchun and Vyshgorod Line and, striking in the direction of Dachí Pushcha-Voditsa, Svyatoshino, Zhulyany railroad station and Vasilkov, secure on the second day of the operation the introduction of the Third Guard Tank Army with the First Guard Cavalry Corps into the breach.

We were only 10 kilometers away from Kiev. However, in the course of our offensive we had to break the resistance of a very strong enemy. There were three enemy defense lines in that direction. Each position was a developed system of trenches and communication trenches and well-equipped fire positions. All roads were mined and many settlements, cities in particular, had become strong points.

All features of the situation had to be considered before a decision on the operation was made. I suggested that the enemy's defense be breached not along the 14-kilometer-wide sector, as planned, but along a 6-kilometer front only, with the main strike to be dealt by the neighboring flanks of the 50th and 51st Infantry corps, totaling four infantry divisions. Naturally, this was risky. It was no accident that Marshal G. K. Zhukov, who represented headquarters, expressed his concern at the 1 November 1943 conference which was held in the premises of the kolkhoz club of Novo-Petrovtsy village. The conference was attended by members of the army's Military Council, the commanders of corps, divisions and brigades within the 38th Army and Col L. Svoboda, the commander of the Czechoslovak brigade. The conference was chaired by Gen N. F. Vatutin, the front commander. In reporting my decision, I substantiated the expediency of narrowing the breach sector by citing the

need to develop high artillery density. In order reliably to suppress the enemy defenses, it was decided to concentrate 88 percent of the guns and howitzers available on the bridgehead on the breach sector, so that the density would average 380 guns per front kilometers. This was the first time that such high density was used in the Great Patriotic War. In order to ensure the successful crushing of the enemy's defenses, we decided to use not only the army tank regiment but also two brigades of the Fifth Guard Tank Corps to provide direct infantry support.

Our observation post was not far from the front end of the enemy's defenses, southwest of Novo-Petrovtsy village, which offered a good view of the breach sector. In order to ensure better interaction, it was also the command post for the Third Guard Tank Army. Pillboxes for the front commander were installed here as well.

It would be difficult to overestimate the role of the political organs and party and Komsomol organizations in the preparations for and successful conduct of the operations. Tremendous party political, ideological and organizational work was done under the leadership of A. A. Yepishev, the experienced political workers and Military Council member, which had a daily impact on all sides of troop combat activities. On the eve of the offensive an appeal of the front Military Council was read to the entire personnel, which spoke of the great honor of liberating the capital of Soviet Ukraine. The battle for Kiev, the appeal pointed out, was a struggle for freeing the entire Ukraine from the fascist yoke and for the full defeat of the Hitlerite occupation forces and expelling them from Soviet soil. Short meetings were held in units and subunits. This type of address to the soldiers immediately before the battle was very effective.

The Kiev operation began on 1 November with the offensive mounted by the 40th and 27th armies from the Bukrinskiy bridgehead. Although it did not breach the defense, it misled the enemy and engaged considerable enemy forces. The 38th Army began its offensive at 0840 hours on 3 November after a 40-minute artillery barrage. Thanks to the exceptional effectiveness of artillery fire, the formations of the 50th and 51st Infantry corps covered the first 2 kilometers of the offensive almost unobstructed. Subsequently, however, the enemy intensified his resistance. German infantry and tanks, supported by aviation, counterattacked repeatedly.

During the first day of our offensive the enemy began hastily to bring up his closest reserves. In the perimeter of the offensive of the 38th Army, as early as 3 November he had committed to battle his 20th Motorized Division.

Despite stubborn enemy resistance, by the end of the day the army forces had advanced 7 kilometers and capture Dachl Pushcha-Voditsa.

Its neighbor to the right--the 60th Army commanded by I. D. Chernyakhovskiy--breached the enemy's defense in the auxiliary direction and by the end of the day had advanced as much as 12 kilometers. On 4 November, at 1030 hours, in accordance with the order of the front commander, in order to increase the pace of the offensive, the Third Guard Tank Army was committed to battle.

After heavy fire at the enemy's strongholds, the tanks rushed into battle. The Hitlerites feverishly filled the breaches, maneuvered with their reserves and mounted desperate counterattacks. Ever-new troop columns were moved up to the Lyuterzhskiy bridgehead.

Fierce battles developed and although our infantry and tanks were able to capture a number of powerful enemy strongholds, no decisive upturn developed during the day. Poor weather prevented the aviation from providing effective support.

Front Commander N. F. Vatutin confidently controlled the operations. He firmly believed in success and demanded active efforts on our part.

Under the existing circumstances, Gen P. S. Rybalko and I decided to continue with the offensive during the night. After completing the necessary preparations, in order to confuse the enemy our tanks turned on their lights and their sirens and, together with the infantry, after a fire barrage, rushed into the attack in the darkness. After crushing the enemy's resistance, the tanks reached the northern edge of Svyatoshina and cut off the Kiev-Zhitomir highway.

On 5 November, pressed on the northern edges and surrounded west of Kiev, the enemy was unable to withstand our strike and began to retreat. By the end of the day the 51st Infantry Corps and 167th Division of the 50th Infantry Corps were fighting in the city. They were destroying the fascists in their strongholds and tried to reach the center to prevent its destruction by the Hitlerites.

In the evening I returned to my command point to issue further orders. N. F. Vatutin rang up. He reported that he had just spoken on the radio with J. V. Stalin, supreme commander in chief.

"The supreme commander ordered me to tell you that he is pleased with the course of the operation," Nikolay Fedorovich said, "and expressed the wish that Kiev be liberated sooner. What shall we report?"

"We shall do it, Nikolay Fedorovich! Nothing else to report," I answered.

Putting the receiver back on its cradle, I decided immediately to go to the front line again, to the lines held by the 50th Infantry Corps which was fighting in the western edge of the city. Together with A. A. Yepishev and a small group of generals and officers, I hastened to the motion picture factory area (today the Movie Studio imeni A. Dovzhenko), which was the closest point to the center. I ordered the offensive to be continued rather than resumed in the morning. Therefore, we moved forward together with units of the 167th Infantry Division commanded by I. I. Mel'nikov, and the army tank regiment.

Our group reached Shevchenko Boulevard. The fighting was going on around us, the artillery was thundering, and houses were collapsing. One of them was the university building which the Hitlerites had set afire. Moving behind

the tanks, we reached the Kreshchatik. Here, unexpectedly, we were welcomed by large groups of happy Kiev people. Shells were exploding around us and bullets were whistling, while the residents surrounded our cars tightly and loudly expressed their happiness. Many of them were crying.

Instead of returning to my command post, I immediately, straight from the staff of the 50th Infantry Corps, reported to the front commander that Kiev had been liberated. N. F. Vatutin was obviously doubtful, for he asked:

"Who reported this to you?"

Learning that I personally had been to the Kreshchatik, he became tremendously happy:

"So, we can report this to headquarters?"

"Yes," I answered firmly. "We may report that Kiev has been freed."

Indeed, in the throes of their high offensive thrust, the personnel of the 38th Army entirely cleared Kiev of the fascist aggressors by 4 am.

That same day the entire country, the entire world, heard the order of the supreme commander in chief to Army General Vatutin, which read as follows:

"As a result of a headlong operation with a bold turning maneuver, today, 6 November, at dawn, the forces of the First Ukrainian Front stormed and captured the capital of Soviet Ukraine, the city of Kiev--the largest industrial and most important strategic center of German defense on the right bank of the Dnepr.

"With the seizure of Kiev, our troops captured the most important and most advantageous bridgehead on the right bank of the Dnepr, of great importance in expelling the Germans from Right Bank Ukraine.

"The forces of Colonel General Moskalenko and Lieutenant General Chernyakhovskiy, the tank men of Lieutenant General Rybalko, the fliers of Aviation Lieutenant General Krasovskiy and the artillerymen of Artillery Major General Korol'kov distinguished themselves."

In the evening, when a solemn meeting on the occasion of the 26th anniversary of the October Revolution was taking place in Moscow, the capital of our homeland saluted the valorous forces of the First Ukrainian Front with 24 volleys fired by 324 guns. Never before had such a large number of guns been used in a salute. The forces which liberated Kiev, including the 38th Army, were given a gratitude citation in the order. Most formations and units in our army were awarded the "Kiev" honorary title.

Thousands of troops who had displayed courage and daring in the liberation of the Ukrainian capital were awarded orders and medals.

The government of the USSR awarded the Order of Suvorov second class to the First Czechoslovak Separate Brigade. Furthermore, 139 of its soldiers and

officers, including its famed commander Colonel L. Svoboda, were awarded Soviet orders and medals.

Kiev suffered severe damage. I remembered the city in its full prewar beauty and looked with pain at the wreckage. The people of Kiev had been exposed to suffering and privation for 778 days. The fascists had tortured and shot to death more than 195,000 Soviet citizens and taken more than 100,000 to Germany. Only 180,000 of the 900,000 prewar population remained. The Hitlerites had destroyed 140 schools, more than 800 enterprises and the best movie theaters and clubs; they had set fire to the conservatory, the university and the city public library; they had blown up the Uspenskiy Cathedral in the Kiev-Pecherskaya Monastery.

After the liberation of the capital of Soviet Ukraine, the forces of the First Ukrainian Front continued to develop their offensive to the west and south. On 7 November they liberated Fastov, followed by Zhitomir, Korosten and Ovruch. The small bridgehead in the Kiev area assumed a strategic importance. It was some 230 kilometers long and 150 kilometers deep. Railroad lines which linked the forces of the Groups of Armies Center and South and the Kiev and Kirovograd enemy groups were cut off. In the Kiev bridgehead the Soviet forces were increasingly pressuring the Group of Armies South from the north.

After somewhat recovering from the shock caused by the overwhelming strike by the Soviet troops at Kiev, the Hitlerite command took hasty measures not only to stop the offensive of the First Ukrainian Front but to restore the front along the Dnepr. Moving in fresh forces from Western Europe, it mounted a counterstrike. The battle was tense. At the cost of heavy losses the enemy was able to recapture Zhitomir and advance as much as 40 kilometers. Toward the end of December, however, the First Ukrainian Front, reinforced with two combined-army and a tank army and two tank corps, mounted an offensive, routed the enemy group and widened the Kiev bridgehead by increasing its depth by another 80 to 200 kilometers.

While the forces of the First Ukrainian Front were engaged in combat in the Kiev area, its neighbors had also achieved significant successes. In November the Belorussian Front cleared the western oblasts of the RSFSR of the occupation forces, entered eastern Belorussia, reached the Dnepr and seized a bridgehead in the Rechitsa area.

The forces of the Second and Third Ukrainian fronts, operating in the direction of Kirovograd and Krivoy Rog, took the huge bridgehead from Cherkass to Zaporozhe, 450 kilometers long along the front line and as much as 100 kilometers deep. The forces of the Fourth Ukrainian Front cleared from the enemy the lower reaches of the Dnepr and cut off the land communications of the enemy group in the Crimea.

The battle for the Dnepr and the successful combat operations in a westerly direction not only marked the end of the summer and autumn campaign of 1943 but indicated a radical turn in the course of the Great Patriotic War and World War II as a whole.

The Soviet army breached the strong enemy defenses, advanced along a 2,000-kilometer-wide front and moved in a westerly direction covering a distance from 300 to 600 kilometers. It liberated the Donbass, Left Bank Ukraine, part of eastern Belorussia and the western oblasts of the RSFSR, completed the liberation of the Northern Caucasus, blocked from the land the enemy group of forces in the Crimea, and captured two important strategic bridgeheads on the right bank of the Dnepr: the first in the Rechitsa, Korosten and Kiev area and the second in the Kremenchug, Znamenka and Dnepropetrovsk area.

In the summer and autumn of 1943 the Hitlerite troops lost 1,413,000 men, some 3,200 tanks and as many as 26,000 guns. The Red Army routed 118 divisions and the process of breakdown of the fascist bloc continued.

Soviet military art was developed further in the battle for the Dnepr. Experience was gained in preparations for and conduct of a strategic offensive on a wide front at a high pace, the organization of interaction among fronts and increased efforts and regrouping of forces along the most important and determining direction, as well as crossing on the march intermediary defense lines and major water obstacles.

The communist party was the inspiration and the organizer of the victory in the battle of the Dnepr. It rallied the rear and the front and merged within a single stream the mass heroism, courage and daring of the Soviet troops on the front and ensured the overall victory won by the Soviet people.

The high title of Hero of the Soviet Union was awarded to some 2,500 soldiers, sergeants, officers and generals for successfully crossing the Dnepr, firmly consolidating the bridgeheads, committing immortal exploits and displaying courage and fearlessness in battle; tens of thousands were presented with orders and medals. Many formations and units were awarded honorary names of the cities they liberated. The exploits of the participants in crossing the Dnepr were commemorated in obelisks, monuments, panoramic displays and museums.

The memory of the victory of the Soviet armed forces in the battle for the Dnepr is sacred. Our losses and casualties in this battle, as in the entire Great Patriotic War were the price which the Soviet people had to pay in the struggle against the aggression committed by fascist Germany, in the struggle for the freedom and independence of the socialist homeland, and for our right to follow the path of social progress, as indicated by the great Lenin. "We carefully preserve the memory of the heroes of the Great Patriotic War," noted Marshal of the Soviet Union D. F. Ustinov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of defense. "The glory of these valorous sons and daughters of our people, who hammered the great victory on the front and the rear, will not fade throughout the centuries."

The war is far behind us. With every passing year the power and might of the Soviet state are growing and multiplying. The life of the Soviet people is improving with every passing day. The country is working hard and the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress and November 1982 and June 1983 Central Committee plenums are being successfully implemented. The Soviet people are

actively struggling for peace and friendship and cooperation among nations. However, they also vigilantly watch the intrigues of imperialist aggressors, defeat provocatory actions mounted against our homeland and the fraternal socialist countries and are doing everything possible to strengthen the combat power of the Soviet state on the level of modern war requirements. "... Let no one be mistaken," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said. "We shall never allow our safety, the safety of our allies, to be threatened." The communist party and the Soviet people are always concerned with strengthening the armed forces and enhancing their combat readiness. The experience of the last war teaches us this.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

WORKER'S DEPUTY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83) pp 70-79

[Article by V. Arkhipenko]

[Text] Maxim, the young worker and character in the famous movie trilogy, had many good tutors who taught him the art of revolutionary struggle. One of the teachers of the young revolutionary was his senior party comrade and a member of the social democratic faction in the State Duma. When the film "Maxim's Return" was shown, old Petersburg workers who saw the Duma deputy unmistakably recognized him:

"This is our Yegorych!"

They were referring to Aleksey Yegorovich Badayev, whose name entered history as a noted leader of the Bolshevik Party, a passionate orator and a favorite of the workers, who were convinced through practical experience that he was a firm and incorruptible defender of their interests. There was something to be learned from such a person. What is interesting, however, is that Badayev himself could have been the prototype of Maxim, the movie character, for he too had come to the revolutionary movement straight from the plant gates as a very young man. He became a member of the RSDWP at the age of 21 and remained its loyal son to the end of his life.

From the Rostrum of the Tauride Palace

In October 1912, while elections were under way for the Fourth State Duma, for St. Petersburg Guberniya, the personnel of the Ministry of Internal Affairs were quite alarmed. Any way they looked at it, a bolshevik would be elected by the workers as a deputy, something which had to be prevented by any means: there were many plants in the capital and strikes had broken out at all of them after the Lena shooting. With increasing frequency the workers were making political demands. Under such circumstances, a bolshevik deputy, who could not be arrested because of his parliamentary immunity, would be not only undesirable but three times as dangerous.

According to the 3 June 1907 law, elections for the worker curia were to consist of three rounds: first at the plants admitted to the vote the workers appointed their representatives who nominated the final candidate. This was mandatory, for the law stipulated that the workers in St. Petersburg Guberniya were guaranteed a seat in the Duma. Despite all the efforts of the

police, all six worker curia nominees were bolsheviks. Therefore, the candidate was to be one of them. The ministry was quick to react. The elections were annulled and bi-elections were declared, in the course of which police pressure on the voting workers increased substantially. As a result, of the six worker curia nominees three were bolsheviks and three mensheviks. Each threesome had a candidate. The bolshevik suggestion of tossing a coin was categorically rejected.

A paradoxical situation developed: now the question of who would represent the Petersburg proletariat in the Duma depended on the votes of the representatives, who belonged to the right-wing parties. The monarchists, Octobrists, cadets and progressives were by far not indifferent as to who would sit on the left side in parliament. They preferred that a representative of the class hostile to them be a less initiative-minded person, a less insistent, a less knowledgeable person than his rival. For these considerations the decision was made to vote for the youngest--for Aleksey Yagorovich Badayev--a worker in the main railroad car workshops of the Nikolayev railroad.

"Byloye" [The Past], an emigre almanac published in Paris in 1933, contains a very curious testimony by a menshevik: "He was elected precisely because to all worker representatives, the right-wing representatives, he appeared to be the least cultured and the most mediocre, for which reason they decided that such a deputy would be the least dangerous to them."

However, this time the supercautious politicians outsmarted themselves. They gained in Badayev, the worker deputy, a clever and stubborn enemy, merciless to the rotten regime and to the liberal chatterboxes in the Duma.

The senior party publicist M. S. Ol'minskiy, who was well familiar with the situation which had developed during the elections, heard that before deciding for whom to vote, the representatives of the other curias checked with the police as to the political reliability of each worker deputy. They tried to obtain information about Badayev as well.

Police department regulations called for having a file on anyone detained for political reasons. The inscription on the file read: "Police Department file. Letter B. Secret." No such file had been started for Badayev, for until then he had not fallen into the hands of the secret police. His name appeared incidentally in a few other files, as being present somewhere, meeting with someone or delivering something to someone else.... All that were left were passport data: Aleksey Yagorov Badayev. Born 16 (4) February 1883. Place of birth: Yurevo, Karachevskiy Uyezd, Orel Guberniya. Religion: Orthodox. Nationality: Russian. Occupation: Metal fitter. Means of support: Personal labor. And so on....

According to police information, Badayev was uneducated and, as an RSDWP member, lacked initiative and was inconspicuous. In fact, however, the omniscient Okhranka had very wide gaps in its knowledge of the fitter in the railroad workshops. This peasant boy, who had come to Petersburg from the countryside, had read a large number of books in a few years and had substantially expanded his knowledge in the legally operating night technical school

in Smolensk and, clandestinely, in the underground revolutionary circle headed by the noted party worker N. V. Krylenko. Nor did the police know that Badayev was one of the most active leaders of the bolshevik organization at the plant and that he had learned a great deal by participating in the activities of worker organizations--the association of metalworkers and the "Knowledge-Light" cultural and educational society.

... And so, the young Petersburg worker (20 years old) became a Duma deputy. The moment this was reported by the press, letters with requests and demands rushed to Badayev and the first petition bearers showed up. It became immediately apparent that the workload was quite heavy: sessions at the Duma, conferences of the social democratic faction, meetings with petitioners, daily contacts with the PRAVDA editors, and visits to factories and plants. He had to rent an apartment on Shpalernaya Street, not far from the Tauride Palace. Badayev informed the workers of his new address and telephone number through PRAVDA and indicated his reception hours at home. He needed both a spacious apartment and a telephone not for the sake of impressing others. He also had to think of his position as "representative." With his deputy daily allowance (10 rubles) he bought himself a conservative suit, white shirts with stand-up collars and ties. The worker deputy was to look decent at the rostrum and at meetings with officials of all ranks.

The State Duma opened on 15 November 1912: the papers of the deputies were checked, a presidium was elected and the government's declaration was discussed. Meanwhile, the social democratic faction (which at that time still included 13 bolsheviks and mensheviks) was preparing its first interpellation to the government. This was no simple matter by far, for an interpellation to be submitted required 33 signatures indicating the support of representatives of other factions and finding the proper references to articles in government orders and laws. These difficulties, however, had to be surmounted. The practice of the preceding Duma had shown that interpellations to the government on specific facts were among the best methods for using the Duma rostrum for raising the curtain on the latest czarist crime, making public particularly shameful cases of arbitrary behavior and naming the culprits. Using a specific case, the speaker tried to prove that under the existing conditions one could not hope for any improvements whatsoever and that the only true way of the proletariat was the way to revolution. A speaker who had expressed this idea was immediately chased off the rostrum. However, the words had been said and they found their way to the workers at plants and factories.

The first question raised by the social democratic faction was about banning the union of metalworkers in Petersburg and was addressed to the ministers of internal affairs and justice. Badayev was the assigned speaker.

Aleksey Yegorovich was to remember later the difficult situation in which he found himself on that memorable evening of 14 December. The entire Duma majority, whose aim was to wear down and frighten the worker deputy, break his will and defeat his speech, was already opposing him--the representative of the Petersburg workers--in advance. The strange atmosphere--the huge hall flooded with light, the impressive deputies on their benches, the uniformed

officials in the government box, the brisk reporters and photographers by the rostrum, and the strings of curious visitors on the balconies--was such as to affect an inexperienced person.

That evening he withstood his first trial honorably. Initially, while Badayev discussed the importance to the workers of trade unions, he was listened to quite calmly. The entire hall was electrified, however, when he said that the government is violating its own laws and that, actually, its entire policy is aimed at violating the laws. He said:

"In 6 years no less than 600 unions have been closed down and no less than 700 have been refused registration. Such is the so-called freedom of association!"

There was a stir along the right-side benches. Badayev began to speak of the detention of strikers and the shooting of 500 Lena workers. Chairman Rodzyanko rang his bell and strongly suggested that the speaker stick to the topic.

"The law says that elections for the Duma will be free," Aleksey Yagorovich continued, as though nothing had happened, "while in fact representatives are being arrested and exiled...."

"Member of the State Duma Badayev!"

"...representatives are being arrested and workers are being exiled."

A wave of indignant shouts from the right welled and the chairman rang his bell sharply. Meanwhile, Badayev continued to speak of the arbitrariness of the government and the greed of plant and factory owners until Rodzyanko asked him to step down.

Thus, Badayev's first speech ended with his being deprived of speech and, subsequently, the matter was put to a vote and tabled and the question itself was lost in the offices of the Duma. Was that a total failure? Not in the least! The agitation objective, above all, was achieved: the truth about the true situation of worker associations under autocratic conditions was heard throughout Russia. The very tabling of the question encouraged the Petersburg metalworkers to new decisive actions.

In April 1913, in discussing the fate of this question in PRAVDA, Badayev reminded the readers that "...the bosses are the same in economics, politics, factories and the Duma. We must remember this and follow our proletarian path in both economic and political life."

The workers understood what had to be done. As a result of several most stubborn strikes they finally obtained permission to organize a metalworkers trade union.

Badayev's popularity among the workers grew with every passing day. He subsequently spoke from the same rostrum on a number of occasions. He spoke on

the explosion at the Okhta gunpowder plant, in which there had been casualties, the mass persecution of working women at Petersburg enterprises, the antinational policy of the ministries of education and industry and the draft bill on the press. Every time he was interrupted with shouts and whistles by the Black Hundred and asked to step down by Rodzyanko, flushed with anger.

On the day when Aleksey Yegorovich was speaking about the inhuman exploitation of the workers at the Obukhovskiy Plant, as always, shouts were heard from the benches on the right during the most touchy parts of his speech.

The administration of the Obukhovskiy Plant, Badayev said, had refused to dismiss a guard who had beaten up a worker. There were shouts of "correct!" from the right. He said that during the strike the Obukhovskiy workers had remained hungry for 2 months, the answer to which was "because of you!" He reported that the leaders of the naval department had not deemed it necessary to hear out the worker deputy on such matters, the answer to which was "correct!" Losing his restraint, Badayev said in a fit of temper:

"Obviously I do not expect to touch you with this description, with a description of the difficult situation of the workers at the Obukhovskiy Plant. To speak of the situation of the workers in this Black Hundred landowners дума is as senseless as trying to inoculate telegraph poles against small-pox."

We know how proud Lenin was of the worker deputies and how he supported and helped them. In his works, during the period of revolutionary upsurge, he frequently referred to Aleksey Yegorovich's apt speeches in the Duma. "What a splendid speech Badayev made on freedom of coalitions," he wrote, "compared with Tulyakov's repeated...liberal fabrications," "what a formulation of the question of the freedom of the press, worthy of the proletariat" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 48, p 241; vol 25, p 411).

Behind the Duma Walls

Asking questions and participating in Duma debates was merely one of the aspects of Badayev's activities as a deputy. He received a great deal of mail and visitors in his apartment. He traveled to hear the complaints at Petersburg factories and plants, and met with tsarist officials to clarify the situation.

At that time a meeting between a worker and a minister was treated as a sensation. A fitter or marker would not be allowed even inside the waiting room, not to mention in a meeting with a minister. But a Duma deputy was a different matter. However, the rich were unwilling to meet even a deputy representing the workers. Sometimes it was impossible to refuse to see someone on the subject of a raised deputy question, however, for the very refusal would trigger an article in PRAVDA and discussions at factories and plants.

In the course of his activities as a deputy, Badayev frequently met with senior officials. His meeting with Beletskiy, the director of the police department, is interesting from a psychological viewpoint. Beletskiy was

a past master of investigations and provocations, an unprincipled person who could adapt to circumstances with amazing success. There is no doubt that he had already become familiar with any information on Badayev gathered by the police. Furthermore Beletskiy, who was receiving information also from Malinovskiy, a secret police informant, was perfectly aware of the clandestine activities of the representative of the workers for the St. Petersburg worker curia.

Nevertheless, he received him in a friendly and very attentive way. When the discussion turned to the detention of 37 workers from the Obukhovskiy Plant, held without charges, he immediately promised to investigate. After Badayev described the beating of political prisoners at the Rozhdestvenskaya police precinct, he promised to investigate this report as well. As to rumors of closing down the union of metalworkers, mentioned by the worker deputy, the director of the police department expressed his amazement as to the origin of such rumors.... The old fox Beletskiy avoided direct answers, giving totally unbinding assurances. However, Aleksey Yegorovich himself was not a dupe. He published in PRAVDA the promises which the director had made, so that everyone would know the way police superiors were meeting their assurances.

He also met with Maklakov, minister of internal affairs, with Gregorovich, minister of maritime affairs, and with other highly placed officials to whom he brought worker complaints. They all avoided the social democratic deputy. Meanwhile, however, he was always welcomed with joy, trust and hope at plants and factories. The workers poured out their troubles to him and the doors of any worker family were hospitably opened to him. Either by mail or from plant workshops, he was sent money saved, kopek by kopek, to help the striking comrades, the families of those arrested, and the proletarian newspaper.

Badayev's apartment was always crowded with members of strike committees, voluntary contributors, worker correspondence, or people abused by their superiors or the administration. Frequently an entire line formed of people waiting to meet and talk with the deputy. And everyone who came to Aleksey Yegorovich with his troubles received real support and gained strength to face new trials.

The popularity of the representative of the workers of St. Petersburg grew with every passing month. They called him Yegorych at the plants, in a simple and loving fashion. They knew that he was one of their own, that he would never mislead them and would do everything he could. The Central State Archives of the October Revolution contains the following document from the files of the Police Department for 1914:

"On 21 March of this year Badayev led a crowd of people who visited the graves of the two workers who died following the explosion of a pipe at the central power plant; he tried to deliver a speech at the grave while a police detachment was scattering the audience. On his return from the cemetery, Badayev was carried by the workers into the Nikolayevsk station to the first-class waiting room, with shouts of 'Hurray!'"

PRAVDA Publisher

A period in the life and activities of Badayev, the young worker, who drew such attention to himself as a politician during the time of revolutionary

upsurge, includes a period which deserves the most serious consideration of historians. It was Badayev's participation in publishing PRAVDA. In explaining the need for recruiting Badayev as PRAVDA editor, in November 1912 Lenin wrote that "a worker newspaper in Petersburg without the cooperation of the worker deputy from Petersburg (and, furthermore, a PRAVDA supporter) would be stupid" (op. cit., vol 48, p 116).

In a book published later, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the October Revolution, Badayev recalled that "in pointing out the tremendous role of the newspaper, Vladimir Il'ich told me that this project must be undertaken with maximal strength and energy. These words were more than strictly educational. Vladimir Il'ich believed that a time when the revolutionary movement was expanding with every passing day the newspaper will be the main link between the Duma faction and the worker masses."

Starting with the new year 1913, the inscription "A. Ye. Badayev, editor," appeared at the bottom of the last page of each issue.

The publisher had a tremendous amount of work--running the press, procuring newsprint, delivering the newspapers, and many others. The most serious problem, however, was one of finances. Naturally, it was by far simpler for Prince Meshcherskiy, who was receiving a subsidy of 180,000 rubles per year from a secret government fund for his newspaper GRAZHDANIN, or the Moscow banker Ryabushinskiy, who covered the publication losses of UTRA ROSSII out of his own pocket, to publish their newspapers. PRAVDA depended almost entirely and totally on donations and collections by the workers themselves at plants and factories. Publisher Badayev received this money by mail or by messenger and sometimes personally, during visits to enterprises.

The Okhranka, which knew perfectly well the financial difficulties of the editors, strangled the newspaper with fines which painfully struck at the already overstressed budget. In order to save the newspaper exceptional steps had to be taken, using figureheads as editors. Here is a typical news item of that time: "PRAVDA newspaper editor Ya. A. Kozyukhin was fined 500 rubles for publishing the article 'To the Voters From the Deputy' in issue No 136, or 3 months in prison for nonpayment of the fine." The editor was fined another 500 rubles for something published in issue No 138, and since he failed to pay the fine, a bailiff showed up at his home and took him to the police precinct to serve a 6-month sentence. The volunteer figurehead editors were workers, most of them single. If some of them happened to be married, Badayev strictly saw to it that their wives and children were fed while they were in jail. The fines came one after the other and many figurehead editors were needed....

During the first 2 months of his work as the publisher, six editors were replaced. However, there were always volunteers ready to assume the full severity of the punishment and spend several months in jail.

The most unpleasant event for a PRAVDA worker was when an issue, which had taken so much work and effort to print, was confiscated by police order. However, even before Badayev became publisher, a system had been developed which allowed them to rescue at least part of that edition.

The established procedure was that any newspaper issue was to be submitted to the committee for the press, manned by officials on a round-the-clock basis. After looking over the copy, the official on duty would decide whether that issue was to be confiscated. If by that time the issue had already been printed, the owner of the publication suffered a loss. That is why many editorial boards held back their presses until they received the committee's permission.

Conversely, the PRAVDA people printed their edition as fast as they could. While the messenger (always on foot, to slow the process down) reached the censor, and just as slowly returned, bundles of newspapers were already in the hands of paperboys or volunteers among the workers. However, the committee personnel became quite quickly aware of this trick. The official on duty came to the printing press himself to read the issue more quickly, while the police dispersed the PRAVDA distributors waiting in the yard and on the stairs.

Aleksey Yegorovich's task was to argue endlessly with the official, thus marking time. He was a master of this. Meanwhile, the printing press workers were hiding newspaper bundles, concealing them under covers of other publications, thus saving some copies. One way or another, the confiscated issues found their way to Petersburg plants.

Despite the heroic efforts of the PRAVDA personnel, it was becoming increasingly difficult to publish the newspaper. On the eve of 17 April 1913, the anniversary of the newspaper, the police provoked a disruption in the editorial premises: a thorough search was made, all manuscripts and letters were confiscated and many people involved in the work were detained. During its first year of life PRAVDA was fined 7,800 rubles and confiscated 41 times. One out of five issues entailed reprisals. During its second year of life, one out of every two issues of the newspaper was "punished."

On 4 March 1914 Badayev rose to speak in the Duma. Using the usual method of asking a question, he described the flood of repressive measures against PRAVDA and the entire Russian worker press. It was precisely at that time that a government draft bill on the press was being discussed, the adoption of which would have meant the total abolition of what was left of the freedom of speech which had been gained during the first Russian revolution. Badayev cautioned that the new law would lead only to the flooding of the country with Black Hundred leaflets. He also said that having gained experience in repressing the worker press, the reaction will suppress the liberal press as well.

The tension of the revolutionary struggle in Russia grew. PRAVDA's notes of the period resemble wartime communiques. The editors were in touch with the committees of strikers, helped them and organized fund collections to help them. The Black Hundred looked at many of the newspaper's materials as an open call to rebellion. In answer to the "Greetings to the Baku Strikers," published in PRAVDA under Badayev's signature, the newspaper RUSSKOYE ZNAMYA printed the article "Badayev to the Gallows!"

On 4 July PRAVDA informed its readers that on the eve before the police had shot at Putilov workers and that there were dead and wounded. Badayev demanded a meeting with the heads of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. General Dzhunkovskiy, until recently Moscow's city chief, agreed to see the worker deputy. Aleksey Yegorovich explained the reason why he was late for the appointment:

"I was late because I spent the entire night defending PRAVDA from your raiders."

The general stood up and, raising his voice, accused Badayev and the newspaper of inciting disorder. He threatened to set up a special commission to prosecute both the deputy and the editors. Hearing that "the police will continue to fire...", Badayev broke off the discussion abruptly. The same day he sent to press a note on his conversation with the police chief. The police immediately confiscated the issue.

Three days later, the police struck its decisive blow. That evening, as always, Badayev's premises were full of people--representatives of Petersburg's plants had brought money for the striking Baku workers. The deputy was recording the amount of the deposits while asking the visitors about the mood at their enterprises. A PRAVDA guard, short of breath, rushed into the room, reporting that the editorial premises were being searched. Badayev was able to cross the police lines only by showing his deputy identification. There were police along the stairs (the editorial premises were on the top floor). There was total chaos on the premises--the doors of cabinets were open, desk drawers had been pulled out and there were piles of paper on the floor. Those found by the police inside had been taken to one room and were being searched and items found in their pockets were piled on the table.

Aleksey Yegorovich glanced inside but was not allowed to see his comrades. After calling someone, the bailiff ordered him to leave the premises. After the search the premises were sealed off and all detainees were taken to the Spasskiy detention house. This was the final routing. PRAVDA did not come out from 8 July 1914 to March 1917.

The latest document on the "illegal interference" by Deputy Badayev in police affairs was added to police files. By that time Aleksey Yegorovich had become the plague of the Russian masters of investigation. They would have long before dealt with him but for his immunity as a deputy. Not having the right to arrest Badayev, the Okhranka tried to restrain him through other methods. The first attempt was made 10 months before PRAVDA was closed down.

Let us look at an excerpt from a police department report:

"Badayev, Aleksey Yegorovich, member of the State Duma representing the workers of St. Petersburg Guberniya. On 9 September 1913, during the burial of two workers who died in an accident at the Minnyy plant, at the Mitrofan'yevskiy cemetery in St. Petersburg, he tried to make a speech to the comrades of the deceased. He urged the workers not to obey the order of the police to disperse, for which reason he was fined administratively..."

This is a very interesting document which, however, requires an explanation. When an official went to Badayev to ask him to pay the 200 rubles, he was met with a firm refusal. Do what you want, but according to the law on the State Duma, a deputy can be fined only by a court and only with the agreement of the Duma itself. The workers at the Langenzipen, Minnyy and other plants answered the action of the city chief by going on strike. Two weeks later, when it had become clear that Badayev did not intend in the least to pay the fine, the Petersburg city chief issued an order for the police to arrest the rebellious deputy the moment the Duma session came to an end. The Petersburg workers answered this with another strike. The Duma presidium became upset. Although Rodzyanko and his colleagues could not stand Badayev, they did not wish in the least that a precedent be set of violating the immunity of a deputy. As a result of secret talks with the minister of internal affairs, it was decided that Badayev would be arrested only after his term had expired.

Clandestine Work

An increasing number of reports on Badayev's opposition to police activities and on his antigovernmental work were piling up at the Ministry of Internal Affairs. However, this stack of papers would have been far bigger had the Okhranka had full information on the deputy's clandestine work.

Under reactionary conditions, Lenin's stipulation of combining legal with clandestine struggle was the only possibility of preserving the party's combat capability and its ties with the worker masses. The experience of the mensheviks, who had given up in the face of the dangers involved in clandestine activities and who relied on legal methods only, most clearly proved the fatal nature of such tactics. It is true that, as they interpreted it, this allowed them to avoid repression and thus to preserve their forces for future actions. However, it was precisely this viewpoint that the workers found cowardly, unworthy and, sometimes, simply suspicious.

When Badayev became a Duma deputy and began to study Petersburg political life closely, he was simply amazed that menshevik leaders, people such as Dan and Potresov, openly wrote in the press. The police did not touch them. Unwittingly, he compared this with the lives of his party comrades, who were being persecuted by the Okhranka every day and every hour. The system of following, provocations and obstructions was efficiently organized and no somewhat noticeable professional revolutionary could remain free for a long period of time. In 1913 alone, Sverdlov, Stalin, Molotov, Kalinin and Inessa Armand were detained in Petersburg.

For a worker deputy to engage in clandestine work was twice as difficult, for persistent surveillance forced him to plan carefully all his meetings. At that time Grigoriy Ivanovich Petrovskiy wrote in PRAVDA that "in Russia a worker deputy must be extremely careful in his relations with the voters, for mere acquaintanceship with them may lead to rather sad consequences to the voters. Nevertheless, despite such close surveillance a deputy can meet and talk with the workers."

Naturally, the deputy achieved more than that, for the members of the faction were in constant touch with the Petersburg and rayon party committees and

plant bolshevik organizations, ensured the distribution of clandestine publications, organized secret meetings, chose safe places for conferences, and were in constant and reliable contact with the Central Committee abroad. Actually, the faction was the organizing center of all party work in Russia.

In a few months the young worker, involved in the complex tangle of the class struggle on a Russia-wide scale, became a political leader valued and loved by the workers of Petersburg and Russia, whose feelings the imperial officials had to take into consideration. Shortly after his initial meetings with Badayev, Lenin began to entrust him with important assignments. By 1913 Aleksey Yegorovich had become a trusted worker for the RSDWP Central Committee. In March 1914, on Lenin's initiative, he became member of the Central Committee's Russian Bureau and 1 month later was made a Central Committee member.

After the Poronin conference, in which Badayev participated, intensive work was launched on convening a new party conference. Badayev's apartment became the most important center in these preparations. Here documents were secretly received on delegates elected to the congress, representatives of local organizations studied itineraries for their trip abroad, and addresses of safe houses and passports were obtained. Here again the funds for the congress were collected.

The outbreak of the war put off all plans. From its very first days a merciless routing of worker organizations was launched. The worker deputies were aware that the police could descend upon their premises any day. Badayev was instructed urgently to ship to Finland the party documents which the faction files contained. He was able to elude the surveillance, safely cross the border and, with the help of Ol'minskiy, who lived in Finland, hide the documents underground in a forest. Subsequently, he returned, dug out the papers and delivered them to reliable comrades in Helsingfors.

The war created incredibly difficult circumstances for the bolshevik faction in the Duma. Even before it started the Black Hundred had begun openly to say that strikes at plants working for the war industry were actions inspired by the German general staff. When military operations began and worker deputies openly opposed the slaughter, they were drowned in a wave of chauvinism. "Listen, traitor," the Black Hundred wrote to Badayev. "You have been disturbing the Russian people enough, you cowardly revolutionary." He and his comrades received death threats.

However, they did not stop their work. A number of times Badayev was able to elude surveillance. Crossing the forest, he reached Obukhovo station and jumped into a freight car of a passing train, reached Lyubani and from there went to several cities. The spies caught up with him only in Baku. Meanwhile, the other members of the bolshevik faction had clandestinely visited a number of cities and rebuilt the routed party centers.

At the beginning of November, the faction organized an all-Russian party conference in Ozerki, at 28 Vyborgskiy Highway. This time, however, the Okhranka picked up their trail. On 4 November, on the third day of the conference, a

detachment of police and gendarmes broke down the door, rushed into the premises and detained all participants.

The trial took place in February 1915. The worker deputies were accused of attempting to overthrow by force the existing system, under the instructions of the RSDWP. Everyone was reminded of his "personal sins." Badayev in particular was accused of writing antigovernment articles for PRAVDA and delivering speeches to the workers. The sentence was strict: deprivation of civil rights and exile to Turukhanskiy Kray. And so, the worker deputies went to jail and were sent to distant Siberia, their hands and feet in chains....

Together with his exiled comrades, Badayev was freed by the February Revolution. Once again the Petersburg fitter began to carry out party assignments. By recommendation of the RSDWP(b) Central Committee, he became a member of the supply management of the city дума. After the October Revolution Podvoyskiy, the chairman of the military revolutionary committee, assigned him to manage food supplies for Red Army men and revolutionary soldiers. Aleksey Yegorovich fulfilled this assignment splendidly. During the civil war Badayev organized food-agitation detachments in Petrograd Guberniya, after which he headed the consumer cooperative in Leningrad and then in Moscow.

The former State Duma deputy was frequently elected deputy of the Petrograd and Moscow soviets. He was deputy chairman of the Moscow City Soviet, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Wherever assigned by the party, Aleksey Yegorovich worked with dedication, sparing no effort and investing in his work his entire bolshevik-Leninist passion.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

REMARKABLE SON OF THE BRITISH WORKING CLASS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83) pp 80-86

[Article by V. Zaytsev]

[Text] Harry Pollit, who held the important positions of secretary general and chairman of the Communist Party of Great Britain, made a major contribution to the ideological-political tempering and organizational establishment and development of the communist movement on the British Isles. His talent as a combat organizer of the masses was vividly manifested also in the ranks of the international communist and worker movements. Between 1924 and 1943 he was invariably elected member of the Comintern Executive Committee and, as of 1935, the Executive Committee of the Communist International. H. Pollit worked extensively for the Trade Union International for a number of years.

Harry Pollit was destined to attend the class upbringing "universities," since literally early childhood. These largely predetermined his career as a fighter.

Harry Pollit was born on 22 November 1890 in Droylsden, a small textile community, not far from Manchester, the largest and oldest industrial city in Great Britain, in Lancashire County, to a family of hereditary proletarians. In his book "The Situation of the Working Class in England," F. Engels highly rated the militant spirit of the proletariat in those areas. "Lancashire, Manchester in particular," he wrote, "is the location of the strongest labor unions, a center of Chartism, and a place where socialists are most numerous" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 2, p 463).

Harry Pollit's great-grandfather on his mother's side was one of the most active rank-and-file members of the Chartist movement in Lancashire and Yorkshire.

His mother's father, a carpenter, was one of those who had done a great deal to persuade his fellow workers to form a trade union. They followed him. Harry's father, Samuel Pollit, a hammerer, had been a trade union member throughout his conscious life. As Pollit himself wrote, his ancestors on his father's side had also played a role in the struggle waged by the working class.

Mary-Louise, Pollit's mother, was the heart and soul of the family. As a member of the Independent Labor Party from the time of its creation, she

hoped, joining the party, to find in socialism the way to a new and better future for mankind. For more than half a century she was an active member of the cooperative movement. She was a member of the weavers' trade union. Immediately after the Communist Party of Great Britain was formed, Mary-Louise Pollit entered its ranks. It was precisely under his mother's direct guidance that Harry began his labor career before he was 12, as an apprentice in a factory processing cotton waste. At the age of 15 he joined the Horton Tank Locomotive Engines Plant, first as an assistant riveter and then a boilermaker.

As THE MORNING STAR, the newspaper of the British communists, wrote, on the occasion of Pollit's 80th birthday, "the Lancashire working class and the country's labor movement molded him from an early age."

From the very beginning of his labor life, Pollit found himself in the center of large anticapitalist actions by the British workers. Thus, in September 1915 he headed a two-week strike in defense of trade union rights at the Thornycroft shipyards in Southampton.

Harry Pollit, the 28-year-old London shipyard boilermaker, active member of the trade union and a revolutionary socialist, was one of the organizers of the movement of the shop stewards in the shipyards of the Thames River Basin. The movement of the shop stewards rallied the most militant and class-conscious workers sharing revolutionary views and filled with fierce hatred for capitalism and the decaying influence of reformism. This militant movement, which appeared within the British trade unions, was the pioneer of a number of mass actions of the working class.

At almost the same time, in January 1919, the London Boilermakers Trade Union Organization made Pollit its secretary. The implementation of these important social assignments helped him to increase his ties in the labor organizations. In September 1919, "despite his youth," he became the national leader of the militant movement of the British working people "Hands Off of Russia!"

"The news which arrived in November 1917 of the socialist revolution," he wrote later, "triggered a happy excitement among all revolutionary-leaning workers.... I eagerly looked for anything related to the Russian revolution and the thought that workers like myself and all the others around me had seized the power and defeated the owners' class triggered a tempestuous enthusiasm in me. I began to concentrate my propaganda activities on supporting the October Revolution and directly participated in the 'Hands Off of Russia!' movement. I soon became known on the docks as a 'bolshevik,' which, naturally, I took as a great honor."

As organizer of the "Hands Off of Russia!" movement, Pollit visited various parts of the country and addressed meetings. His anti-imperialist articles appeared in the worker press. His article "Dockers, Watch Out!" printed in WORKERS DREADNAUGHT in May 1919 read: "The British government is helping inveterate reactionaries--the Russian capitalists and landowners--to restore the overthrown tsarist regime which embodies everything that is most bloody

and despotic in the world...." The article ended with an appeal to the British working people "to refuse to work on all ships hauling military equipment to Russia."

The extensive agitation conducted among the masses of the British workers, who were members of the "Hands Off of Russia!" movement, soon began to yield tangible results. On 10 May 1920 the London dockers went on strike, refusing to load coal on the steamship "Jolly George," which was to take military equipment to landowners' Poland, which, in accordance with the Entente plan, had started a war against Soviet Russia. The war materials had to be unloaded on the docks.

The British communists justifiably consider Harry Pollit one of the founders of the Communist Party of Great Britain. He actively participated in the work of its first congress. The development of this party as a Marxist party of the working class of a new type was directly influenced by the Comintern, V. I. Lenin's advice and his theoretical works. Lenin's struggle against sectarianism and opportunism and his polemics against the supporters of refusal to work in reformist trade unions and in parliament played a major role. In speaking of Lenin's "Left-wing Communism--an Infantile Disorder" and his withering criticism of sectarianism and opportunism which was contained within it and which affected the British labor and communist movements as well, Pollit frequently repeated that "this was a great school for us."

Harry Pollit's encounter with Lenin at the Third Comintern Congress left an ineradicable impression on him. "The day I met Comrade Lenin," he recalled, "was the most important day in my life." Pollit remembered with reverence Lenin's advice to the British communists for the rest of his life. As a communist of the Leninist school he tirelessly struggled for the triumph of the Leninist ideas and principles. In turning to the theoretical legacy of the great leader of the international proletariat, Pollit again and again realized the intransigent significance of Leninism in understanding the problems of the contemporary world. Fighting in the vanguard sectors of the British and global worker and communist movements, on the basis of his own experience H. Pollit reached the conviction that Leninism alone "expresses the interests of the working class and all working people and the needs of global social progress profoundly and accurately, and teaches us to find daring and creative solutions to ripe problems and arms us with a scientific understanding of social development prospects." He constantly studied Marxism-Leninism himself and persistently worked for Marxist-Leninist theory to capture the minds and hearts of the toiling masses.

As a professional revolutionary-communist, he developed within himself features of a Leninist party leader, such as infinite loyalty to the cause of the revolution, closest possible ties with the masses, competence and ability to judge people and the art of the organizer. It was precisely these qualities which gave him new strength in the struggle against the enemies of the working class. According to his fellow workers and comrades in the struggle, Pollit was "incorruptible and as firm as a rock" in his loyalty to the cause of the working class and the principles of communism.

Already in his youth Pollit became known as a "socialist agitator," and this reputation of a capable speaker continued to grow. He received invitations to address meetings throughout Lancashire and Yorkshire--Liverpool, Oldham, Leeds, Huddersfield and Grimsby. In introducing him in one meeting or another, the sponsors announced that "the famous Manchester orator Harry Pollit will speak." He had read the classics of British literature in the local library and thoroughly studied any available socialist and Marxist literature.

In his younger years he had been most attracted to poetry and frequently ended his speeches with poems. In his addresses and pamphlets he frequently used the poems of Chartist Ernest Johns, the great English romantic poet George Gordon Byron, the French communist poet Louis Aragon and many others. One of Pollit's favorite poets was William Morris, British poet and socialist, whose poem "Worker March" Pollit cited most frequently.

"What is this noise and thunder in many countries,
Like wind along the valleys,
Like an approaching hurricane,
Like a fierce storm in the ocean?
The people are on the move....

"Listen to the thunder!
The sun pours its living rays,
And anger with hope has risen.
The troops are thunderously on the march."

Pollit's speeches were distinguished by their profound belief in the rightness of the working class, militant style and fine humor. However, his main weapon was real facts on the situation of the working people in the various parts of Britain. R. Palm Datt, who worked in the Communist Party of Great Britain Executive Committee with Pollit for more than 30 years, noted with profound knowledge of the matter that if "no other English orator could rival Harry Pollit in the ability to draw vast audiences in any part of the country, this was the result not only of his oratory gift and ability to explain political problems simply and understandably or his contagious enthusiasm, but also his closeness to any listener, and the ability to express his hopes, fears and expectations."

The leitmotif of Pollit's speeches and reports were topics of the struggle for the unity of action among the working class and the entire toiling people, against imperialist preparations for a new war, for a policy of peace and national independence of the country, against the reactionary policies of the conservatives and right-wing labor leaders, and against the subordination of Great Britain to American capital.

Pollit tirelessly called for unity of action among the British working people for the sake of the common objectives. "When workers-laborists and workers-communists receive their pay on Friday evening," he wrote in one of his articles, "their thoughts are entirely identical. On Saturday, when their wives go to the stores and see how prices have increased over the past week,

they think exactly alike. When the fathers and mothers of laborists and communists see how their sons are drafted for 2 years' military training or sent to Malaya and Korea, they think alike. When reservists--laborists and communists--are drafted, their thoughts are the same.

"When the impudent entrepreneurs pursue the shop stewards who are not their puppets, the laborist and communist workers act jointly and strike together and always whenever this happens (which does happen frequently) the workers are the winners."

However, Pollit also realized that "social democratic illusions are still very strong among a considerable segment of the workers and that the British social democrats are still strongly influencing the labor movement." He pointed out to his party fellow workers the need to take this feature into consideration.

In his speeches, articles and pamphlets Pollit repeatedly reiterated that the Communist Party of Great Britain has never had nor will have any interests other than those of the British working class and all working people.

From his youth Pollit was one of those who decided, in his expression, "to fight war with all possible means." In answer to an appeal at the peak of the war, 1915, to the workers of one of the war plants by the authorities to give up their paid leave, Pollit said: "Your class triggered this war. My class would like to stop it." Initially, his antiwar actions were spontaneous. Gradually, however, the young socialist became a convinced opponent of imperialist wars.

When a real danger of a new world war arose after Hitler's advent to power in Germany, as secretary general of the Communist Party of Great Britain Pollit directed the main attention of the party and entire working class to the need to fight fascism. On behalf of the communist party he appealed to the British workers: "Fight fascism today. Its growth can be stopped and it can be defeated." In his article "The Lessons of 9 September," Pollit explained to the workers briefly but extremely clearly how one could and should struggle against the brown plague. The article was dedicated to the heroic action of the London workers against the attempts of the Black Shirts to march through the East End, a blue-collar district, on 9 September 1934. Within 5 days every party member and party cell had been mobilized. The entire campaign, as Pollit said, took place in a state of unparalleled upsurge and was successful. It became a model of how a political campaign should be conducted.

In many of his articles and speeches Pollit said that the British reaction was urging on Nazi Germany to fight an aggressive war against the Soviet Union. Thus, in the article "The Lessons of 9 September" he wrote that "In England there is a large number of workers and intellectuals who admire the Soviet Union.... These workers and intellectuals solemnly promise to take up the defense of the Soviet Union." At the expanded plenum of the Communist Party of Great Britain Central Committee, in January 1936, Pollit said that the "intensified preparations for war made by the 'national' government, calls for energizing the struggle for the preservation of the peace." He

noted that "the time has come to launch a broad mass campaign for putting an end to the policy of friendship with German fascism pursued by the 'national' government, and instead promote peaceful cooperation with the socialist state.... Millions of people in England will warmly welcome such peaceful cooperation, will offer full support to the organization of such a movement and will support our desire to live in peace and friendship with the Soviet Union."

Pollit's contribution to the struggle for peace and lifting the threat of a new world war was considerable and comprehensive. In 1937-1938, at the very peak of the fascist intervention against republican Spain, he visited that country on five different occasions. With his warm and intimate words, directly on the front lines, he inspired the soldiers in the British battalion (which included several hundred communists) of the International Brigade in their courageous struggle against the fascists and participated in patriotic demonstrations in Madrid. The difficult circumstances of that period, the high moral spirit of the Spanish people and the internationalist fighters and their profound hatred of fascism were reflected in Pollit's pamphlet "Spain and Its Real Friends," written after his initial trips. "All fighters: English, Irish, Scottish and Welsh, were cheerful.... Comrade Fred Copman, the commander of the British battalion, proudly said that he was happy to command such an outstanding detachment of troops." It was truly with the blood of his heart that he wrote about Madrid of that time and its population: "I shut my eyes and again see in front of me that city tortured by the fighting. Every day and every night it was shelled and the shelling from heavy guns was worse than bombing from the air.... The huge buildings which were built to last centuries crumbled like houses of cards and entire worker districts were swept off the face of the earth...."

Harry Pollit, the communist-internationalist, described the heroism of the Spanish people, their loyalty to democracy and peace, and their gratitude to the Soviet people for their help in the struggle against fascism. "I shall never forget," Pollit wrote, "and I shall never impartially react to the fact that the entire military power of fascism and all devilish tools of death which Hitler and Mussolini sent Franco were unable to crush the courage of the Madrid population.... One can read on each barricade, wall and fence throughout Spain: Long live the Soviet Union!"

The defeat of republican Spain did not stop the persistent struggle of this British communist against war. In a 32-page pamphlet "How To Defeat War," which came out in 1939, Pollit analyzed the international situation and the events leading to a world war. He paid particular attention to exposing the policy of the Chamberlain government, whose refusal to accept the Soviet proposals of concluding a peace pact was actually encouraging fascist aggression in Europe.

When Hitlerite Germany treacherously attacked the Soviet Union, Pollit was in the front ranks of those who expressed their feeling of solidarity with the Soviet people. He actively and consistently called for the unification of all anti-Hitlerite forces and for the fastest possible opening of a second front in Europe. During the entire war Pollit tirelessly crisscrossed the

country, addressed with his fiery speeches large meetings on city square and at plant gates and shops.

After the war, when the British ruling circles mounted their "cold war" against the USSR, Pollit firmly exposed this anti-people's course. "Our congress," he spoke in the report submitted to the 22nd Communist Party of Great Britain Congress in 1952, "must most emphatically tell the British people of the threat of war. The scale and nature of military preparations made by the American imperialists and their allies greatly exceed even Hitler's preparations during the period directly preceding World War II...." The Soviet people remember his words at the 20th CPSU Congress: "... I repeat the statement I made in Sheffield, this large center of the steel industry, at the beginning of the cold war, in 1947: 'The British workers will never participate in a war against the Soviet Union'."

Pollit consistently exposed the plans for military preparations carried out by the British ruling circles, showing the danger they bring to the British people. "Like the people of all other countries," he wrote, "our people are deeply interested in preventing a third world war, for our small, densely populated and highly industrialized island would suffer more than any other large country should nuclear weapons be used."

In his speeches and articles, with his inherent faith in the justice of his cause, Pollit shamed the warmongers and tore off the masks from the faces of the slanderers who tried to slander the peaceful construction taking place in the USSR and the other socialist countries. He persistently pointed out that the Soviet Union "gives the world every day new proof of the fact that its only desire is the safeguarding of universal peace. No honest person who looks at the fact could believe the slander that the Soviet Union wants war." As we know, this old lie is being repeated today again and again, by the imperialist politicians and their mouthpieces, without their conscience being bothered.

At the same time, Pollit drew the attention of the British communists and the entire labor movement in the country to the major shortcomings in the organization of the struggle for peace. He emphasized that a constant struggle must be waged against two dangers: against underestimating the threat of war and the views of its fatal inevitability. Finally, Pollit said that the greatest weakness of the peace movement in Britain is its lack of deep roots in factories and plants.

As an active propagandist and agitator for strengthening peace the world over, Pollit always pointed out the indivisibility of the struggle for peace from that of socialism. "Socialism," he wrote in 1952, "means elimination of poverty and unemployment. It means an end to slums, an end to the oppression of other nations and peoples and an end to war."

The idea that Leninism is the Marxism of our time, the single, integral and steadily developing theory of the international working class, runs throughout Pollit's fiery speeches, political pamphlets and articles. He repeatedly said that there neither is nor could be any Marxism without the new features

in its development introduced by Lenin. Peter Kerrigan, a party veteran, described Pollit as a major Marxist. Pollit made a creative contribution to the application of Marxism to the social problems of Great Britain and the labor movement in the British Isles. D. Gollan, who replaced Pollit as secretary general of the Communist Party of Great Britain, also noted that Pollit was a master of Marxist-Leninist theory. Inherent in his works were a profound knowledge of processes occurring in the British and global labor and communist movements and a thorough consideration of new manifestations in life. In his theoretical conclusions he relied on the experience of the practical struggle of the working class. Pollit's fellow workers consider as the peak of his theoretical activities his long work on the party's program "The British Path to Socialism." Its draft was published for the first time in 1951 and it was adopted at the 22nd Communist Party of Great Britain Congress in April 1952. Work on the program proved the ability of the British communists creatively to apply Marxist-Leninism under the specific conditions of the labor movement in Great Britain and in accordance with profound politician changes which have taken place as a result of the growth of the forces of socialism in the world and the radical changes in the ratio of forces in the world arena. It theoretically substantiated the question of the possibility of the seizure of political and economic power by the working class by gaining a majority in parliament, which would be in the interest of all working people in the country and, on the basis of such a parliament, forming a socialist government.

Pollit dedicated the rest of his life to the dissemination of the ideas contained in the party program. In his articles, speeches and reports he persistently explained to the broad masses of British working people its concepts, including those dealing with the struggle for peace and against the threat of a new war.

Today as well the British communists are firmly speaking out against the imperialist threat of unleashing a new, this time nuclear, war. During the preparations for the regular 38th National Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain, to be held this November, its executive committee pointed out that the most important and urgent task of the communists and all democratic forces is firmly to oppose the plans for the deployment of American cruise missiles on British soil and to organize a mass movement against the program of "modernizing" the British submarine fleet by arming it with the Trident nuclear missile system.

It is in the tradition of the British people and working class sacredly to honor the memory of their outstanding countrymen. Pollit was a loyal son of the working class and a passionate opponent of the capitalist system which dooms the working people to cruel exploitation. He dedicated his entire life to the struggle for the victory of socialism in his homeland.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

PARTY OF PATRIOTS AND INTERNATIONALISTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83) pp 87-96

[Article by Alvaro Cunhal, Portuguese Communist Party secretary general]

[Text] The 70th birthday of Comrade Alvaro Cunhal, the inflexible fighter against fascism and for the freedom and social progress of his country and the triumph of the great communist ideals, will be celebrated on 10 November. In presenting to him their sincere congratulations, the KOMMUNIST editors express their feelings of fraternal friendship and solidarity with the Portuguese communists and all Portuguese working people.

Following, slightly abridged, is the speech delivered by Comrade Alvaro Cunhal at the meeting of friendship between the Portuguese Communist Party (PCP) and the CPSU, which was held in Barreiro on 22 June 1983.

History and the contemporary struggle prove that the Portuguese communists are the most consistent patriots in their country and the most firm defenders of the national interests, progress, sovereignty and independence of their homeland.

However, in no way does patriotism exclude holding internationalist positions. One can boldly assert that the most firm Portuguese patriots are also the most firm internationalists.

The Portuguese Communist Party has a class nature. In terms of its political essence, ideology and program it is a party of the working class. The interests and final objectives of the working class and the other Portuguese working people are the same as the interests and end objectives of the working class and working people of all countries and the interests and objectives of the common struggle for socialism and communism on all five continents.

Such is the base of the reciprocal solidarity among the working people of all countries and the communists and worker parties. Such is the base of the lofty ideas of proletarian internationalism, which inspire relations of fraternal friendship between the PCP and the CPSU.

Today a delegation of the CPSU is among us. Unquestionably, all of you will agree if we were to assert to our guests that "the Portuguese communists and

working people welcome you with open arms, like friends and brothers. In many long years of restless history, life itself proved that the friendship between the PCP and the CPSU is unbreakable."

Barreiro, this worker district with glorious and heroic traditions in the struggle, deserves the right to be the site of this meeting of friendship between the PCP and the CPSU.

The workers of Barreiro, this old "red settlement," as it was known already during fascist times, welcome today the Soviet comrades not only on their behalf. Barreiro perfectly expresses the feelings of friendship, fraternity and solidarity between the Portuguese working people and the party of Lenin and the great land of the soviets.

It would be no exaggeration to say that for more than 60 years the October Revolution, which became a turning point in the history of all mankind, the creation of the first state of workers and peasants, and the achievements and victories of the USSR in building a socialist society, together with the activities of the BCP and the class organizations of the working people, are exerting a profound influence and shaping a high class consciousness and the revolutionary ideals of the proletariat and the population of Barreiro and among the entire Portuguese proletariat.

For more than 60 years the USSR has set the example of how the working people not only should but could put an end to capitalist exploitation through their struggle, take in their hands the fate of the country and guide state, economic, social and cultural life and, by building socialism, enhance the material well-being and cultural standards of the people, freedom and social progress. The very existence of the USSR is a factor in the progress and liberation struggle of the working people and nations of all countries.

To the Barreiro working class anti-Soviet campaigns are nothing new. The Barreiro working people are familiar with anti-Soviet campaigns ever since the Soviet Union has existed. They have known what an anticommunist campaign is ever since the PCP was organized. The Barreiro working people will never allow themselves to be misled by such campaigns.

That is precisely why they are so profoundly attached to the ideals of socialism. That is precisely why they maintain such strong ties with the PCP which, as a result of the elections, received the absolute majority in this district.

Unity and Mutual Solidarity

The development of the world itself today has defined the main forces for the liberation of working people and nations and for social progress and peace: the labor movement in the capitalist countries, the national liberation movement, the progressive countries, and the socialist countries, among which the USSR is the main force.

The immediate and more distant objectives of these forces are unquestionably different. However, all of them are united in defining their common enemies

--imperialism and reaction--and in formulating the common objectives which coincide in their basic aspects despite differences in the historical stages in which each of these forces operates.

The unity of joint actions or actions leading to unity among these forces are factors of tremendous importance in terms of their common and individual victories.

The unity and joint actions or actions leading to unity ensure the transition to another stage of action, to reciprocal solidarity, which helps us to understand the situation and define our positions and political actions.

It would be difficult to imagine the existence of social forces supporting the labor movement in a number of countries and the national liberation movements and the progressive countries but failing to consider as their duty solidarity with the USSR and the other socialist countries.

The USSR and the other socialist countries are not only the main bulwark of the progressive development of mankind but are actively supporting the forces of progress and peace the world over. This is a reality which some people are nevertheless trying to dispute.

What can we, Portuguese communists, say on this subject?

With first-hand knowledge of the matter, based on the experience of dozens and dozens of years, during 48 of which Portugal was under a fascist dictatorship, we can say that the Portuguese working people, the Portuguese nation, the Portuguese democrats have always relied in their struggle on the support and the solidarity of the CPSU and the Soviet people. We can also say that the Soviet Union has always relied on the support and solidarity of the Portuguese communists and working people.

No. We have never retreated and we shall never retreat even in the face of the worst pressure and attempts to make us deviate from the path of friendship and fraternal cooperation. This path is fully consistent not only with the interests of our party but also those of our people and our country, which is free and independent. That is why friendship between the PCP and the CPSU is part of our international, national and patriotic policy.

Marxism-Leninism--Ideological Foundation of Party Unity

The relations between the PCP and the CPSU were not established today. They existed in the past and will exist in the future. They are characterized by fraternal friendship, profound sincerity and mutual respect, solidarity and a common ideological base consisting of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

We know the zeal with which the offensive against Marxism-Leninism is being conducted. The capitalist ideologues are shrieking that since Marx died 100 years ago and Lenin died 60 years ago, allegedly Marxism has become obsolete, lost its relevance and become incapable of answering the ever-new questions

which appear in the course of global economic, social and political developments.

Those who say that are either unaware or pretend ignorance of the fact that Marxism is a theory open to life, a theory which is steadily developing and which offers a scientific method for the study of the new processes and realities and is expanding through new lessons and new experience every day.

Marxism-Leninism is not a dogma, an ossified or frozen formula. Marxism-Leninism is the ideological manifestation of constantly changing realities. It is a science which is the result of practice. It is inseparable from practice and is steadily enriched by it.

That is why Marxism-Leninism is a necessary and irreplaceable ideological foundation for the worker parties in all their national and international activities.

In defending Marxism-Leninism we defend not a mechanical repetition of experience but its critical mastery, not a repetition of processes but the discovery of new ways, and not stagnation but construction of practical and theoretical work.

Marxism-Leninism is most strongly related to reality and life. Aware of this, we have never joined those who assume that theoretical discord and the withdrawal of some trends in the labor movement from Marxism-Leninism are irreversible. We have never joined those who consider irreversible the destructive effect of so-called "centrifugal forces," which, actually, are the result of objective differences in the situation in individual countries and existing ideological differences.

We know that some differences have appeared on a rather broad range of problems. We know that some communist and worker parties have broken relations of cooperation and friendship with others. We know that some parties have pitted their own "ways" to socialism against real, already extant, socialism. We also know that some parties have abandoned the term "international communist movement" and the concept of "proletarian internationalism." We know that some parties have proclaimed a withdrawal from Leninism, although claiming to remain Marxist while depriving Marxism of its richest constructive historical experience.

In the face of the difficulties which developed in the communist movement, our party has always struggled and continues to struggle to the extent of its possibilities for a rapprochement with all parties, friendship, cooperation, joint actions, and strengthening cohesion and unity in the international communist movement.

Marxism-Leninism--the historical experience of the revolutionary struggle in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism--is the only firm foundation for this.

Experience has already indicated that a withdrawal from Marxism-Leninism has not brought about a scientific study of new phenomena and realities or the

proper and effective definition of a political direction or progress in social changes and strengthening the unity, organization and growth of influence on the masses by the respective parties (the statements of those who made this withdrawal notwithstanding). Conversely, practical experience proved that a withdrawal from Marxism-Leninism impoverishes and weakens the combat capability of the party and its influence on national life and social changes.

In the light of this, it is entirely natural that the tendency to separate Marx from Lenin is considerably weakening in the international communist movement, as are tendencies to suppress the class nature of the party and its policies and the constant criticism of the USSR and the socialist countries.

The Reality of the Socialist Countries and Portugal's Socialist Future

One of the charges raised against us in the campaign against the PCP is that we want to "copy the Soviet model."

Indeed, we value the great historical accomplishments of the USSR and the other socialist countries and describe them to our people.

It is true, we say, that our people would be happy if the hour of the Portuguese socialist revolution would strike today and if the Portuguese socialist revolution would accomplish even part of the successes in improving the living conditions and raising the living standard as have the Soviet people.

However, it is precisely because we are Marxists-Leninists it is absolutely accurate that we do not wish to "copy the Soviet model," for a revolution cannot be duplicated and there are no ready-made "models" of revolution, for in each country the solution of problems and the course of social changes depend on the specific situation in the country and its possibilities and characteristics.

As far as Portugal is concerned, our party line is based on the study of the realities of the country, i.e., the extent and characteristics of capitalist development, the socioeconomic structure, the class structure of the society, the numerous contradictions and class conflicts, the structure of the state and its elements and a variety of subjective factors, such as the level, influence and degree of social and political organization of the individual classes.

Our party program characterizes the current stage in the revolution as national democratic and as a structural component of the process which should bring about the building of a socialist society in Portugal.

There is a Portuguese reality and to us this means a Portuguese solution of the problem, consistent with the conditions of our country and the expectations and will of our people.

In precisely the same way that the development of capitalism in Portugal was different from the development of capitalism in countries where the socialist

revolution won, the development of the revolutionary process and social and economic progress in building a socialist society in Portugal will have its distinctive features.

However, this is not to say that we reject the universal and basic features of social systems and, in this case, of socialism. Conversely, this demands of us to observe them as a necessary starting point and not only acknowledge but understand the entire depth of the objective laws of social development and the revolutionary lessons which have acquired universal value, and the richest possible experience (both positive and negative) of the process of reorganization in other countries.

That is why the attention we pay to the experience of the October Revolution and the building of socialism in the Soviet Union and our assessment of this experience are not astounding, for no single country can show us a greater variety of accomplishments, experience and lessons than the Soviet Union.

We are witnessing every day the way the mass information media are presenting most outrageous lies, slanders and distortions of reality regarding the USSR and the other socialist countries.

This campaign was not started today. It was conducted by the fascist dictatorship. The shame which befell Portugal in April is the fact that such an irresponsible campaign is continuing, poisoning public opinion day after day, and is being conducted not only by traditionally reactionary forces but also by politicians who consider themselves democratic and even leftist.

Whatever political choice the working people may make, they must ask themselves why the big capitalists and entrepreneurs and the political parties which defend their interests are concentrating their entire attacks precisely on the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

Could we believe that attacks on the Soviet Union by the Portuguese exploiters and reactionaries are triggered by the ideas of equality, social justice and well-being of the people, when they are blithely pursuing in Portugal a policy which increases inequality and promotes the domination of inequity and dooms the people's masses to poverty?

No. We cannot believe that the rights of the working people of other countries are being defended by those who are exploiting and most rudely suppressing the working people in their own.

We cannot believe that those who are violating most cynically human rights in their own country would be defending the rights of the working people in other countries.

We cannot believe that those who in Portugal are inflicting on the working people and people's masses layoffs, mass unemployment, drastic price increases and unbearably high rentals and costs of medical services and education, which is becoming inaccessible to the children of the working people, who doom the elderly to poverty and privations and who deprive the young

people of the hope of getting their first job, are interested in the well-being of the Soviet people.

Capitalists, reactionaries, all those who are preaching in Portugal the so-called model of Western society, cannot tell the truth about the Soviet Union, for in the Soviet Union the working people have become free from capitalist exploitation and have built a new society--a society without exploiters and exploited.

They cannot forgive the Soviet Union for its lack of unemployment and because, conversely, it is short of manpower; that its young people can attend universities without any discrimination whatsoever, acquire a profession, have access to culture, engage in sports and have guaranteed jobs. All of this clearly contrasts with the tragic situation of Portuguese youth, which numbers hundreds of thousands of unemployed and hundreds of thousands of those who have sunk to the bottom of drug addiction, crime and prostitution. Women living a most pitiful life can be seen everywhere, on the streets and boulevards of all Portuguese cities, on the highways and in the fields.

The main reasons for anti-Sovietism are rooted in the importance which the example of the victorious building of socialism in the USSR and its great accomplishments in the economic, social, cultural and scientific and technical areas and in all basic aspects of social development has in terms of the awareness of the exploited and the oppressed; in the profound and greatly determining influence which the USSR (and the socialist countries as a whole) have on the progressive development of the global situation and the solidarity among working people and nations of all countries. The main reasons for anti-Sovietism stem from the fact that the USSR and the other socialist countries are a real force which stands against the policy of imperialist aggression and in the current dangerous international situation serves as a reliable bulwark of peace the world over.

The struggle for peace today has become of prime importance.

An extensive campaign is under way in Portugal as in other countries aimed at promoting the entirely false and absurd idea of the so-called "Soviet military threat" in Europe and for the sake of convincing public opinion that the responsibility for the aggravation of international tension and the arms race falls equally on the United States and the Soviet Union.

The facts, however, are different.

The foreign policy of the USSR and the other socialist countries is directed above all toward the defense of peace. This is an unquestionable fact.

Another unquestionable fact is the suggestions and initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries aimed at hindering the arms race, opening a way to detente and guaranteeing the security of the peoples and peace throughout the world. These proposals and initiatives clearly contrast with the arms race and nuclear blackmail of the Reagan administration.

In this connection, our party considers exceptionally important the suggestions made by the Soviet Union on freezing nuclear armaments with a view to their subsequent reduction, suggestions on the creation of nuclear-free zones and the Soviet declaration of not being the first to use nuclear weapons, added to the appeal to other nuclear powers to assume a similar obligation.

Those who wish objectively to assess the international situation face the inevitable conclusion that the main threat to peace comes from imperialism, American above all, and the Reagan administration; the greatest contribution to the cause of peace throughout the world is made, along with the struggle waged by the peoples, by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

A Reactionary Foreign Policy Is a Threat to Portugal

As far as Portugal is concerned, Reagan's adventuristic policy and, specifically, his intention to expand and intensify the use of Portuguese territory for military purposes are the cause of particular concern due to the fact that the "Democratic Alliance" government has been directly serving American imperialism, while the parties within the new cabinet (Socialist and Social Democrat) are showing major symptoms of a compromise or readiness to compromise with Reagan.

Pinto Balsemao, the former prime minister, recently wrote in a Brazilian newspaper that the talks with the United States will deal with the use of four airfields on Portuguese continental territory, including the Beja city airfield.

Such a statement is being made by a person who is no longer prime minister, while remaining the head of the Social Democratic Party, i.e., a party which remains in the government. If Balsemao's statement is not true, the new government should deny it quickly. If it fails to do so, the conclusion is that preparations are indeed under way for the use of Portuguese airfields by American forces.

We would like to state once again that we firmly oppose and will continue to oppose the expanding of the American presence at the Lajes military base, the use of airfields on the continent by foreign armed forces, the use of the port of Lisbon by American nuclear submarines (which in itself is a dangerous and scandalous fact) and the deployment of American nuclear missiles on Portuguese territory.

In the name of the national interest, security and tranquility of the Portuguese people and our sovereignty and independence, we shall continue to struggle against the aggressive imperialist plans, for achieving a democratic change in our country's policy and, after such a change, for a government to begin at last to pursue a policy of peace, friendship and cooperation with all nations on earth, both capitalist and socialist, and not only with members of the Common Market and the United States but also with the USSR and the other socialist countries. To exclude from Portuguese foreign policy the development of friendly relations with the USSR and the other socialist countries means to follow the cold war policy of the Reagan administration.

We insist on a policy of diversified Portuguese international relations, with no discrimination harming our national interests.

Portugal needs peace. Portugal must develop relations of friendship and cooperation with all countries which are willing to develop them on the basis of the fundamental principles of mutual benefit, noninterference in domestic affairs and respect for national independence.

Only such a foreign policy can be truly national and independent, and only such a policy is consistent with the interests of our homeland.

Looking at our relations of close cooperation with the fraternal ruling parties of other countries, the party's enemies and opponents sometimes raise the accusation that such relations among parties harm relations between governments.

Such an accusation is thoroughly false.

Regardless of the parties represented in the Portuguese government, our party has defended, is defending, and will defend the development of relations with all countries, the USSR and the other socialist countries above all.

The foreign policy of the Democratic Alliance governments, which have followed the aggressive and hegemonistic policy of American imperialism, and the provocatory actions of these governments toward countries with which Portugal maintains diplomatic relations, have created major difficulties in developing relations of cooperation.

It is legitimate to demand of the new government to put an end to cold war diplomacy and provocations which the Democratic Alliance governments have pursued toward the USSR and the other socialist countries, and for this government to assume a positive position toward the development of mutually profitable cooperation in the diplomatic, political, trade, economic and scientific and technical areas, culture, sports and tourism. Tremendous possibilities exist for developing said relations. This could only greatly benefit Portugal and the Portuguese people.

Portugal also needs friendship with the USSR and other socialist countries. On that level relations of friendship and cooperation between our party and the CPSU (as well as the other fraternal parties) not only do not harm but are a major contribution to improving and developing relations between two countries, particularly because it is precisely our parties which are systematically working precisely for such improvements and development of relations between our countries.

The program of the socialist and social democratic governments are a confirmation of right-wing politics.

The formation of a government by the Socialist and Social Democratic parties has triggered a natural and profound concern caused by the foreign and domestic policies which it intends to pursue, as confirmed by the governmental

program submitted to the republic's national assembly. This program fully confirms what we had long been saying, despite the constant denials of the Socialist Party secretary general.

What are its main features?

The first is a worsening of working and living conditions of the working people and the popular masses with a view to increasing exploitation and the growth of profits and the accumulation and concentration of capital. The program clearly states that real wages will be reduced and stipulates in advance that wages will fall behind price increases. This in itself is nothing other than a characteristic method of setting a wage increase ceiling.

The reason for reducing wages is what the government describes as "inevitable sacrifices by the Portuguese people." Other "gifts" are added to it, such as raising rents, as is also stipulated in the program.

The second main aspect of the program is a new offensive mounted against nationalization and the agrarian reform, with a view to accelerating the process of restoring monopolies, landed estates, privileges and the rule of the rich. With the new law on the demarcation of sectors (which was unconstitutional from the start, for it questioned the constitutionally irreversible nature of bank nationalization), the government intends to open the way to putting in the hands of big capital banks and insurance companies and the cement and fertilizer industries. Once again, standing behind these measures announced by the government are the big monopolies from fascist times: Melo, Sampalimo, Espírito Santo and others, who are now preparing for an offensive.

The third aspect of the governmental program is a policy of stagnation, paralysis and economic decline, which leads to increased foreign indebtedness and steady and catastrophic foreign loans which, step by step, are strangling our economy, reducing the living standards of the people and putting in doubt prospects for the development and the very independence of Portugal.

The fourth aspect of the governmental program is to restrict the freedoms and civil rights of the working people in order to hinder the struggle of the toiling and popular masses which, under such circumstances, will inevitably intensify and grow. This is confirmed by the programmatic intention of reviewing the laws on the freedom of associations, assembly and demonstrations, and the promulgation of the law on internal security and coordination of police actions.

The governmental program leaves no doubt that the attack on the gains of the revolution in the socioeconomic area is paralleled by an attack on political democracy and civil rights and freedoms.

The very manner in which the Socialist and Social Democratic parties intend to rule the country exposes their anti-democratic intentions.

After starting with a variety of maneuvers in the republic's national assembly, the government is preparing to pass behind its back and that of the

people a number of laws aimed against the rights of the working people and their democratic gains.

We insist on the fact that the country cannot be led out of the crisis with such policies.

We insist that the policy pursued by the Socialist and Social Democratic government, which will continue to lead the country to an economic and social crisis and to increased foreign indebtedness, is not inevitable or fatal, as the Socialist and Social Democratic leadership claims.

We insist that a policy exists which could take the country out of the crisis, a policy which is in many aspects diametrically opposed to the one announced by the government.

The policy of the Socialist-Social Democratic government will not bring the promised changes. It will not be a democratic alternative. It will not be left of center. It will essentially remain, both domestically and in foreign policy, a continuation and an even worsened variant of the Democratic Alliance government, which the people through their struggle defeated, rejected and severely condemned at the 25 April elections. However, by essentially continuing and intensifying this policy, the government of the Socialist and Social Democratic parties will meet with the same fate as the Democratic Alliance government.

The Struggle for a Democratic Alternative Continues

Yes, comrades, the Socialist-Social Democratic coalition will fall. However, it will not fall automatically, any more than did the Balsemao-Freitas do Amaral government.

The coalition will fall because the political course it has announced will not resolve but only aggravate the problems facing the country. The coalition will fall because its social, political and electoral base will shrink quickly (we can say that it is already shrinking as a number of people who voted for the Socialist Party in the hope that it will not make an alliance with the Social Democratic Party and will make real changes in the country's policies are losing their illusions).

The coalition will fall because democratic institutions operate and because the working people, the people's masses, the people of Portugal, in defending their rights, April gains and freedoms, will wage a major and stubborn battle against the anti-people's, antidemocratic, and antinational policy proclaimed by the government of the Socialist and Social Democratic parties.

Mario Soares proclaims, on the one hand, the need for social and political "stability," while on the other a drastic policy which is essentially a policy of destabilization.

The working people, the people's masses, the Portuguese people want true stability and will stubbornly fight a policy aimed at destabilization.

On the one hand, Mario Soares calls for "accord," "dialogue," "mutual responsibility," and "social and political armistice" with the class organizations of the working people and the PCP. On the other hand, he insults and threatens.

The working people and the PCP favor a dialogue, but a true dialogue rather than as it is understood by the Socialist and Social Democratic parties, which is a "dialogue" in which the government makes statements and decides while the working people can only talk but must obey.

The working people and the PCP want an accord, a responsible approach to the solution of problems and national solidarity in surmounting the crisis based, however, on a truly national and democratic policy.

The working people and the PCP favor social and political armistice but not a one-sided armistice proclaimed by the working people and their parties and war on the part of the government. They favor a social and political armistice based on respect for the vital interests of the working people and the April gains which, in accordance with the constitution, are an inalienable part of the Portuguese democratic regime.

It is precisely the government of the Socialist and Social Democratic parties which is unwilling to engage in a true dialogue, which does not want a real agreement or true armistice but is ready to mount a fierce offensive against the working people and the April gains. The working people will give it their worthy response and we are confident that in this future struggle the working people of Barreiro, the population of Barreiro, will be on the level of their splendid traditions.

As in the past, democracy remains stronger than reaction.

The democratic alternative will triumph.

The Portugal of April will win!

Long live the friendship between the PCP and the CPSU and between the Portuguese and Soviet peoples.

Long live proletarian internationalism.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

IN THE INTERESTS OF PEACE AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83) pp 96-105

[Article by Dr of Historical Sciences Yu. Rakhmaninov]

[Text] The Madrid meeting of the representatives of the 35 members of the European Security and Cooperation Conference was an important event in world politics and an arena of sharp and stubborn struggle in the present international situation which has become drastically aggravated as a result of the aggressive, militaristic and adventuristic course followed by the present U.S. administration, which is a major threat to universal peace. The conference triggered the broadest possible and close interest the world over.

At that major international forum the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries struggled persistently and systematically to preserve the trend of detente, to advance the general European process initiated in Helsinki, ensuring its continuity, making progress in all sections of the Final Act and drafting and adopting a meaningful political document on holding a conference on measures to strengthen trust, security and disarmament in Europe, something of particular importance.

The position held by the representatives of the United States and some of its NATO allies was the direct opposite. They were not hoping for a successful completion in the least. In pursuing a course of further aggravation of international tension and confrontation with the USSR, in its imperial global policy Washington considers Europe a potential "theater of military operations" and its NATO partners hostages in a nuclear war. It is trying at all cost to prevent an improvement in the political atmosphere on the European continent.

Political realism and the line of dialogue, mutual understanding and peaceful resolution of problems through talks gained the upper hand in the course of the stubborn confrontation between the two courses at the Madrid meeting. This was quite natural, for only a policy of peace can be consistent with the interests of the absolute majority of mankind, and for no sensible alternative to peaceful coexistence exists in international life.

The positive results of the Madrid meeting, as the communication on the session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo states, "proves that despite all differences in politics and in assessing the reasons for the current state

in international affairs and the tension of the current situation in Europe and throughout the world, countries with different social systems can reach mutually acceptable agreements to the benefit of all nations." The results achieved in Madrid are a victory for intelligence and common sense, and for anyone concerned with peace and security. The effectiveness of the principle-minded course charted by the members of the socialist commonwealth, aimed at strengthening peace and international security and rebuffing the policy of aggression and diktat was confirmed in practice.

I

The Madrid meeting, which was convened in accordance with the Helsinki Final Act and the decision adopted at the Belgrade meeting, initiated at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, opened on 11 November 1980. Its work was quite intensive and difficult and lasted slightly under 3 years.

The meeting in the Spanish capital took place during an extremely alarming and difficult period in the development of the international situation, when American imperialism, intending to ensure a dominating position in the world for the United States, unleashed an insane arms race in an effort to achieve military superiority and destroy to its advantage the strategic balance in Europe and throughout the world. The talks were conducted against the background of an extremely dangerous turn of events on the European continent as well -- Washington's intention to deploy its medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe as of the end of 1983.

Naturally, this had a most adverse impact on the course and nature of the meeting and darkened its atmosphere. The imperial manners and gross and unceremonious pressure applied by the United States on the Western European countries created friction during the meeting and upset its work.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, which put on the scale of peace their entire international prestige and political and economic potential, were the leading forces which favored a successful outcome of the Madrid meeting from the very start. They countered the forces of reaction and confrontation with a firm yet weighed and flexible line, displaying maximal good will and restraint in the search for mutually acceptable solutions. This line was based on the sincere aspiration to develop further the healthy and fruitful process of European cooperation in all areas, in accordance with the Final Act, to add military to political detente and to open new opportunities for strengthening relations of peace and good neighborhood in Europe.

The constructive line taken by the socialist countries was clearly defined in the joint documents of the Warsaw Pact members, which had been adopted at the meetings of the Political Consultative Committee in Moscow (1978), Warsaw (1980) and Prague (1983) and other meetings of leading party and state leaders of these countries.

In firmly opposing the provocative maneuvers of the United States, the representatives of the socialist countries did not allow the meeting to be shunted aside from the main tasks. Having suggested the holding of a conference on measures to strengthen trust and security and disarmament in Europe, and

formulating a number of other constructive initiatives, they directed the attention of the meeting to key European problems, such as military detente and stopping the arms race in Europe in the first place.

The members of the socialist commonwealth supported reaching agreements at the Madrid meeting covering all sections of the Final Act. They called for the adoption of effective steps to intensify cooperation in economics, science and technology and considered desirable and possible progress in the implementation of the Helsinki agreements in culture, education, information and contacts on the principled basis defined in the Final Act. This was consistent with the objective requirements of the development of the world today and the process of internationalization of mankind's economic and spiritual life. The survival of the Western European countries itself forces them, whether they wish it or not, to take the path of trade and economic relations with the socialist countries regardless of Washington's pressure. Practical experience indicates that the development of cooperation in the humanitarian and other areas largely depends on the overall level of detente and the status of bilateral relations.

All elements of the constructive platform adopted by the socialist countries at the Madrid meeting clearly display the characteristic features of their foreign policy -- love of peace, democracy and humanism. As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, pointed out at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "In our epoch it is precisely socialism which is acting as the most consistent defender of the healthy principles in international relations and of the interests of detente and peace and those of the individual nations and all mankind."

The policy of the socialist countries, aimed at ensuring the success of the Madrid meeting and continuing and intensifying the European process initiated in Helsinki, was consistent with the vital and most profound interests of all participating countries. This was the main source of its strength and effectiveness.

The calculations of the American representatives in Madrid were the precise opposite. Their position was entirely governed by the aggressive imperialistic views of the Reagan administration. It was precisely by the fault of the United States and a number of its NATO allies that the meeting dragged on and that various difficulties, obstacles and crises took place repeatedly. Since a successful Madrid meeting was not part of Washington's militaristic plans, which were aimed at turning Western Europe into a launching pad for the new American missiles, the overseas representatives were doing everything possible to derail the meeting or at least to lead into a quagmire of sterile arguments, and to limit it to the adoption of a short meaningless communique.

Literally from the very first days of work of the meeting the United States tried to turn it from a forum for ensuring the security and development of cooperation in Europe into its opposite -- an instrument of confrontation and psychological warfare waged against the socialist countries. Having assumed the task of taking the meeting to a dead end and wreck the talks, the American delegation went out of its way to prove the "impossibility" of reaching an agreement among the participants at the present time and thus to justify

somehow in the eyes of public opinion, Western European in particular, the United States' turn to tension and unprecedented arms race. The American representatives did not shy even at organizing provocative campaigns and attempts to interfere in the domestic affairs of the socialist countries under the hypocritical demagogic pretext of "human rights," the threadbare myth of the "Soviet military threat" and so on. Through such unseemly actions they wanted to undermine the main foundations of the European process to which the peoples of Europe link their hopes for a peaceful future and the fruits of which they are already enjoying to a certain extent.

Washington heavily relied on its Western European partners in the implementation of such unseemly plans. Speculating on the concept of Atlantic solidarity, it did everything possible to draw them into the fairway of a destructive policy. It was self-evident that taking into consideration the role and importance of the Western European countries in world affairs, their position could greatly determine whether or not the United States would be able to channel the course of the Madrid meeting into a suitable bed and attain its objectives. It was a question of whether or not the basic need of preserving detente and cooperation and ensuring security or circumstantial and propaganda reasons would gain the upper hand.

It is no secret that the approach taken by the Western European countries was substantially influenced by some aspects of their situation within the system of international relations. On the one hand, their leaders had to take into consideration the fact that the development of cooperation between the socialist and the Western European countries offered them both economic advantages and a greater independence in resolving political and economic problems important to them. On the other, narrow class interests lead the ruling circles in these countries to becoming closer to the United States on matters affecting the defense of capitalism. The NATO countries are limited by their treaty obligations in making independent decisions and, under constant overseas pressure, were forced to act circumspectly because of Washington.

However, American diplomacy was unable to ensure their full support. Although they joined the United States in efforts to apply pressure on the socialist countries, they nevertheless did not dare to go so far as to wreck the meeting or agreements related to cooperation and security. Unquestionably, the positions taken by the Western European countries were substantially influenced by the powerful antiwar movement which was expressed in mass people's actions against U.S. nuclear strategy and the conversion of Western Europe into a launching pad for the new American missiles.

The neutral and nonaligned countries made a positive contribution to the Madrid meeting. Because of their greater freedom of action, compared to the Western European NATO countries, and having soberly assessed the dangerous consequences of the American course of intensified military confrontation on the continent, these countries essentially became the spokesmen for political realism in the capitalist West, having realized the objective need for peaceful coexistence. They became convinced through personal experience that detente allows all big and small European countries to play an independent role in international affairs and that it helps to ensure their security. By virtue of this fact the neutral and nonaligned countries held an overall

constructive position, helped to reach mutually acceptable agreements and worked hard on drafting a final document.

The major initiatives of the members of the socialist commonwealth, which were supported by the majority of the participants, had a determining influence on the course of the Madrid meeting. The United States not only failed to turn it into an instrument of pressure on the socialist countries but found itself unwillingly involved in this process, and thereby forced to consider the desire of the Western European countries to pursue the dialogue and to cooperate with the socialist countries. Under those circumstances, Washington was forced to abandon its plans for wrecking the Madrid meeting, for the global responsibility for taking such a step was too grave.

II

The Madrid meeting crossed a number of difficulties, withstood many trials and surmounted a variety of obstacles erected by NATO's strategists in the course of its development. At the same time, its proceedings were also influenced by the specific characteristics of holding multilateral talks involving the participation of 35 countries and the need to make decisions based on unanimity (consensus). Naturally, coordinating the views of the participants, who represented countries with different social systems, was quite difficult.

However, such difficulties were clearly secondary compared to the subversive tactics which American diplomacy tried to use starting with the very first stage, in accordance with its main task of using the meeting for propaganda purposes and as an arena for the promotion of anti-Soviet and antisocialist hysteria in the spirit of Reagan's "crusade." It tried to lead the discussions away from the crucial problems of European security and cooperation by all possible means and to direct them toward demagogic logomachy about human rights and discussion of problems totally unrelated to the nature of the meeting, such as the situation in Afghanistan, etc.

The ill-intentioned activities of American diplomacy greatly misfired. It proved unable to take with it the majority of the Western European countries and was forced to join in the practical consideration of the specific questions on the agenda, including that of calling a conference on measures of trust and security and European disarmament. Here as well, however, the United States pursued its obstructionist line by making as preconditions for resolving that problem a number of unacceptable demands, particularly on defining the areas in which measures of trust were to be applied.

A factor which led to a decisive shift in resolving this problem was the proposal formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress on extending the area of measures of trust to the entire European part of the USSR, providing that the Western countries would correspondingly increase their area. The Soviet initiative, which created a qualitatively new situation, helped to remove obstacles on the way to resolving the question of holding such a conference.

The constructive position taken by the socialist countries also helped to energize the efforts of the neutral and nonaligned countries in the search for mutually acceptable ideas and ensuring the successful conclusion of the

meeting. The draft of the final document, submitted by the neutral and non-aligned countries, was a major positive step in that direction. It included all the ideas on which preliminary agreement had been attained and some compromises on unresolved problems. Although not perfect, this draft represented, in the overall view, an acceptable basis for a positive conclusion of the meeting.

Indeed, all the necessary objective prerequisites for this were extant. Unfortunately, they could not be applied because of the unbridled psychological warfare campaign unleashed by the United States and its NATO allies. Once again using as a pretext domestic events in Poland, in the spring of 1982 they mounted an unseemly anti-Polish and anti-Soviet propaganda spectacle at the Madrid meeting.

As a result, the meeting entered an extremely dangerous phase characterized by Washington's unconcealed effort to wreck the talks and disturb the European process as a whole. Riding the crest of the anti-Polish and anti-Soviet campaign, the United States fiercely attacked the draft final document proposed by the neutral and nonaligned countries, claiming that "it no longer coincided" with the developing situation.

However, the clearly visible objective of American diplomacy and its unceremonious and rude methods of diktat and pressure on other countries failed to yield desired results. Even the "firm" NATO allies of the United States did not risk giving their unconditional support to the overseas strategists and somewhat distanced themselves from them. The intention of the Washington administration to turn the Madrid meeting, as the Western press reported, "into one of the sharpest diplomatic conflicts since World War Two" failed. As was noted at the February 1982 Munich meeting of representatives of NATO members, attended by the head of the U.S. delegation, "NATO lost the propaganda war against the Warsaw Pact members."

The Madrid meeting entered its final stage in November 1982. Thanks to the further persistent and consistent efforts of the fraternal socialist countries and other states interested in detente, the positive direction taken in Madrid toward a fruitful completion of the meeting began to assume an irreversible nature. This was made apparent, among others, by the fact that the U.S. delegation found itself isolated whenever it drew away from the mainstream of problems and resorted to the hackneyed methods of antisocialist demagogy and futile attempts to drag on the meeting forever.

The redrafted final document submitted by the neutral and nonaligned countries on 15 March 1983 was a specific reflection of the essential positive changes. Although it did not take fully into consideration the stand of the socialist countries, given the specific situation it offered as a whole realistic prospects for the favorable and rapid conclusion of the Madrid meeting.

The new large-scale peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and its appeal to all participating countries to show the necessary political will and realism had a decisive impact on the situation. In April 1983, responding to the appeal of the heads of states and governments of Austria, Cyprus, San Marino, Finland, Sweden and Yugoslavia, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov called for the new

draft of the final document to become the basis for completing the work on reaching full agreement on its adoption.

The appeal of the Soviet Union to the participating countries in May 1983 led to a radical turn in the work of the meeting. Our country proclaimed its readiness to adopt the draft final document as it had been submitted by the neutral and nonaligned countries. Although the document ignored a number of essential considerations expressed by the Soviet side, our country nevertheless took this step for the sake of strengthening peace and security and developing cooperation in Europe.

As though by inertia, the NATO countries continued to raise obstacles, clinging to their clearly unacceptable amendments. It had already become clear, however, that this was being done merely "to save face." In the final account, there was nothing left for the United States and its allies but to go back on their word and to adopt with minor corrections the document submitted by the neutral and nonaligned countries. Comrade Yu. V. Andropov characterized as a "healthy and encouraging sign" the choice made in Madrid in favor of finding mutually acceptable solutions.

III

The results of the Madrid meeting are expressed in the balanced and meaningful final document which listed the specific agreements called upon to assist the development of intergovernmental relations in all areas covered by the Helsinki Final Act and to contribute to the improvement of the situation in Europe, which is experiencing an important and worrisome period. This offers new opportunities for further mutually profitable cooperation among the participating countries in the interest of strengthening European and world peace. In his address delivered at the final session of the Madrid meeting, Comrade A. A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and USSR minister of foreign affairs, said: "The results of the Madrid meeting confirm once again that further possibilities remain in the policy of detente. The specific steps agreed upon in Madrid can contribute to its dynamic continuation and development."

What specifically are the Madrid agreements?

Above all, the participating countries declared their resolve "to make new efforts detente to become an effective and a continuing and increasingly viable and comprehensive universal process, consistent with the stipulations of the Final Act." This concept assumes particular importance in the light that even while the meeting was still in progress, occasional voices could be heard in the West to the effect that "detente is dead." The Madrid document convincingly proves that the policy of detente is hardly a past stage in the development of international relations and that the future belongs to it.

The agreement reached on taking steps for the further practical implementation of the principles formulated in the Final Act in intergovernmental relations is of great importance. One of the major steps to this effect would be to codify said principles, as the concluding document stipulates, in the laws of all the countries in a way consistent with their practices and procedures.

As we know, the Soviet Union, the great socialist power, was the first country in the world to include all nine principles of the Final Act in its constitution and to base on them its relations with other countries.

The importance of the results of the Madrid meeting was greatly enhanced by the decision to convene a conference on measures to strengthen trust and security and disarmament in Europe, which will open in Stockholm in January 1984. Its first stage will deal with the discussion and taking of steps to strengthen measures of trust and security for all of Europe and adjacent maritime areas and their air space. It has been decided that similar steps will be taken in military affairs and will be politically mandatory, with suitable verification methods.

As we know, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, bearing in mind the positive experience acquired in the course of the implementation of the Helsinki agreements on the adoption and consolidation of measures of trust, have spoken out in favor of their further development and expansion. An entire set of new proposals have been formulated, stipulating changes in some rules related to giving advance notification on holding large-scale military exercises on land, air and sea, on large troop movements, on limiting the scale of exercises and on extending the measures of trust to the Mediterranean.

In ascribing prime significance to strengthening and widening the measures of trust, the members of the Warsaw Pact proceed from the fact that their implementation will contribute to making progress in disarmament as well. They have proposed that the material measures of trust and disarmament be combined with contractual-legal guarantees aimed at reducing the threat of war and ensuring the safety of the countries. This realistic approach is reflected in the final document of the Madrid meeting which stipulates that the purpose of the conference is the gradual implementation of "new, effective and specific actions aimed at achieving progress in strengthening trust and security and achieving disarmament."

Obviously, if the forthcoming conference is to be successful, it must be conducted in a businesslike manner from the start and contribute to the efforts aimed at reliably blocking the arms race and making a real contribution to improving the atmosphere and reaching an agreement on reducing the level of military confrontation in Europe on the basis of equality and identical security. This conference should become an important factor in strengthening European and international security.

At the Madrid meeting the representatives of the socialist countries supported the foundations of international cooperation in the protection of human rights as well, rebuffing various attempts at undermining such cooperation. In the course of coordinating the stipulations on human rights it was noted that international cooperation must take place in accordance with the objectives and principles of the United Nations Charter and the stipulations of the Final Act, which forbid interference in the domestic affairs of other countries. The final document contains an appeal to the participating countries which have not as yet done so to sign the international pact on human rights (among the big powers this applies to the United States only).

The section of the document dealing with economics, science, technology and the environment notes that cooperation in these areas "contributes to strengthening peace and security in Europe and throughout the world." It stipulates that "efforts must be made to reduce or gradually eliminate all obstacles in the development of trade." It mentions expanded industrial cooperation in which long-term agreements play a useful role. Great attention is paid to cooperation in science and technology. All of this is a proper answer to Washington, which is trying to undermine trade and economic relations between Western Europe and the socialist countries with the help of various sanctions, boycotts and restrictions.

As stipulated in the Final Act basic steps are also outlined on exchanges in culture and education, increased information and contacts among individuals, establishments and organizations and resolving humanitarian problems. The respective stipulations in the Final Act state that cooperation in such areas can be developed only on the basis of the strict observance of the principle of nonintervention in domestic affairs and respecting the sovereign rights, laws and administrative regulations of the individual countries.

The purpose of cooperation in the field of culture is to put the spiritual wealth of Europe, acquired in the course of centuries, on the service of peace the mutual understanding and rapprochement among peoples and the all-round development of the individual. Such cooperation would enrich the national cultures of participating countries and contribute to the development of European and world culture. Let us note in this connection that the Madrid agreements call for a "cultural forum" to be held in Budapest in October 1985 with the participation of leading cultural personalities.

The final document also reflects problems related to security and cooperation in the Mediterranean. The participating countries expressed the desire to take positive steps with a view to reducing tension in that area and strengthen its stability, security and peace.

The participants in the conference also agreed on taking further specific steps which could assist the extension and development of the European process initiated in Helsinki. They include the resolution to mark suitably the 10th anniversary of the conclusion of the Final Act, and to hold another European meeting in Vienna in 1986 and many other working conferences.

The Madrid forum is not history. However, the positive results achieved at the meeting are also addressed to the present and the future and aimed at leading Europe on the path of peace and agreement, the materializing of detente and rescuing the peoples on this continent from a threatening nuclear catastrophe. This requires an exceptionally serious approach to the developing situation and the display of a greater sense of responsibility on the part of all participants in the conference, regardless of size, geographic location or social system. Today, when the clouds of war are gathering over Europe by the fault of the imperialists, the urgent task is to bring into action all reserves contained in the Madrid agreements and to restrain the arms race.

The systematic implementation of the Madrid agreements would have a beneficial impact on the situation on the European continent. It would direct the

course of events into the channel of peaceful cooperation and make a major contribution to universal peace. Europe would become the cradle of detente. Madrid proved that it could give a new impetus to this process. It is the duty of the participants in the European conference to justify the hopes of the peoples and to ensure their peaceful and tranquil future. As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized in his declaration, "The release of material resources senselessly wasted in the arms race, and bringing to light the inexhaustible creative possibilities of man is what could rally the people and should define national policy at the turn of the 21st century. In order for this to take place the forces of militarism must be stopped and joint efforts be made to prevent the world from sliding into the precipice."

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

FIFTY YEARS OF MANY DIFFICULTIES

PM010934 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83)
pp 106-108

[Article by Yu. Molchanov]

[Text] International tension, which has been sharply exacerbated recently through the fault of ultrareactionary imperialist forces, the perceptible increase in the threat of nuclear war, and the muddy streams of malicious anti-Soviet fabrications which are poured out liberally every day by the present American Administration, have to some extent cast their shadows on the noteworthy date that falls at this time--the 50th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the United States. Half a century is long enough to sum up the results, draw certain conclusions, and learn useful lessons, the more so since it is a matter of relations between today's two mightiest powers that represent opposing social systems and have the most substantial, profound influence on the state and development of the international situation as a whole.

The history of Soviet-American relations in the period that has elapsed has been marked by its complexity and has gone through various periods--ups and downs, periods of stagnation and animation--as a consequence of the two warring trends in the United States, the two approaches to contacts with the Soviet Union. Progressive U.S. forces, the broad masses of working people, and realistically minded business and political circles have come out and continue to come out in support of the normalization of Soviet-American ties, the development of mutually advantageous cooperation, and the creation of an atmosphere of greater trust, all of which accord with both people's vital interests. The forces of bellicose imperialist reaction, blinded by class hatred for socialism, invariably adhere to the other, opposing stance, which is one of sharp hostility toward the Soviet Union, and these forces have tremendous influence across the ocean and consider it their main task, as V. I. Lenin noted, to "stifle world bolshevism, to stifle its main cell, the Russian Soviet Republic" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Completed Collected Works], vol 37, p 164.

The Soviet people do not bear grudges, but they have a good memory. They remember well both the bitterness of the war years and the joys of victory, the good and the evil that they underwent. Soviet people have always felt deep sympathy and respect toward the industrious, talented American people and have sought to live in peace and friendship with them. The Soviet state has pursued an invariably constructive line in relations with the United States since the very first days of its existence. On 18 February 1920, answering the questions of (Karl Vigand), Berlin correspondent of the

American news agency UNIVERSAL SERVICE, Lenin formulated the Soviet side's approach to mutual relations with the United States as follows: "As long as the Americans don't touch us, we won't touch them. We are even prepared to pay them in gold for machines, equipment, and so forth which are useful for transport and production. And not only in gold, but in raw materials too." And in reply to the supplementary question "What are the obstacles to such a peace?" Lenin particularly stressed: "There are none on our side. Imperialism is the obstacle on the side of the American (or any other) capitalists" (op. cit., vol 40, p 145-146).

These words of Lenin's formulate with the utmost clarity the fundamental principles of the Soviet conception of relations with the United States that to this day determine the Soviet state's line.

And the Soviet Union was not to blame for the fact that for a long time Washington stubbornly refused to recognize the new, worker-peasant government in Moscow or establish normal interstate ties with it.

The birth of the Soviet Republic as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution was, as is well known, greeted with hostility by the international bourgeoisie--with American imperialism in its front ranks, acting as initiator of the economic blockade of Soviet Russia in the hope of using hunger and privation to stifle it. An official U.S. Government statement of 24 November 1917 stated frankly: "...If the bosheviks remain in power...the embargo on exports to Russia will remain in force." As we see, the present American Administration, which imposes various kinds of "sanctions" and "bans" on the USSR, has not invented anything new or original, it is only rehashing the old ways of imperialist reaction's anti-Soviet policy.

The historical fact is indisputable: the USSR and the United States have never been in a state of war. But we cannot erase from memory the fact that the United States participated most actively in the campaign--the "first crusade," so to speak--of the imperialist powers against Soviet Russia, and American warships trained their guns on Arkhangelsk and Vladivostok as they train them on Beirut today. And while it is only in Hollywood movies that Soviet soldiers have landed in California or New York, American infantry marched in real life along the roads of our north, our Far East, and Siberia, doing many evil deeds. The young Soviet Republic withstood the blockade then, won the Civil War, and made the foreign interventionists get out. After this a phase of wide diplomatic recognition by states with a different social system began. But people across the ocean continued to bide their time, hoping in vain for the collapse of the new social system.

In our country to this day people value highly the political realism and state wisdom of U.S. President F. D. Roosevelt, who has an undisputed service to his credit--the implementation of a decisive turnabout in American foreign policy and the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union on 16 November 1933. The legal and treaty foundation was thereby laid at last for maintaining and developing mutual relations between the world's first country of victorious socialism and the biggest state of the capitalist world on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence and for establishing multifaceted, mutually advantageous contacts between them.

But let us not forget: It took all of 16 years for the U.S. ruling circles to recognize the failure of their calculations aimed at overthrowing the "godless communist regime" and the futility of the policy of nonrecognition of the USSR. The United States was the last of the major capitalist states to enter into official diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. The decisive role was played by the USSR's successes in building socialism, the growth of its political, economic, and defense forces, and the strengthening of its international positions. The growing interest of American business circles in developing trade and economic cooperation with the USSR played a part, as did the mighty public movement which was launched in the United States for the normalization of Soviet-American relations.

There is no need to remind Soviet people that in World War II the Soviet Union and the United States were allies in the ranks of the anti-Hitler coalition and waged a victorious struggle together against the brown fascist plague that threatened the freedom of all the peoples and human civilization itself. The meeting of Soviet and American soldiers--comrades in arms who had crushed Hitlerism--on the Elbe remains as fresh as ever in our memory, and particularly in the memory of the veterans of the front.

While giving due credit for the contribution of the Allies, the United States among them, in the attainment of victory, we must not forget other facts. The fact, first and foremost, that American monopoly capital made a considerable contribution to the creation of the military-industrial potential of Hitler's Germany, and then, by participating in the notorious "appeasement" policy, basically encouraged the aggressor and sought to direct his expansion toward the east, against the Soviet Union. We must not forget the keen struggle that developed in the United States when the war was at its height about whether or not to enter into allied relations with the USSR. Or the position of influential U.S. political circles whose opinion was expressed with the utmost frankness at the time by Sen H. Truman: "If we see that Germany is winning, we should help Russia, and if Russia is going to win, we should help Germany, and may they kill as many as possible." Or, lastly, the fact that the Allies did not open the second front in Western Europe until 6 June 1944, when the backbone of Hitler's war machine had already been broken by the heroic efforts of the Soviet Army and people, the liberation of Soviet territory was complete, and the fighting to liberate Poland had begun.

It appeared that the combat cooperation of the Soviet and American peoples during the war years had laid good foundations for the development of mutually advantageous ties of goodwill between the USSR and the United States for the postwar period. But an obstacle to this was created by those circles in the United States that applauded W. Churchill's Fulton speech proclaiming a new, anti-Soviet thrust in Western policy, knocked together the NATO bloc, and gambled on a U.S. nuclear monopoly and on "rolling back" communism. Their efforts in international affairs established not the lasting, reliable peace promised to the peoples by the allied agreements, but the "cold war" which for a long time poisoned and fettered not only relations between the Soviet Union and the United States but international relations in general.

The process of relaxation of tension that began in the late '60s and early '70s as a result of the persistent struggle of the USSR with the support of

all peace-loving forces, was greeted by all the peoples--the Soviet and American peoples among them--as a long-awaited event, with great relief and hope. In the subsequent period much that was positive emerged in USSR-U.S. relations too: many agreements and accords were reached, including a whole series in connection with problems of preventing war and limiting the arms race, regular political contacts were established, and trade and scientific and cultural exchanges broadened.

Fundamental significance was attached to the signing on 29 May 1972 at summit level of the document "Principles of USSR-U.S. Relations" in which the sides acknowledged that "in the nuclear age there is no other basis for maintaining relations between them than peaceful coexistence."

At the same time there is no cause for surprise that in an atmosphere of a certain relaxation of tension in Soviet-American relations, the reactionary wing of U.S. ruling circles did not change its inveterate anti-Sovietism and anticommunism and made active efforts to attempt to use the atmosphere of detente to weaken and undermine real socialism. Militarist preparations continued to be stepped up in the United States. All the same, during that period there were grounds for believing that influential circles across the ocean who determine the political course had at last drawn the necessary long-term conclusions from the many difficulties in the history of Soviet-American relations and had realized clearly enough that you cannot talk to the Soviet Union, which has become a mighty, great socialist power and achieved military-strategic parity with the United States, "from a position of strength" and in the language of superiority and diktat, and that it is necessary to be guided by the principles of equality, equal security, and mutual advantage.

But events turned out differently and bellicose ultrareactionary circles again took the upper hand in Washington--circles unwilling to reckon with the realities of the nuclear age and obsessed with ideas of global U.S. imperial hegemonism and fierce hatred for socialism and everything progressive on earth. The Soviet Union was declared the main enemy, the "focus of evil." Speculating on false myths of "Soviet military superiority" and "Moscow's expansionism," they started blaming the USSR for all American imperialism's failures and defeats in the world arena, for the fact that they cannot impose "Pax Americana" on mankind and that world events are not developing according to Washington's scenario.

The present American Administration's anti-Sovietism has already surpassed all that was "achieved" in this sphere by transatlantic reaction in half a century. The U.S. President has declared a new "crusade" against the Soviet Union and socialism as a social system. The American capital has set a course of global confrontation with the USSR and of achieving decisive military superiority in the arms race. In recent years Soviet-American relations have been led into an impasse and spoiled in virtually all areas.

A clear class analysis and principled, all-around appraisal of the present American Administration's foreign policy courses and its approach to relations with the USSR are contained in the statement by Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme

Soviet Presidium. "This is a militarist course," the statement stresses, "which constitutes a serious threat to peace. Its essence is to try to secure dominant positions in the world for the United States, without reckoning on the interests of other states and peoples."

Recent events have finally dispelled the illusions of a possible evolution for the better in the policy of the present American leadership, which undertakes such irresponsible and dangerous actions for the sake of achieving imperial goals that doubt arises as to whether there are any restraining centers in the Washington politicians' heads to stop them from crossing the fatal mark dividing mankind from thermonuclear catastrophe.

The sophisticated criminal act of provocation using the South Korean aircraft organized by the U.S. special services is further striking confirmation of this. This planned act of sabotage was used to spark off a violent wave of anti-Soviet hysteria whose tone is being set by the U.S. President himself who has virtually been resorting to abusive language in trying to denigrate the socialist system and the Soviet state. Curses are being hurled at us, various "sanctions" are being announced once more and, on the sly, an even more inflated military budget is being pushed through and new militarist programs are being adopted.

Once again America is trying to threaten us with force and war, to intimidate us, and to test out our firmness and restraint. Our motherland has sufficient forces and power and the Soviet people are not easily frightened, their nerve is strong. The Soviet Government forms its policy not on emotions but on the basis of realism and common sense.

The overall political atmosphere in the international arena now depends to a great extent on the character of relations between the USSR and the United States. The tremendous forces and might that these two powers possess place on them a special responsibility not only to their own peoples but also for the fate of peace and of all mankind. The Soviet Union takes this responsibility fully into account when carrying out its foreign policy course.

"For the Soviet leadership the question of what line to pursue in international affairs and in the present acute situation does not arise," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov stressed in his statement. "Our course remains aimed at preserving and consolidating peace, at the relaxation of tension, at curbing the arms race, and at expanding and deepening cooperation among states. Such is the immutable will of the CPSU and the entire Soviet people."

The USSR strives to live in peace with all countries including the United States. It by no means rules out the possibility that in the long term Soviet-U.S. relations will return to the path of normalization and mutual understanding as the vital interests of both peoples and of all mankind demand, and for its part is ready to do everything possible toward those ends as has repeatedly been demonstrated in practice. The ball is in the American court.

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

CSO: 1802/4

GRENADA -- VICTIM OF U.S. IMPERIALIST AGGRESSION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83)
pp 109-111

[Article by D. Murav'yev]

[Text] United States imperialism has mounted its latest gangsterly attack. This time, its victim was Grenada, one of the smallest countries in the world (110,000 people, 344 square kilometers). From the viewpoint of the Reagan administration, its entire "guilt" was its aspiration to resolve its internal problems independently and to pursue a foreign policy based on the principles of peaceful coexistence and nonalignment.

Grenada became a British colony in 1783 and gained its independence in 1974. This, however, did not improve the situation of the country's toiling population and the democratization of its life. The power fell into the hands of the reactionary dictatorial regime of Eric Gairy. Punitive gangs -- the "mangusta" -- created by the dictator raged throughout the country. Gairy's politics was entirely proimperialist. The dictator established close ties with the profascist rulers of Chile, South Korea, South Africa and other reactionary regimes.

The New JEWEL Movement Party (in English JEWEL stands for Joint Efforts for Welfare, Education and Liberation) assumed the leadership in the struggle against the blood-stained Gairy dictatorship. The party's objectives, described in its 1973 Manifesto and concretized in its 1974 "Ten NJM Principles," called for independence, general democratization of life in the country, participation of the people in the administration of the state, exercise of a people's policy, democracy, establishment of cooperative farms, people's control over national resources, enhancing the living standards of all families, ensuring full employment, and so on.

The hated Gairy regime was overthrown on 13 March 1979 with an armed coup d'etat led by the New JEWEL Party. A people's revolutionary government came to power, headed by Maurice Bishop, the NJM leader. According to the "Grenadan Revolution Program" of 25 March, the new government assumed full executive and legislative powers.

The Grenadan revolution was anti-imperialist.

In the slightly more than 4 years which followed the 1979 revolutionary uprising, the JEWEL Party and the people's revolutionary government achieved some successes in the fields of economics, education, health care, housing and women's rights.

Grenada, which pursued a consistently peaceful and anti-imperialist foreign policy, became an active participant in the nonaligned movement. It established diplomatic and trade relations with the Soviet Union, Cuba and other socialist countries. It also established close relations with many developing countries and active relations with many capitalist states, including the EEC. It favored the creation of a zone of peace and independence in the Caribbean and putting an end to interference in the affairs of the region.

The New JEWEL Party was accepted as member of the Socialist International. It also established friendly relations with the communist, revolutionary-democratic, socialist and social democratic parties in a number of countries.

Naturally, the revolutionary process in Grenada, as in other countries, faced difficulties and problems. The private sector remained dominant in the economy and the creation of a state sector was merely at its beginning. The people's revolutionary government was suffering from an acute shortage of funds needed for its economic development and social change and in upgrading more tangibly the living standard of the working people. The government tried to resolve these problems by relying on the activeness of the working people. However, it lacked experience in organizing the active and efficient work of the trade unions and the other mass organizations. Party construction was lagging behind the requirements of the revolutionary process. The internal counterrevolution was doing everything possible to use these difficulties and problems. Hostile elements sabotaged the measures taken by the revolutionary government and were spreading malicious rumors aimed at causing discontent and insecurity among the population.

The difficult problems related to guiding the revolutionary process under such unusual conditions triggered differences within the party itself. They applied less to the main trends followed in domestic and foreign policy than to the methods of economic management and other areas of party and government activities and demarcations of responsibilities among party and state organs.

Unfortunately, the differences within the party and related happenings led to a tragic turn of events. On 19 October, as a result of an armed clash in one of the districts of Saint Georges, the Grenadan capital, the country's prime minister Maurice Bishop, and several ministers and trade union leaders lost their lives.

Whatever interpretations may be given to these events, one thing was certain: the difficulties which had developed in Grenada and their consequences were a purely internal Grenadan affair. These events presented no threat whatsoever to international peace or the security of other countries. Unquestionably, the people of Grenada and the JEWEL Party would have found the strength to revolve their strictly internal problems.

However, American imperialism used these events to strike at the Grenadan revolution and to engage in a direct military intervention.

U.S. hostility toward free Grenada was shown from the very first days of its existence. This was manifested in the aspiration to do everything possible to undermine the rule of the people's revolutionary government, mounting a slanderous propaganda campaign against Grenada, trying to impose an economic blockade and applying open pressure on the governments of other countries in order to prevent Grenada from obtaining credits and loans. At the same time, Washington started preparations for a frontal military attack on Grenada. The United States gave asylum to the dictator E. Gairy, who had been expelled from his country, and helped him to organize gangs of mercenaries for the invasion of the island. American armed forces regularly held exercises around Grenada, which were obvious rehearsals for invasion. CIA agents repeatedly made attempts on the lives of the country's leaders.

Although the Grenadan government persistently tried to normalize relations with the United States, its proposals met with a deaf ear in Washington.

The American aggressor concentrated powerful armed forces around Grenada for its invasion: 15,000 soldiers and officers, a navy armada which included aircraft carriers and even nuclear-powered submarines, and a large number of airplanes and helicopters. The Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces "toiled" day and night on the invasion plan, as President Reagan himself acknowledged.

The gangsterly attack on Grenada began on 25 October with an American airborne landing, after which thousands of American Marines armed to the teeth rushed into the island from ships and airplanes.

In order to justify its unprovoked aggression against a sovereign country and member of the UN, the U.S. administration resorted to stupid arguments, such as "the need to ensure the safety" of American citizens in Grenada, although no one had been threatening their lives and safety. With imperial cynicism President Reagan declared that the invasion of Grenada was undertaken "with a view to restoring order and democracy in that country." Who gave him that right? However, international law is not honored in Washington, which did not even take into consideration the fact that Grenada was a member of the British Commonwealth and that the British Queen was the country's head of state. This made the invasion of Grenada a slap in the face of the closest NATO ally of the United States. Naturally, equally absurd were expatiations to the effect that Grenada was a "Soviet-Cuban military base."

The entire world condemned the barbaric aggression against Grenada as a gross violation of the UN Charter and the universally accepted norms of international law. Let us not even mention human rights. No justification whatsoever exists for such an aggression.

The actions of the United States triggered a tempest of indignation throughout the world. The overwhelming majority of the developing countries and the nonaligned movement sharply condemned the U.S. aggression. The U.S. NATO

allies as well distanced themselves from this action and even condemned it in one form or another. The Socialist International expressed its indignation.

The communist parties and the other national and international progressive organizations condemned the shameful new crime committed by American imperialism.

The overwhelming majority of the members of the UN Security Council, including France and The Netherlands, qualified the U.S. armed intervention in Grenada as a gross violation of international law and an attempt directed against Grenadan independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. The U.S. representative -- the aggressor himself -- cast the single vote against the Security Council resolution which called for putting an immediate stop to the American intervention against Grenada and the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from the country. In the United States itself many mass organizations, noted public personalities and even many senators and congressmen spoke out against this governmental action.

The stand taken by our country and people concerning the U.S. aggression against Grenada and its arbitrary and illegal behavior was clearly and unequivocally expressed in the 27 October 1983 TASS declaration, which stated that "The Soviet Union firmly condemns the aggression committed by the United States against Grenada and brands it a crime against peace and mankind... The aggression against the people of Grenada must be stopped and the occupation forces must be withdrawn immediately from this independent country."

This view is fully shared by the governments and peoples of the other socialist countries, including Cuba.

The people of Grenada and its armed forces heroically resisted the aggressor and the troops of his satellites. Many Cuban workers, who were helping the Grenadans to build major national economic projects, voluntarily took part in the battles against the interventionists. Cuban teachers and physicians were subjected to attacks by the interventionists armed with all sorts of weapons. The Cuban construction workers resisted firmly, displaying true heroism, self-sacrifice and understanding of their international duty. Many envoys of the Island of Freedom died a heroic death in the battles for Grenada. "The courageous and heroic construction workers and other Cuban citizens," reads the 27 October Declaration of the Cuban Communist Party and revolutionary government, "wrote an unforgettable page in the cause of international solidarity. Eternal glory to the Cubans who fell in the battles and to all those who fought and are continuing to fight in defense of their principles, international duty and homeland threatened by the illegal, impudent and criminal imperialist aggression."

The open aggression committed by the United States against Grenada cannot be separated from the global imperial policy pursued by Washington, based on militarism and the use of naked military power. The Pentagon in concentrating powerful land, sea and air forces in a number of points throughout the world and planning new aggressive actions against peace-loving independent countries.

The purpose of Washington's imperialist policy is clear: to turn back the historical process of social development. This was expressed with rare cynicism by CIA Director Casey on 29 October. He stated that the United States must "formulate a broad strategy for the struggle against the communist menace the world over." This is the banner under which the most reactionary militaristic circles in the United States are trying to prevent the strengthening of the national independence and the socioeconomic and democratic changes in Asian, African and Latin American countries and imposing upon them an order suitable to the U.S. imperialists. As F. Burnham, the Guyanan president, justifiably noted in his address to the people of his country, the attack on Grenada is merely a stage in the offensive against the developing countries. "Today it is Grenada," he said. "Tomorrow it will be Guyana, and the day after tomorrow someone else. Unless we take a firm stand, our hard-earned independence will prove to be nothing but a chymera."

However, Washington's imperial policy is fraught with danger not only for the peoples of the developing countries but for all mankind. Even the U.S. allies, in Europe above all, including their government circles, are speaking with increasing frequency of Washington's aggressiveness and perfidy, inevitably asking themselves whether the U.S. administration could just as easily and in exactly the same way, without consulting anyone, mount military operations, including the use of nuclear weapons, from the territory of its allies? This should give more food for thought to those who support the deployment of American Pershing and cruise missiles in Western Europe. Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's declaration is a serious warning to such politicians. "The European allies of the United States," the declaration reads, "are treated as hostages. This is a frank but cynical policy. What is truly hard to understand is whether those European political leaders who, ignoring the interests of their nations and peace, are helping to implement the ambitious militaristic plans of the U.S. administration think about this."

The tragedy of Grenada, which fell victim to the imperialist export of counterrevolution, affects not only the Grenadians and the peoples of that area. It calls upon all peace-loving mankind to show vigilance. The world's reaction showed with amazing clarity that the sinister intervention in Grenada is a link in the chain of the U.S. imperial policy — the very same chain which already includes the treacherous intervention in Lebanon and the "punitive sanctions" contemplated by Washington against the peoples of Nicaragua, El Salvador and other countries fighting for their freedom. It also proved that the Reagan administration is crossing, step by step, the "threshold" of the permissible in international relations, not only from the moral viewpoint but from that of basic legal norms as well.

A firm barrier must be erected against this kind of criminal policy.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

MAIN MOTIVE AND MOBILIZING FORCE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83)
pp 112-118

[Review by V. Bushuyev, candidate of historical sciences, of the book "Mezhdunarodnoye Rabocheye 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 6. "Rabocheye Dvizheniye Razvitykh Kapitalisticheskikh Stran Posle Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny (1945-1979)" [The Worker Movement in the Developed Capitalist Countries After World War Two (1945-1979)]. N. N. Inozemtsev responsible editor. Mysl', Moscow, 1981, 687 pp]

[Text] The stubborn unwillingness of imperialism to acknowledge the new realities in the world and soberly to accept the occurred social and political changes, and the efforts of the reactionary forces to change in their favor the approximate military-strategic balance which developed in the world arena and to hold the course of history back drastically aggravated the danger of nuclear war, which threatens to destroy civilization on earth. The dialectics of development of international relations today, however, is such that along with the intensification of the trend toward the growth of aggressive militaristic efforts of imperialism, most threatening to the very existence of mankind, another trend is developing, which embodies the will of the peoples to prevent the advent of a nuclear catastrophe and to defeat the criminal imperialist plans.

Never before has mankind had such potential for restraining the arms race and lifting the threat of war as today. The members of the world socialist commonwealth, the international working class, the peoples in the developing countries and all people of good will on earth are the forces which today oppose the aggressive imperialist circles which are formulating plans for a global thermonuclear war. The future fate of mankind largely depends on the extent to which this gigantic potential of the forces of peace will be activated.

The working class in the industrially developed capitalist countries has an exceptionally great role and responsibility in the struggle for restraining the arms race and lifting the threat of nuclear catastrophe. As the main productive force in contemporary society, and holding the center of our age, the international working class is called upon not only to block the

aggressive aspirations of imperialist circles but to put once and for all an end to the arbitrary behavior of monopolies and achieve the destruction of capitalism -- the main source of wars and all forms of oppression and exploitation -- and to lead its countries on the high road of mankind's development, the road of socialism.

The substantially changed ratio of forces between labor and capital on a global scale offers the working class qualitatively new opportunities and strengthens the positions of democratic and peace loving forces in all continents. The intensification of the class struggle of the proletariat in the developed capitalist countries in recent years weakens imperialism and narrows the opportunities of its most aggressive and militaristic circles. The activities of the toiling masses in defense of peace are becoming a structural element of the revolutionary strategy of the working class in the citadels of imperialism and an inseparable component of the antimonopoly struggle. Increasingly broad circles of the working class are realizing that the historical task of the proletariat, "rescuing mankind from the yoke of capital and imperialist wars" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch. [Complete Collected Works], vol 44, p 148), can be accomplished only by combining the revolutionary struggle for the basic interests of all working people with the struggle for peace.

A number of scientific works have been published in our country and abroad in recent years on the study of the extent to which the contemporary working class in the developed capitalist countries is ready to implement this twin task, which is the most important from the viewpoint of and in the interest of protecting mankind from the threat of nuclear catastrophe, and the prospects for conversion to socialism on a global scale. This basic work written by a large group of Soviet scientists has justifiably assumed a noticeable place among them. It is a study of the development of the worker and democratic movements in the developed capitalist countries between 1945 and 1979. It traces the dissemination of the influence of Marxism-Leninism and the increased role of the working class and its organizations in the sociopolitical life of their individual countries. It describes the trends of the ideological struggle within it and the possibility of achieving the unity of the political forces of the proletariat in the interest of peace, democracy and social progress.

The authors, who offer a comprehensive study of the exceptionally varied experience of the class struggle in the capitalist world and a scientific interpretation of the trends and characteristics in the development of the global revolutionary process today and the contribution to it by the international working class, concretize in terms of the present historical period the idea discovered by the founders of scientific socialism of the inevitable increase in the role of the proletariat as the leading force in the revolutionary reorganization of the world and their basic conclusion that "the position of the working class is the real foundation and starting point of all contemporary social movements, for it is the sharpest and most revealing manifestation of our social troubles" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 2, p 238). The authors thoroughly analyze the complex set of various internal and international circumstances which have determined the living and struggling conditions of the proletariat in the individual countries and regions

after the war, and study its structure, status, development of mass consciousness, politics and ideology of its organizations and the role of the communist parties in resolving the problems which have faced the worker movement during the period under consideration.

The desire of the authors to be guided in their analysis, in the ocean of specific facts related to the status and activities of the proletariat in the capitalist world and the large number of economic and sociological studies of many and quite disparate countries, by the main, the basic criterion, is profoundly justified and fruitful: establishing the level of organization and the militant and aggressive spirit of the working class, its readiness to engage in decisive actions in the defense of peace and democratic and socialist ideals and its ability to lead the broad masses.

In formulating their task, the authors of the collective monograph indicate the need "to reveal the main and determining trends of the dynamics of history behind its entire complexity and contradictoriness" (p 18).

Which are these main trends which determine the main directions followed by the worker movement today?

The study of the development of the capitalist system during the postwar decades enables us to identify the close interweaving of global sociohistorical processes, the contradictions between capitalism and socialism on a global scale above all, with the intensification of the internal contradictions within capitalism and its general crisis. This explains the further intensification of the international nature of the worker movement in the developed capitalist countries and its objective interconnection with the development of the anti-imperialist struggle waged by all global revolutionary forces and the confrontation between socialism and capitalism in the world arena. It is only the consideration of these most profound factors that makes possible the interpretation of the complex and largely conflicting nature of the development of the worker movement during the postwar years on the basis of the general methodological principles of Marxism-Leninism.

It was during that period that, more than ever before, it became clear that "capitalism had outlived itself and had become the most reactionary obstacle to human development" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 39, p 116). Despite the tremendous opportunities made possible by the scientific and technical revolution, capitalism displayed its total inability to cope with its organically inherent contradictions. Furthermore, scientific and technical progress, which the bourgeois ideologues proclaimed as just about the panacea for economic crisis and the class struggle, led the production forces in capitalist society to an even greater conflict with its production relations. These contradictions have been steadily manifested over the past decades in the cyclical crises which spread to the capitalist countries, one after the other, in the various areas of their economy, the monetary and energy crises, the aggravation of the competitive struggle on the world markets of the capitalist states, the crisis in relations between developed capitalist and developing countries, the deepening crisis in bourgeois ideology and the increasing devaluation of the social and moral values of bourgeois society.

The groundlessness of the efforts to accomplish the state-monopoly reorganization of capitalism, and to introduce some controlling principles in the uncontrolled development of capitalist production became particularly clear in recent years. The entire capitalist social system is experiencing a significant aggravation of the crisis. As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "the methods through which capitalism was able to maintain a relatively stable development in the postwar period are becoming increasingly ineffective. It is becoming increasingly clear that imperialism is unable to cope with the social consequences of a scientific and technical revolution of unparalleled depth and scale, in the course of which millions and millions of working people are doomed to unemployment and poverty.

"Imperialism has become mired in internal and international antagonisms, upheavals and conflicts."

In their effort to find a solution to the crisis which threatens the very foundations of capitalism as a system, the imperialist circles are increasingly engaging in creating a market for fictitious needs in an effort to promote an industrial boom related to the accelerated development of the war industry, urging on the arms race and directing most scientific discoveries and material resources to preparations for war. In order to justify this policy a war psychosis is being encouraged throughout the world and large-scale anti-Soviet provocations are being organized. However, the facts prove that such a course of action, while immeasurably enriching the military-industrial corporations only, in itself becomes one of the most important contributing factor to the further aggravation of the crisis and to the even further lowering of the overall employment level. For example, American economists have estimated that investing \$1 billion in war production opens from 10,000 to 80,000 jobs less than the same investment in the civilian economy.

Naturally, however, it is not solely a question of the aggravation of the unemployment problem. The militarization of the economy of the imperialist countries and the senseless squandering of national resources lead to the fact that the productive forces in contemporary capitalism are increasingly turning into forces of destruction, objectively serving social regression and creating an increasingly real threat to the very existence of civilization.

The working people are feeling the main burden of the consequences of the crisis. Thus, unemployment in the OECD, which includes the industrially developed capitalist countries, reached 9.2 percent in the summer of 1983, or double the mid-1970s level. Consumer prices in the United States, Western Europe and Japan doubled during the 1970s, striking particularly hard at basic commodities and services which determine the standard and way of life of the working population. Increased taxation and the cost of housing, medical services and education are turning into tremendous losses for the working people in the developed capitalist countries. Thus, in the United States by the end of the 1970s taxes accounted for 37 percent of working people's wages, which meant for them an annual loss of more than \$400 billion. Adding to this the cost of housing, more than 70 percent of the wages of the working people were extracted from them. The intensification of economic difficulties, increased unemployment and raging inflation are estranging a growing number of

working people from bourgeois society. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in the summer of 1983 the number of the country's officially registered poor had increased by 2.6 million in 1 year, reaching 34.4 million, or 15 percent of the total population. Such is the situation in the richest and, according to bourgeois propaganda, "most prosperous" country in the capitalist world.

Naturally, not all working people categories in the capitalist world are equally experiencing today the material privations which were typical in their case during previous periods of historical development. The struggle waged by the working class for better living standards and against the monopoly onslaught against its vital rights and interests erected a certain barrier against the growth of poverty and the worsening of the material situation of the masses. A major role in this case was also played by the successes of the socialist commonwealth, the force of its example and its influence, which inspired the working class and which the ruling classes in the capitalist world had to heed. In the postwar years the working class in the developed capitalist countries was able to extract from the bourgeoisie considerable concessions in the realms of economic life and social legislation. That is why Lenin's concept formulated as early as the end of the last century, according to which a situation may develop in the capitalist countries in which "poverty increases not in the physical but the social meaning of the term, i.e., in the sense of the disparity between the rising level of needs of the bourgeoisie and the needs of the entire society and the living standard of the toiling masses" (op. cit., vol 4, p 208) remains relevant.

On the basis of specific studies of the development of a number of countries, the authors convincingly prove, however, that under the conditions of the capitalist system no single socioeconomic gain of the working class is irreversible and guaranteed, for the solidity of such gains is undermined both through the deliberate tactics of the ruling classes and the production anarchy and cyclical and structural crises which remain under the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism. The living and struggling conditions of the working class are seriously affected by the course of the scientific and technical revolution also, used by capitalism in perfecting the most refined methods for exploiting the proletariat, the development of the process of capital concentration and monopolization, the increasing unification between the forces of the monopolies and those of the state and the growing arsenal of means used by state-monopoly capitalism against the worker movement.

As a result of the influence of this complex and heterogenous set of factors throughout the postwar period, during the last 15 years in particular, a substantial renovation of the content, forms and methods of activities of the working class in the developed capitalist countries has taken place. It has also developed more energetic and aggressive forms of struggle. The steady increase in the number of strikes since the mid-1960s in these countries led to the fact that during the first half of the 1970s the overall number of strikes and their participants was higher by a factor of 1.8 while the number of man/days of strike doubled. During the second half of the 1970s the overall number of strikers in these countries exceeded the 20-million mark on an annual average, for the first time since the war (see p 306).

Naturally, however, it is not merely a question of numerical indicators. The very nature of the struggle waged by the working people and their objectives changed considerably. In a number of countries they changed with increasing frequency from demands for better material conditions to a struggle for restricting the arbitrary behavior of the capitalists, consolidating already attained gains, achieving "economic democracy," and participation by the working people and their organization in production management.

During the postwar period the "politicizing" of the socioeconomic struggle waged by the working class increased steadily. Its aspiration to influence governmental policy and provide a worker and democratic alternative to the state-monopoly political course intensified. This was helped by the development of the struggle of the worker movement for political democracy, for eliminating the trend toward suppressing and emasculating democratic rights and freedoms, inherent in imperialism at its state-monopoly stage, the increased struggle for the overthrow of fascist regimes in several countries (Portugal, Greece, Spain) during the 1970s, the intensification of democracy and its expansion beyond the framework of formal bourgeois democratism.

The struggle waged by the working class in the socioeconomic area is increasingly spreading today to the area of national economic, social and political problems. The toiling masses are calling for the protection of the environment, disarmament, demilitarization of the economy and the struggle against processes which lead to the breakdown of social and private life. They demand general improvements and streamlining of the economy, way of life and morality and the humanizing of the norms of bourgeois culture and way of life.

Based on the rights gained in the course of persistent class battles, during the postwar period, the working class considerably enlarged its positions within the parliamentary and municipal system of bourgeois society. On the one hand, this contributes to a great extent to the class upbringing of the working people and the reinforcement of their conviction of the need for a revolutionary reorganization of capitalist society into a socialist one. As Lenin scientifically proved, such social practices, along with the struggle for ensuring normal human living conditions, equality, civil freedoms, peace and disarmament, educate the exploited class, "helps it to determine the extent of its strength, broadens its outlook, clarifies its ideas and strengthens its will" (op. cit., vol 30, p 314). On the other, the increased participation of the working class and its allies in representative institutions of the bourgeois power system helps the regrouping of the class forces in the developed capitalist countries, the narrowing of the social base of monopoly rule and the more active involvement of the masses in the struggle for radical social changes.

The gravitation toward joint actions by the rank and file members of the toiling masses of different political persuasions has become increasingly clear and powerful in recent years. The proletariat in the developed capitalist countries is interacting every more actively with its natural allies in the antimonopoly struggle: peasants, artisans and intellectuals subject to capitalist exploitation. Despite the difficulties, the ideas of unity among all national and international detachments of the working class

are making their way. The communist calls for the creation of broad democratic coalitions based on the alliance between the working class and the other toiling strata are gaining increasing support.

The active participation of the working class in the developed capitalist countries in the struggle against the threat of thermonuclear war and for restraining the arms race is assuming particular importance today. As a result, the antiwar movement in these countries has become a major political factor of international life. A broad worldwide coalition such as the one opposing the nuclear threat today has probably never previously existed in human history. The ruling circles in the capitalist countries as well are forced to heed its growing weight and influence.

The economic crisis in the mid-1970s and the difficult situation which remains in the economic life of the capitalist world clearly proved the aggravation of all aspects of the general crisis of capitalism and substantially undermined the faith of the masses in the doctrines of "people's capitalism," and the "industrial" and "postindustrial" society, persistently instilled by bourgeois ideology, doctrines which proclaimed that the contradictions inherent in "traditional" capitalism had been surmounted and that the very possibility of further crisis had been eliminated. The intensification of crisis phenomena in the economy hinders the efforts of the bourgeoisie, the right-wing social democrats and the conciliationist trade unions to "freeze" the class struggle, to dilute the autonomy and initiative of the labor movement and to switch it to the track of "loyal" cooperation and "social integration" of the working class within the capitalist system. The aggravation of social problems, increased unemployment and cost of living and intensified feeling of uncertainty on the part of millions of people regarding their future debunk the illusions fostered by bourgeois and reformist ideologues of the commonness of interests of owners and workers, the lack of necessity for basic social changes and the possibility of the working people to satisfy their interests under capitalist conditions. The upsurge experienced in the labor movement and the widening of the area of its confrontation with capitalism in recent years help to refute the theses of bourgeois and reformist ideologues on the "abatement" of the class struggle, the "bourgeoisification" and "deproletarianization" of the working class, the "loss" of its revolutionary potential and the appearance of some kind of "new middle class" allegedly uninterested in the struggle for the socialist reorganization of society.

Without simplifying the situation, the authors prove that the development of consistently class and revolutionary trends in the labor movement in the capitalist countries is far from even. This is based on the disparity of conditions under which the class struggle is waged in one country or area or another in the capitalist world and differences in the extent and forms of manifestation of the general trend toward a growth in the movement for deep social changes. A significant percentage of the working class is still under the strong influence of bourgeois ideology and politics. As in the past a number of mass political and professional organizations defend the reformist and conciliationist positions held toward the state-monopoly upper crust. The further progress of the revolutionary process is seriously complicated also as

a result of the increased activeness and coordination of action on the part of international capitalism against antimonopoly liberation forces.

The class enemies of the proletariat are using all available means to prevent the establishment of a broad anti-imperialist front and to divide or perpetuate the division among the working people. They are trying to draw over to their side their individual detachments, incite the other social strata against the proletariat, sow discord among the working people of different capitalist countries and provoke conflicts with foreign workers and national minorities. The international reaction works particularly hard at defaming in the eyes of the international working class the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and to compromise their experience in building a new society and the foreign and domestic policies of world socialism.

The working class faces many new problems also in connection of the increased complexity of its own and changed professional and skill structure as a result of scientific and technical progress. The objective rapprochement between the bulk of the proletariat and the nonproletarian population strata -- workers in the intellectual professions and the service industry, technical specialists, etc. -- in terms of their role in the production process and way of life creates yet another tangle of complex problems. Since in their majority such masses are easily subject to oscillations and to the influence of alien political and ideological currents, the responsibility of the working class and its hegemonistic role in the antimonopoly struggle, capable of uniting and leading all oppressed and exploited population masses, increases tremendously.

The continuing division within the labor movement -- the lack of resolution of the central problem of its historical fate and the fulfillment of its role as the leading progressive social force -- continues to play an extremely negative role. Today, more than ever before, there is an urgent need for unity in the worker movement on the basis of independent class positions free from bourgeois influence. Another urgent problem of today is that of the future ideology and politics of the right-wing social democratic movement which is still influencing a significant segment of the working class. The unsatisfactory results with which it had arrived at the end of the 1970s "face with renewed emphasis the social democratic parties with crucial problems regarding their place and role in the labor movement and the struggle for making radical socioeconomic and political changes in bourgeois society. It faces the same problems also as a result of the forward development of the labor movement itself and the unification processes developing within it and clashing increasingly with the conciliationist strategy and tactics and the ideological foundations of right-wing reformism" (p 616).

As confirmed by the entire practice of social development, the influence of bourgeois ideology and reformist illusions on the toiling masses can be surmounted only on the basis of the personal experience of their struggle, headed by the political vanguard of the proletariat, armed with the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist theory creatively developed by the communist and worker parties. The establishment of relations among the main trends in the worker movement and their unity of action in the struggle for peace and social progress and in defense of the basic interests of the working people

would be inconceivable without the elimination of anticommunist prejudices artificially enhanced by imperialism in order to justify the struggle against real socialism, the intensification of the arms race, the onslaught against the rights and freedoms of the working people in the capitalist countries and the adventurist and interventionist course in the Afro-Asian and Latin American countries.

The authors convincingly depict and prove that in the modern world there is no force which can implement radical social changes other than the working class. Thanks to its power, organization and experience in the class struggle it alone can apply effective pressure on monopoly capital, its entire power system and the policies of the bourgeois state, and protect and broaden democracy. Any plan for the implementation of the antimonopoly alternative and the revolutionary substitution of socialism for capitalism would be totally impossible to implement without its active and purposeful actions.

The further intensification of the role of the working class is directly related, first of all, to the fact that despite decades of capitalist development and scientific and technical progress, the basic and most profound capitalist contradiction between the social nature of production and the private capitalist method of appropriation and, in the social area, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, has been fully preserved even under the conditions of its state-monopoly stage and has become the determining antagonism of all social life. As F. Engels note, "this contradiction contains the embryo of all collisions of our time" (op. cit., vol 20, p 282).

Secondly, it is determined by the fact that regardless of all changes in the social structure of contemporary bourgeois society, according to Lenin's familiar definition, the working class still dominates the center and nerve of the entire capitalist economic system, economically and politically expressing the true interests of the tremendous majority of working people (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 40, p 23).

On the basis of the study and summation of the experience of the labor movement in the industrially developed capitalist countries during the postwar years, the authors scientifically prove the relevance of Lenin's view that the working class can fulfill its hegemonistic role only by making the broad proletarian strata aware of its revolutionary role and understand its historical mission and the need for political education of even its most backward strata. The entire experience of both victorious and temporarily defeated social revolutions irrefutably proves that it is only the existence of high class consciousness that can turn the working class into an invincible force. That same experience also confirms that such a task can be performed only by a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party.

The high level of production socialization, its accelerated internationalization and increased state-monopoly economic control, which intensifies the contradictions within the capitalist system even more, are all confirmations of the increased maturity of the material and technical prerequisites for the implementation of both antimonopoly and socialist changes in a number of developed capitalist countries. However, in many cases material prerequisites frequently outstrip the ripening of the necessary subjective prerequisites.

The lag in shaping a revolutionary consciousness is frequently related to broadening the participation in the anti-imperialist struggle and the social base of the revolutionary movement and the involvement in it of the nonproletarian toiling strata and the members of the petite bourgeoisie with all their typical prejudices and oscillations, search for the "golden middle" between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and swings from left- to right-wing extremism. This gap between the ripening of objective prerequisites and the insufficiently mature subjective factor formulates exceptionally strict requirements for the vanguard party of the working class.

The "ability of the revolutionary class to engage in mass revolutionary action ..." (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 26, p 219) becomes increasingly important under contemporary conditions. In turn, this depends above all on factors such as the degree of influence of the communist party on the masses and its ability to be on the level of the historical situation, express the aspirations and expectations of the masses, lead them, achieve the cohesion of the proletariat and unity of leftist and democratic forces, unite all spontaneous currents of the antimonopoly struggle, make skillful use, in particular, of the anticapitalist protest of the currently very active youth, women's, anti-war, ecological and all sorts of other "alternative" movements, help them to free themselves from bourgeois ideological entrapment, convincingly expose the policy of bourgeois social maneuvering and rebuff all manifestations of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, however fashionable their appearance. Practical experience indicates that an exceptionally great deal depends also on the ability of the revolutionary party of the working class to surmount and discard the elements of reformist and revisionist ideology, constantly introduced into it from the outside, to preserve an inflexible loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and creatively to develop it in accordance with conditions in its own country. It is clear that without meeting such important requirements which the contemporary stage of social development sets to the communist parties and without the unification of broad antimonopoly forces around the working class and its political vanguard it is impossible to use the revolutionary potential which is inherent in the high level of maturity reached in the material prerequisites for socialism in the developed capitalist countries.

The long-time neglect of such objective prerequisites is fraught not only with continuing capitalist oppression and exploitation, but with new suffering and privations among the toiling masses.

Most recent history contains a number of tragic examples of the way an "over-ripe" objective factor, lack of suitable preparedness of the working class and revolutionary resolve and initiative on the part of its vanguard has turned into painful "decay" in the superstructure, intensification and strengthening of reactionary trends in state-monopoly capitalism, a swing to the right in the axis of political life, the emasculation and elimination of the rights and social gains of the working people, won at the cost of tremendous sacrifices, upsurge of various left-wing extremist movements and the simultaneous energizing of incredibly many-faced specific forms and manifestations of fascist or fascist-leaning and militant counterrevolutionary forces. No less dangerous to the fate of peace and social progress on earth is the threat of a certain disappointment of the masses in the policies of some communist parties which, for one reason or another, fail to be on the level of the historical demands and expectations of the progressing working class strata.

In analyzing the tasks facing the revolutionary forces in the labor movement in the capitalist countries at the present time, the communist parties above all, the authors rely on the programmatic documents of these parties, emphasizing the large number of basic theoretical and specific practical problems of the development of the struggle for democracy and socialism they must solve. In this connection, they mention above all the development of a convincing and substantiated program for the defense of their economic and social interests despite the aggravation of the general crisis in capitalism while, at the same time, consistently defending the class line in the antimonopoly struggle and the socialist objectives of the labor movement, and the consideration of the specific interests, feelings and traditions of the working class allies and of its own politically underdeveloped strata.

Today the question of the ratio between the comprehensive consideration of the characteristics of contemporary conditions and methods of revolutionary struggle in each capitalist country and the equally necessary reliance on its general laws discovered by Marxism-Leninism, between the national and international tasks of the labor movement and between its activities in its own country and the strengthening of its alliance with all revolutionary forces assumes particular significance.

The authors are fully justified in paying great attention to the elaboration of the currently most important problem of the role of proletarian internationalism and to proving that the international nature of the struggle waged by the working class, the increased internationalization of monopoly capital and the increased coordination of imperialist efforts demand the maximal unification of the proletariat of all countries and its effective solidarity with its class brothers throughout the earth.

Along with successes and accomplishments the history of the postwar labor movement has known many difficulties, defeats and temporary failures. The authors point out that it would be premature to sum up definitively the results of the current stage in the development of the labor movement in the capitalist world and that this stage, which is directly related to major changes and processes of universal significance, which have been taking place throughout the postwar period, has still not become exhausted or fully revealed the trends within itself. "During the last 3 decades the overall effect of such processes on the conditions of the class struggle waged by the working people and the labor movement has been steadily growing and assuming an increasingly profound and comprehensive nature. The trends and forms of its activities triggered precisely by these circumstances have been correspondingly and steadily developing and enriching themselves, and many of them are still at their initial and sometimes embryonic stage of development. In other words, the stage of development of the labor movement, which began shortly after World War II, has by far not revealed all of its basic features and characteristics and is in its growing stage" (pp 676-677).

The exceptionally complex, uneven and greatly contradictory struggle of the working class is becoming richer with every class battle, the mastery of new experience and the solution of hitherto unknown problems created by the development of life itself and the unparalleled scale of changes in contemporary international and domestic circumstances.

The profound study of the postwar period in the history of the international labor movement and the analysis of its extremely rich and varied experience prove that the proletariat was and remains the main motive and mobilizing force of the revolutionary struggle in the developed capitalist countries and strengthens our confidence that despite the entire complexity and twists along the path to the final objective it will be able successfully to fulfill its great historical mission as a defender of peace and fighter for the right of mankind to life and as the grave-digger of capitalism and creator of the new, communist society.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

ON THE PATH LAID BY THE GREAT OCTOBER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83)
pp 119-120

[Review by Dr of Historical Sciences I. Mel'nikova, UkSSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, of the book "Velikiy Oktyabr' i Revolyutsii 40-kh Godov v Stranakh Tsentral'noy i Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevropy" [The Great October and the Revolutions in Central and Southeastern Europe in the 1940s]. Comparative study of socioeconomic changes in the revolutionary process. Second revised and enlarged edition, edited by D. V. Kuznetsov, A. Ya. Manusevich (responsible editor) and Yu. A. Polyakov. Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 535 pages]

[Text] An antifascist and national liberation resistance movement developed in most European countries under the yoke of Hitlerite fascism at the beginning of the 1940s. In the course of the war, as the superiority of socialism over the shock forces of imperialist reaction was becoming increasingly apparent and the role of the working class and the ideological-political and organizational influence of the communist parties increased in the resistance, the antifascist struggle developed into a powerful revolutionary process.

However, the revolutionary process came to a temporary halt in Western Europe and Greece during the concluding stage of the war and the first postwar years thanks to the efforts of the British and American imperialists and the complicity of the internal reaction.

A different situation developed in the Central and Southeastern European countries where, given the existing ratio of forces, the Soviet Union blocked the efforts to export a counterrevolution. Consequently, favorable external conditions were created in the area, which offered opportunities for the free development of the revolutionary process and the establishment of a new type of social system and power structure.

The book under review deals with the study of this topic.

The monograph, which is structured according to the problem-topic principle, considers on the basis of a comparative-historical study the process of maturing of the revolutionary situation, the development of the revolutionary crisis, the victory of the people's revolutions and the development of the new transitional social form -- the people's democracy.

The new type of system was shaped in the course of a fierce class struggle. Its establishment confirmed the strength and effectiveness of the Leninist concepts of a people's revolution, left-bloc tactics, and the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry and its growth into a proletarian dictatorship. These concepts, which were creatively developed through the revolutionary thoughts and practices of subsequent years, had led in the mid-thirties to the conclusion that given the deployment of forces in the world the appearance of countries of a new type -- people's democracies -- was possible. In explaining this concept, as early as 1936 G. Dimitrov said that such a state would be a "particular form of democratic dictatorship by the working class and the peasantry."

The task of the people's democracies was not only to eliminate fascism but also to destroy its material base -- the omnipotence of the imperialist monopolies and big landowners. Such general democratic changes, carried out with the leading role of the working class, offered an opportunity for the growth of the people's democracy into the dictatorship of the proletariat.

During the 1940 the people's democracy developed in the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe as a revolutionary antifascist system. As the authors prove, it was based on a wide range of social forces which were part of the national, popular, fatherland and other fronts and blocs.

As the book shows, despite the specifics of the revolutions of the 1940s, all of them "were able to make the same fundamental and essential rapid political and socioeconomic changes as were made by the Soviet system at the initial stage of its existence" (p 498).

The book leads the reader to the proven conclusion that in the course of the antifascist struggle, which grew into people's democratic revolutions, the proletariat in the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe "became the acknowledged spokesman for the basic interests of all nations and the hegemonic class which rallied around itself all antifascist forces. This facilitated the rapprochement between the socialist aspirations of the working class and the general democratic and anti-imperialist aspirations of the broadest possible popular masses. The influence and role of the working class in the individual countries in Central and Southeastern Europe greatly strengthened the commonness of international positions and objectives and the class alliance with the Soviet Union, which was turning into an increasingly effective force..." (p 168). This view, universally accepted in Marxist literature, is convincingly presented through a specific study of the common and the specific in the process of the antifascist struggle and the revolutions in the individual countries and in the groups of countries similar to each other in terms of one determining feature or another.

The deployment of the class forces itself and the nature of the people's system, which was a proletarian dictatorship from the very beginning in some countries and a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship in others, in which the role of the working class gradually increased, determined the depth and scope of political and socioeconomic changes. The most important among them was the expropriation of the capitalist class and the elimination of the land owning class. The nationalization and confiscation of enterprises, banks and

transport facilities was both an antifascist, democratic and national patriotic step taken against the traitors and collaborationists and a step dictated by the need to resolve a national problem such as rebuilding the economy destroyed by the war. The dynamics and methods of nationalization of industrial enterprises, transportation and banks which, in some cases, allowed also for buying them out, were dictated by the specific conditions which, in their totality, made it ubiquitously possible for the countries in the area to eliminate the capitalist class within a short time, albeit at a varying pace and on different legal grounds. In those countries the total expropriation of private capitalist property proved to be possible after major political upheavals which brought about the total expulsion of the bourgeoisie from the governments and the national and popular fronts and blocs. By that time the fronts themselves had turned from coalitions of antifascist parties and organizations into strong unions of anticapitalist forces.

The profound agrarian reforms which were made in the course of the people's democratic revolutions abolished the landed estates. From the very start of the intensification of the revolutionary process toward socialism, the communist and worker parties of these countries pursued a line of coordination with all working people, including the middle peasantry (see p 410). Naturally, this did not exclude oscillations on the part of the middle classes, oscillations which, as the authors prove, differed from one country to another.

The common nature of the system, socioeconomic base and development targets and the leading role of the communist and worker parties led to the establishment of international relations of a new type between the USSR and the countries in the area, based on proletarian and socialist internationalism and comradely mutual aid.

Conditions leading to a transition to a new stage in the development and cooperation among these countries and between them and the Soviet Union developed with the intensification of political and socioeconomic processes in the people's democracies, the strengthening of their socialist sector and the assertion of planned economic management methods and, therefore, the drawing of these countries closer to the Soviet economic system. This led to the objective necessity of the organization of CEMA in 1949. Its activities and those of the Warsaw Pact, which was created in 1955, substantially contributed to the development of the economies of all the partners and their firm counteraction to the economic an all other pressures exerted by imperialism on the existing world socialist system.

This is a valuable addition to Soviet social science publications, proving, on the basis of extensive and thoroughly studied data, the firm and universal significance of the basic Marxist-Leninist stipulations and the continuity between the revolutions of the 1940s and the Great October Revolution.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

AT THE SOURCES OF A YOUNG SCIENTIFIC TREND

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83)
pp 120-123

[Review by V. Andreyev of the book "Ekonomika Prirodopol'zovaniya" [The Economics of the Use of Nature] by T. S. Khachaturov. Ekonomika, Moscow, 1982, 256 pp]

[Text] In recent years the broad public in our country and abroad has paid increasing attention to problems of the utilization of natural resources, protecting the human habitat and maintaining the economic balance. A type of "ecological boom" has been noted in Western publications. A number of concepts have been formulated on the interaction between nature and society, ranging from openly bourgeois apologies to critical evaluations of the influence of capitalism on the environment. Various "models" and variants of the ecological development of mankind are being drafted. In a number of Western countries entire political trends and parties have appeared on the basis of ecological demands and slogans.

This is a reflection of real processes of increased interaction between society and nature under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution. The sharp increase in the level of involvement of natural resources in social production and the close interweaving of natural with social processes are essentially converting the production process into a single ecological system. The role of the natural factor in economic progress and its dependence on the availability of raw and fuel and energy resources are increasing. The problem of protecting the environment from pollution is becoming aggravated. Under capitalist conditions all of this increases the tangle of contradictions of the so-called ecological crisis, which cannot be resolved under that social system.

Conversely, socialism creates the necessary socioeconomic prerequisites for the solution of contemporary ecological problems on a scientific basis. This is achieved, however, not automatically but through a number of measures in the area of regulating the exchange of matter between man and nature, aimed at the rational utilization of natural resources, as the most important social possession, and environmental protection. This is the purpose of ecology -- a new branch of scientific knowledge -- and its nucleus -- the economics of the use of nature. We believe that this includes one of the major problems of socialist economic theory, the solution to which is urgently required for the

sake of increasing production efficiency, as was mentioned at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The considerable number of articles, pamphlets and books dealing with ecological problems, published in the Soviet Union, is a confirmation of the ripe need for serious research in this area and the appearance of a new scientific trend. Noteworthy among them is the recently published book by Academician T. S. Khachaturov. Unlike other works, which deal primarily with one narrow aspect of the economics of the use of nature or another, it is an effort to formulate the basic problems of the new scientific discipline. The book offers a thorough description of the problems of interaction between nature and society, scientific conscientiousness, thoroughness and, I would say, a high standard of study of statistical data and literary sources.

The author has carefully gathered, summed up and interpreted statements by the founders of Marxism-Leninism on the interaction between society and nature and the role of natural resources in social development. He cites interesting thoughts culled from the works of G. Bokel, L. I. Mechnikov and G. V. Plekhanov. He offers a detailed critical analysis of the reflection of global ecological problems in Western social thought and literature, particularly in the reports of the Club of Rome, the works of many scientists commissioned by the United Nations, and others. T. S. Khachaturov justifiably assumes that although such works are of some value in formulating the problem of regulating the exchange of matter between man and nature and providing information, they fail to reveal the socioeconomic foundations of the ecological crisis, for which reason they are useless as a reliable guide in resolving existing ecological problems.

This most complete published summarized characterization of the various types of resources in our country and the rest of the world is of unquestionable interest. The author describes the tremendous qualitative and quantitative changes which have taken place in this area in recent decades in terms of the intensification of the utilization of natural resources and the increased release of industrial waste in nature.

As a whole, the book clearly reflects the current status of this new scientific sector in terms of its accomplishments and problems requiring further work and collective discussions. I would like to comment on some of them.

Defining the subject, tasks, place and relations with others is of great importance in the development of a new scientific discipline. The author of the book believes that the economics of nature utilization, like any other type of economics, "has as the target of its study production relations among people; in this case it is a question of relations developing in the course of the interaction between the development of society and the natural environment. The task of the economics of nature utilization includes the study of the economic laws regulating the use of natural resources by human society for the satisfaction of its needs" (p 11). It is based on the laws developed in other sciences, such as geology, geography, biology, soil science, forestry, meteorology and demography. However, being an economic science, it is closely related to political economy and proceeds from its basic concepts (see p 12).

What can we say on this subject? The emphasis put on production relations in defining the object of the economics of the use of nature is necessary and justified, particularly bearing in mind the efforts of many Western authors to emasculate the socioeconomic content of contemporary ecological problems. However, production relations must not be considered separately from production forces. Even in political economy production relations are studied in close relation to production forces. In the individual economic sciences the problem of production forces is even more important. In this sense, the economics of the use of nature cannot be the exception, the more so since the interaction between man and nature is expressed directly in the level of development of production forces. The author is fully justified in considering natural resources within the system of production forces as one of the factors of economic growth, along with labor resources and productive capital. That is why the subject of the economics of the use of nature must clearly include not only production relations among people, which develop in the course of interaction between the development of society and the natural environment but the interaction itself, naturally not in its specific technological but its economic meaning. The entire context of the book confirms precisely the taking of such an approach in the study of economic-ecological problems.

The methodological problems of the economics of the use of nature include defining the place of natural resources in the national wealth and the principles governing their economic assessment, which is also a major problem of political economy. We cannot fail to support the author's stand on such matters and his critique of the traditional view of many economists, who exclude natural resources from the country's national wealth on the grounds that they are not the product of labor and, therefore, have no value.

In arguing against such assertions, the author notes that the existence or lack of some natural resources could substantially affect productive labor outlays. "Their influence is reflected on the cost of output and can be measured, which means that the natural resources themselves can be appraised although they may not have any value by themselves" (p 28). As an element of the national wealth, natural resources, together with social resources -- the accumulated productive and nonproductive capital -- are partly usable and partly potential. This determines the growth of output in the future (see p 187). These essentially important concepts have been formulated in the book in a quite concise and brief manner. They should be developed more thoroughly further in the sense of the systematic application of Marxian methodology used in defining the national wealth. The material content of the wealth, regardless of its social form, forms the consumer value, according to Marx. Under capitalism this is manifested in a huge stockpile of goods, i.e., in its commodity-value form. The social form of the wealth of the socialist society cannot be derived from commodity-value criteria. In this case the consumer value itself assumes a direct social significance, i.e., the capacity of objects to serve the effective satisfaction of society's individual or production needs. Clearly, with such an approach natural resources become an essential part of the national wealth.

A closely related problem is that of the economic assessment of natural resources. The history of its solution as part of the economic theory of socialism is complex. For a long time the exclusion of the land and other

natural resources from the area of purchase and sale was interpreted as their lacking an economic assessment in general, and was sometimes even considered a socialist advantage. The groundlessness and harm of considering natural resources as a gift of nature with a zero assessment became particularly obvious when priority was given to the task of upgrading public production efficiency. The rational use of natural resources, one of the main factors of efficient economic management, is impossible without their economic assessment.

T. S. Khachaturov was among those who have long favored a different approach to this problem, presuming not only the acceptance but also the development of a methodology for the assessment of natural resources. The book offers a further deeper interpretation of this problem. The assessment of resources based on their value, i.e., on the cost of their treatment and utilization, as the author points out, "would conflict with the size of the consumer value of qualitatively different resources" (p 188). He suggests that the differential rent I be used as the base in assessing natural resources, the size of which is determined by the comparative level of labor productivity in the use of resources of different quality. On this basis the author cites interesting computations of the value of land, timber, water and other resources. In fact this means an assessment of natural resources based above all on their consumer value, although this is not directly mentioned in the book. Naturally, we cannot ignore outlays for the preservation, development and utilization of resources. The comparison between labor savings in the use of a certain resource and the outlays enables us to determine its effectiveness.

The main problems considered in the book include the protection and rational utilization of natural resources. Obviously, we must strengthen the measures of legislative and administrative liability and improve educational work. Above all we must "make" the economic mechanism work in that direction. This is one of the most relevant and grave problems in the economics of the use of nature. It involves introducing payments for the use of natural resources, which would encourage the economical use of resources which are national but are left at the disposal of individual enterprises and associations.

The book under review includes a number of important and accurate views on this matter and discusses the inadequacy of existing economic methods (increased payments for timber, payments for water use, etc.), and the need to institute payments for mineral resources and their inclusion in enterprise balance sheets. We believe, however, that problems related to paying for resources -- economic nature, methodology of determining links to the evaluation of resources and place in the system of cost accounting relations and the economic mechanism -- require further qualitative and quantitative studies.

The author is known as one of the greatest specialists in the theory of the effectiveness of capital investments. The application of the general principles of this theory to the economics of the utilization of nature proved to be very rewarding. The monograph offers a thorough study of problems related to the assessment of the economic and social harm caused by pollution and methods for determining the efficiency of capital investments. It emphasizes the need to determine and take into consideration losses of useful materials at all reproduction stages, for in the final account all of them turn into losses of natural resources because of the need to recover them through additional

extraction. The systematic consideration of these losses would enable us to determine more accurately the amount of capital investments required for the elimination of losses and the time needed for the recovery of one-time and running outlays. The author's main conclusion is that capital investments in the conservation of resources and the comprehensive extraction of useful components at the present stage are by far more effective than the cost of additional involvement of resources in production.

The results of the author's work on methods for determining the effectiveness of environmental protection costs cited in the monograph have already been put to practical use in the adopted provisional method for determining the economic effectiveness of outlays for environmental protection measures. The importance of this problem rises in connection with the steady expansion of environmental protection measures. The sum total of outlays for environmental protection during the 10th Five-Year Plan in our country is assessed by the author as equalling approximately 2 percent of the GNP. This indicator is consistent with the share of ecological investments in the U.S. GNP, where the extent of the pollution is considerably higher than in the USSR (see p 199).

The final chapters on comprehensive low-waste or wasteless production, and technical progress and use of nature are of definite interest. They indicate our huge possibilities in increasing the final output from natural resources, such as fuel and energy, mineral, timber and others. The author cites likely estimates for such increases based on improvements in the technological processes of the use of nature. He convincingly proves that the main way leading to the development of social production should be the gradual conversion from open to closed technological processes, involving the total treatment and utilization of all waste and ending their release into the environment.

The work contains a number of constructive suggestions on improving the management of the use of nature. Today a large number of organizations are dealing with problems related to environmental protection. This is the main function of some of them (the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control). In other organizations various subdivisions deal with ecological problems (at the ministries of agriculture, land reclamation and water resources, and others). In the author's view, departmental frameworks prevent the efficient solution of comprehensive ecological problems. For example, no single organization is responsible for the economical and efficient utilization of all mineral components. In this connection he notes the expediency of developing a uniform system for the protection of natural resources and controlling and supervising their use and, in the future, creating a single organ in charge of the administration of natural resources.

The monograph discusses many other problems of both theoretical interest and great practical significance. It is regrettable that the book was published in a rather small, even miserably small edition inconsistent with its importance as a noteworthy phenomenon in the development of a young but very necessary scientific discipline: the economics of the use of nature.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

PUBLICISTS' QUEST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83)
pp 124-126

[Two book reviews]

[Text] The number of serious publicistic works written by journalists from the central and local press and journals has noticeably increased in recent years. The limits of their searches have broadened substantially and the possibilities of the publicistic genre and the very topics of their works have become richer. A number of books on topical contemporary problems containing rich factual data, presented in a vivid and emotional style, have triggered a broad public response. Some of them were awarded the prize of the USSR Union of Journalists for best publicistic works written in 1981 and 1982.

They include the book "Tayna Marukhskogo Lednika" [The Secret of the Marukhskiy Glacier] by Vladimir G. Gneushev and Andrey L. Poput'ko, in its fifth printing (Stavopol'skoye Knizhnoye Izdatel'stvo, 1981, 560 pp with illustrations), reviewed by Captain First Rank N. Belous, a participant in the defense of the Caucasus, a collection of documentary essays "Afganistan. Molodost' Revolyutsii" [Afghanistan. [The Youth of the Revolution] by Ivan M. Shchedrov (Molodaya Gvardiya, Moscow, 127 pp with illustrations) and "Mnogolikaya Bezrabotitsa" [Many-Sided Unemployment] by Vladimir V. Bol'shakov (Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1981, 224 pp, the last two reviewed by I. Satarin. They have triggered a large readership response, denoting the importance and relevance of the problems discussed, combined with a vivid publicistic presentation.

Dedicated to the Heroes of the Caucasus

High up in the mountains, at the Marukhskiy Pass, kolkhoz shepherds came across traces of a fierce battle fought during the Great Patriotic War. Old foxholes, cartridge and shell cases, machine-gun belts, grenade cases and helmets with bullet holes had been preserved in the kingdom of this eternal glacier. Also found were and soldier's hand-made spoon, a cartridge pouch with engraved initials "I. F.", an unmailed postcard written by private A. P. Ivanchenko with a Baku address. Remains of soldiers were also found....

Who were these nameless heroes, who stopped the fascist scum in the mountains? A search was undertaken in honor of these courageous and still unknown soldiers and for the sake of showing to the living to whom they owed their lives and who were those who protected the beloved fatherland from the enemy during those trying times.

The Stavropol Kray Executive Committee assumed permanent control over the search from the very first. A prestigious commission was appointed, consisting of military specialists, expert physicians, representatives of the public and mountain climbers. Naturally, the journalists from the local and central press immediately joined in the search.

The results of the long and painstaking search is described in the trilogy written by writer Vladimir Gneushev and journalist Andrey Poput'ko. It consists of the documentary novels "Tayna Marukhskogo Lednika," "Partizanskiy Zaslon" [Partisan Covering Force] and "Dykhaniye Lavin" [The Breath of the Avalanche].

The main characters in the novels are Red Army troops and commanders, seamen, partisans, clandestine workers and workers and kolkhoz members who took part in the defense of the Caucasus. The main theme of each of the works is the people's exploit, the mass heroism of the Soviet people. Its documentary nature and truthfulness account for the power of this thorough work which makes extensive use of witness testimony, files and German sources. Komsomol units and hikers have been and are following the traces of the heroes.

This book is not a simple narrative of the battles in the mountains of the Caucasus or a simple story of the characters and their fate. Here the past becomes closely interwoven with the present. Many exciting pages describe the activities of the young pathfinders, who are sacredly preserving the great combat traditions and are always ready to multiply them through their dedicated service to the homeland.

All three novels are imbued with the sacred feeling of friendship among the peoples, for the old Caucasus was defended by troops of all nationalities: Russians, Ukrainians, Belorussians, Kazakhs, Azerbaijani, Osetians, Latvians and Adygeys. They were innumerable, but were all united by their high status of being Soviet people.

After reading the trilogy, V. Kaupan wrote from far-away Yakutiya: "Thank you very much for the book, for the persistent and heroic work of its authors. This book cannot be read without emotion. It is an excellent material for educating our young generation in a spirit of love for the homeland."

The role of the communist party -- the organizer and inspirer of the armed resistance to the hated enemy -- runs throughout the work. The leading role of the communists -- party leaders, army political workers and many rank and file members of the Leninist party -- privates, sergeants, partisans and scouts -- is suitably described.

The pathfinders -- Pioneer and Komsomol members and journalists, including the authors of this work, engaged in a tireless search for the heroes of the ice

fortress. They sought the living and the dead, looked for documents and personal items, and engaged in extensive correspondence covering literally all corners of our immense fatherland.

The result of such tremendous work was the unraveling of many secrets and the identification of thousands and thousands of heroes. Priceless relics were gathered, confirming the exploit and are now kept in museums, describing the history of the battles for the Caucasus.

Museums, monuments and obelisks were built with donations from the people. Production brigades allocated for this noble project some of their earnings. Subbotniks were held by young workers and university and school students.

The first obelisk, which was erected at the Marukhskiy Pass more than 20 years ago, was brought there in the backpacks of mountain climbers—students at the Moscow Engineering and Construction Institute imeni V. V. Kuybyshev. Today hundreds of memorial markers stand on the sites of the heroic battles for the Caucasus. The young people of Cherkassk erected a monument at the Klukhorskii Pass, while those from Taganrog at the Naurskiy Pass. Young patriots from Kuybyshev, Odessa, Pyatigorsk, Sukhumi, Groznyy and many other cities have built memorials. They are a visible expression of the slogan "No one will forget and nothing is forgotten."

In the vast Kuban valley, within sight of the snow-capped peaks, witnesses of the immortal exploit, an architectural complex has been erected symbolizing the firmness of the Caucasus and the immortality of its defenders. The carefully preserved relics, documents and photographs kept here make an ineradicable impression.

Gneushev's and Poput'ko's documentary novels have spread far beyond the confines of Stavropol. They have been disseminated throughout the country and become known abroad. Tens of thousands of people have learned of this exploit thanks to the authors' priceless research.

Entire Pioneer detachments, schools, military-patriotic associations and youth clubs took part in the search which widened with every passing year. Many of them took the names of previously unknown heroes, who defended the inaccessible mountains.

Every year people from Karachayev-Cherkessiya and the entire Stavropol Kray, and tourists from various parts of the country and from abroad climb up to the passes in the Caucasus Mountains. They come here to honor the sacred glory sites and to lay flowers at the feet of monuments and obelisks. These are older people accompanied by their sons and grandsons, school students and teachers, workers and foremen. These are the people in whose heart the memory of courage and exploits is kept alive.

It is pleasing to think that the authors of this trilogy, modest chroniclers of a national exploit, stood, with others, at the sources of this memory of the whole nation.

The Truth of History

The vivid and profoundly meaningful presentation of problems of great social significance is a characteristic feature of Soviet international publicism. It is precisely this feature which is inherent in the books of the noted international affairs PRAVDA journalists Ivan Shchedrov and Vladimir Bol'shakov, who were deservedly awarded the award-prize of the USSR Union of Journalists for best publicistic work. Both books offer a vivid study of events and describe the fates of individuals. This has been helped by the personal presence of the authors, their encounters, talks, observations and thoughts resulting from their creative work abroad.

The book by I. Shchedrov is about Afghanistan and the revolution. It describes the profound revolutionary changes in the country, the active participation of the youth in them, the history of the establishment of the Democratic Organization of Afghan Youth (DOAY) and its activities in uniting the Afghan young men and women in the struggle for their future.

The author recalls the first nationwide rally of the DOAY which was held in Kabul in July 1980. "To defend the revolution and selflessly to fight its enemies is the sacred duty of the youth," the DOAY Central Committee directival report stated at the rally. The stories of the participants in the struggle, with whom I Shchedrov talked, present a panoramic view of the dedicated struggle waged by the young people of cities and villages, in the center and in the most remote areas, awakened to a new life by the spirit of the revolution. The author has recreated the atmosphere of enthusiasm, courage, patriotism and high responsibility of the young Afghan fighters for a just cause.

The readers learn about the most important landmarks in the history of the country's youth movement, starting with the creation of the first organization of Afghan revolutionary youth, the Student Federation, which was headed by Babrak Karmal, who was captured and served 4.5 years in jail. The youth organizations were subjected to constant repressions. However, the revolutionary struggle grew. The People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) was founded in 1965. "Optimism and confidence in the victory of our just cause," Babrak Karmal said, "come from the youthfulness of our society. More than half the country's population is under 19. The youth will largely determine the present and the future of the Afghan revolutionary process, its blossoming and progress."

Convincingly and with specific examples and descriptions of people's lives, the author describes the role of the youth in the struggle against reactionary and imperialist forces and in defense of the gains of the April revolution. The book presents the collective picture of the young generation of the new Afghanistan and exposes the efforts of imperialist propaganda to distort the picture of the real events in that country.

Burhan Giasi, first secretary of the DOAY Central Committee, a direct participant in that revolution, has rated the book highly: "This story about today's Afghan youth was not written by an uninvolved person. The author describes living people with their joys and sorrows, their faith in the

future and their difficult lives." We can only agree with this objective assessment.

"....Even the most vivid and interesting propaganda, the most skillful and clever instruction and the most talented art," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "will fail in their objectives unless they contain profound ideals closely related to today's realities and indicating the way of our further advance."

"Mnogolikaya Bezrobotitsa," the book by Vladimir Bol'shakov, is an example of high idea-mindedness.

The greater interest shown by the readers in this book is justified. It contains a study of the economic and political reasons for the growth of mass unemployment in the capitalist countries, and rich statistical data. This most sensitive topic is steadily covered by our newspapers and journals, but few books have been written on the subject. Among them this book will occupy a special place.

The first reason for this will be that the author, who analyzes unemployment as a social phenomenon, convincingly describes the class nature of "surplus people" in the capitalist world. He thoroughly analyzes the economic situation of all classes and strata in bourgeois society, identifies the social and economic roots of unemployment, exposes its ethnic, religious and political reasons and talks about the discrimination against women and foreign workers, who are among the first to become unemployed.

One of the book's qualities is the extensive use of data gathered in the course of the author's discussions with a number of unemployed. As we read such passages we share with the deprived the bitterness of their lives. Here, for example, is the testimony of Debbie Pelegrino, 30, a personnel department employee in College Park, Georgia:

"It is very hard to endure all this. Every time I must literally force myself to go to a job interview. And the more they refuse me the more difficult it becomes to knock at another door. When I go out looking for a job I feel like crying."

The author cites a number of such cases. He acquaints the reader with those who stand in line for the unemployment pittance: highly skilled engineers, bank clerks, bankrupt farmers and shop owners, and university graduates. "Mass unemployment," he writes, "proves most convincingly the historical groundlessness of capitalism and its inability to guarantee the basic rights and freedoms of the people" (p 6). This thesis is reliably backed by specific facts and figures.

Under the conditions of capitalist integration and growth of multinational monopolies, unemployment, the scourge of the working people in the West, has become a truly international problem. It is planned, for the sake of preventing the capitalist economy from "overheating," and is even subsidized in order to ease the social discontent fraught with the threat of revolutionary explosion. However, the author concludes, "the illusion as to the

opportunities offered by capitalism is diminishing even in countries considered as industrially developed, for even in them, at the start of the 1980s capitalism had proved its total historical bankruptcy by depriving of jobs and hopes for the future dozens of millions of people. History itself links the future of the working person to socialism" (p 210).

A growing number of unfortunate people in the capitalist world are reaching the same conclusion.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

SHORT BOOK REVIEWS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83) p 127

[Text] "Ekologicheskiye Problemy: Sotsial'no-politicheskiy i Ideologicheskiy Aspekty" [Ecological Problems: Sociopolitical and Ideological Aspects] by I. D. Laptev. Mysl', Moscow, 1982, 247 pp.
Reviewed by Dr of Philosophical Sciences I. Mochalov]

We are well familiar with the gravity of the present global ecological situation. The complexity of the interaction between society and nature has drawn the attention of specialists in various fields, not only geographers but philosophers, sociologists, economists, jurists, and so on. This book emphasizes the sociopolitical and ideological aspects of these problems, which is quite timely for they are becoming increasingly important. The author is right by saying that "the interests of various classes, social groups, social institutions, regions and socioeconomic systems inevitably clash in this vitally important area of interaction between mankind and nature," and that the theoretical interpretations of the condition and trends of development of the system of relations between society and nature bear the "imprint of class objectives, positions and orientations and have a steadily increasing impact on the moods and behavior of huge population groups" (pp 20-21). These ideas are presented in a thorough fashion, with logical consistency and proof throughout the book. In Chapters II-IV the author offers a special study of the interaction between society and nature under the conditions of the coexistence of today's opposing socioeconomic systems and proves the way ecology is becoming a new front in the ideological struggle.

The book convincingly proves the historical inevitability of substituting the consciously controlled and planned socialist use of nature, the supreme objective of which is the preservation and development of the biosphere as a whole and its individual areas in the interest of the entire society, for the uncontrolled and predatory use of nature characteristic of capitalism and aimed, in the final account, at the destruction and degradation of the natural environment. Without belittling the significance of partial nature-protection steps taken in the capitalist countries or concealing temporary miscalculations and omissions which are being surmounted in our country, the author leads the readers to the thought that "capitalism is outliving its life not only on the socioeconomic, ideological-political and moral but the ecological level as well" (pp 234-235). He points out the state of the contemporary ecological movement on earth, which is becoming increasingly obvious in the

political arena. He also proves the way bourgeois propaganda, which clings to the ecological aspect of the ideological struggle and, on the one hand, creates a variety of philosophical myths on the future interaction between mankind and nature and, on the other, tries to discredit the socialist use of nature through various forgeries, tricks and manipulations of falsified data.

The reader will find in the book a description of the principles governing the socialist use of nature and a qualified analysis of their advantages, as well as a frank explanation of a number of deviations from them and, above all, a justification of the stabilizing role which socialism plays in the global process of aggravation of ecological problems. The author discloses the sources of these problems and indicates, in particular, their connection with the increased arms race today, which divert huge forces and funds from the solution of vital social and economic tasks facing mankind. He provides propagandists and workers in education with interesting facts and substantiated arguments with which to fight the ecological demagogy of our ideological opponents. He is far from advocating an a priori nihilistic attitude toward the ecological developments by bourgeois scientists and emphasizes the need for a differentiated approach and the ability to separate what is scientifically valuable and accurate from that which has been introduced from the outside under the influence of a false methodology or ideological and circumstantial considerations. An instructive example in this connection is the meaningful study of bourgeois ecological forecasting and its ideological and political significance (the reports of the Club of Rome and others -- see Chapter 4, Paragraph 2).

The entire work is imbued with the enthusiasm of a qualitatively new ecological awareness, an awareness which is developing and strengthening with the development of socialist social relations and the practical embodiment of the theory of scientific communism.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 83 (signed to press 4 Nov 83) p 128

- [Text] 1. Lenin, V. I. "Rasskaz o II S"yezde RSDRP" [The Story of the Second RSDWP Congress]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 79 pp (improved edition).
2. "Rozhdeniye KPSS" [Birth of the CPSU]. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 134 pp (improved edition).
3. "Kommunisticheskaya Partiya Sovetskogo Soyuza v Rezolyutsiyakh i Resheniyakh S"yezдов, Konferentsiy in Plenumov TsK (1898-1986)" [The Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Central Committee Plenums (1898-1986)]. Vol 1, 1898-1917. Ninth expanded and corrected edition. A. G. Yegorov and K. M. Bogolyubov general editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 638 pp.
4. "Aktyvnyye Formy Vedeniya Politzanyatiy" [Active Political Training Class Methods]. Compiled by V. T. Syzrantsev. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 96 pp.
5. Barykin, K. K. "Khleb Kotoryy My Yedim" [The Bread We Eat]. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 222 pp.
6. Vasil'yev, A. M. "Persidskiy Zaliv v Epitsentre Buri" [The Persian Gulf in the Eye of the Storm]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 288 pp.
7. Voropayev, M. G. "Gazete Poruchayetsya..." [The Newspaper Is Instructed...]. On the party committee's management of its press organ. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 64 pp (Party Worker's Library, No 5).
8. Dyukov, V. M. and Mogilat, S. D. "Doveriye i Kontrol'" [Trust and Control]. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 264 pp.
9. Ignatovskiy, P. A. "Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn' Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva" [Economic Life of the Socialist society]. Ekonomika, Moscow 1983, 248 pp.
10. Il'in, I. A. "Istoriya Iskusstva i Estetike" [The History of Art and Aesthetics]. Selected articles. Preface and compilation by M. Lifshits, general editor. Uskusstvo, Moscow, 1983, 288 pp.
11. Kassis, V. B., Kolosov, L.S. and Sturua, M. G. "Tiraniya Veshchey" [The Tyranny of Things]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 222 pp.

12. Kosolapov, N.A. "Sotsial'naya Psikhologiya i Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya" [Social Psychology and International Relations]. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 271 pp.
13. Manfred, A. Z. "Velikaya Frantsuzskaya Revolyutsiya" [The French Revolution]. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 431 pp.
14. "Marksistsko-Leninskaya Teoriya Istoricheskogo Protsessa" [The Marxist-Leninist Theory of the Historical Process]. The historical process: integrity, unity, variety, formation stages. Authors' group headed by F. V. Konstantinov. Yu. K. Pletnikov responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 535 pp.
15. Mel'vil', Yu. K. "Puti Burzhuaznoy Filosofii XX Veka" [Directions of 20th Century Bourgeois Philosophy]. Mysl', Moscow, 1983, 247 pp.
16. "Narodnoye Khozyaystvo SSSR v 1982 g." [The USSR National Economy in 1982]. Statistical Yearbook. L.A. Umanskiy in charge of publication. Finansy i Statistika, Moscow, 1983, 574 pp.
17. Sedykh, V. N. "Jacques Duclos." Mysl', Moscow, 1983, 302 pp.
18. "Sovremennaya Ispaniya" [Contemporary Spain]. By a group of authors. V. V. Zagladin responsible editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 383 pp with ill.
19. "III S'yezda Narodno-Revolyutsionnoy Partii Laosa" [Third Congress of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party]. Vientiane, 27-30 April 1982. Yu. Ya. Mikheyev general translation editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 119 pp (documents and materials of foreign communist and worker parties).
20. Ul'yanovskiy, R. A., Yur'yev, A. Yu., Vavilov, V. V., Khros, V. G. and Vinokurov, Yu. N. "Politicheskiye Portrety Bortsov za Natsional'nuyu Nezavisimost'" [Political Portraits of Fighters for National Independence]. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 319 pp.
21. Faria, J. "Stanovleniye Kommunista" [The Development of a Communist]. Recollections. Translated from the Spanish by Yu. K. Kozlova and V. G. Tkachenko. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 176 pp with ill.
22. "Filosofiya Epokhi Rannikh Burzhuaznykh Revolyutsiy" [Philosophy of the Age of Early Bourgeois Revolutions]. By a group of authors headed by T. I. Oyzerman. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 583 pp.
23. "Filosofskiy Entsiklopedicheskiy Slovar'" [Philosophical Encyclopedia]. Editors in Chief L. F. Il'ichev, P. N. Fedoseyev, S. M. Kovalev and V. G. Panov. Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, Moscow, 1983, 840 pp.
24. Tsedenbal, Yu. "Izbrannyye Stat'i i Rech'i" [Selected Articles and Speeches]. April 1973-December 1982. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 528 pp.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/4

END