

289108

JPRS-UKO-84-014

15 August 1984

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 8, May 1984

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 8

19990917 069

FBI

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

10
156
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.

15 August 1984

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 8, May 1984

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

CONTENTS

Topical Problems in the Analysis of Capitalism	1
K. U. Chernenko's Reply to American Scientists' Appeal	13
Concrete Actions for the Sake of Strengthening Peace (B. Ponomarev)	15
Lenin on the Scientific Revolution (R. Aronov, L. Mikeshina)	31
Man at His Workplace (Yu. Konishchev)	45
Increasing the Efficiency of the Brigade Contract (P. Lomako)	59
Genius of Russian Culture (V. Kukharskiy)	74
Inexhaustible Source (Doychin Doychinov)	85
Certain Problems of the Ideological Struggle and the Shaping of a New Culture in Vietnam (Ha Xuan Truong)	93
Object Lesson of Revolutionary Endeavor (V. Mushinskiy)	106
Women in the Struggle for Peace, Equal Rights and Social Progress (V. Tereshkova)	120

Yesterday in Today's Washington (V. Falin)	131
Book by a Fighter (L. Borodin)	146
Bookshelf	149

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 8
May 1984

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : May 1984

Signed to press : 23 May 1984

Copies : 927,000

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

TOPICAL PROBLEMS IN THE ANALYSIS OF CAPITALISM

AU191400 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84)
pp 3-13

[Editorial. Words in all capitals published in italics in original]

[Text] The decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and of the June 1983 Central Committee Plenum and Comrade K. U. Chernenko's speech at the meeting of the Central Committee commission for the drawing up of the new wording of the CPSU program presupposes that the party's theoretical ideas will be concentrated upon interpreting and generalizing the main results of domestic and international developments during the last quarter of the century. Among the problems upon which particular attention is focused is that of the development of contradictions in capitalism: The deepening of its general crisis, the contemporary forms of capital's exploitation of labor, and the correlation between its internal contradictions and the contradictions between two world systems.

Characterization of capitalism and its contradictions has been an organic component part of all three of our party's programs. This stems from the scientific nature of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook. The scientific theory of the proletariat--Marxism-Leninism--shows how the objective and subjective prerequisites are maturing within the heart of capitalism for its revolutionary transformation into socialism and how the victory of the workers class, originally in one country, has begun the historic era of a universal transition from capitalism to socialism and communism.

Naturally, as capitalism historically develops, scientific interpretation of its laws and prospects also deepens, and the party draws conclusions from this for its own strategy and tactics and sets concrete tasks of struggle which are applicable to the given stage of development of both socialism and capitalism, arming the multimillion army of communists with knowledge of ways of progressing forward in any, even the most complex situation.

At the same time, the party remains loyal to its initial, methodological aims and conclusions concerned with the principled fundamentals of the capitalist system. A concise but full characterization of capitalism--only six paragraphs and less than two pages of printed text--was the starting point of the first party program, drawn up by the editorial staff of Lenin's ISKRA in 1901-02. V. I. Lenin had to defend the most important tenets of this characterization in a complex theoretical struggle against the future mensheviks. This characterization has become a real class in Marxist literature and it is

the most concise, but also the most multifaceted and complete generalization of the laws and trends of capitalist development. It is precisely for this reason that it is of permanent value, has fully retained its significance for subsequent periods of struggle, and sounds just as fresh and topical today as it did at the time it was written, notwithstanding all the changes experienced by capitalism during this century.

When the party adopted its second program at its Eighth Congress in 1919, this characterization of the fundamentals of capitalism was included in this program with the addition of an analysis of the imperialist stage.

In this respect, Lenin had to endure a serious struggle against N. I. Bukharin and G. Ya. Sokolnikov, who proposed excluding the old characterization by citing new phenomena and changes within capitalism. Lenin and the party categorically spurned these attempts. "Rewriting the whole general part of the program," Vladimir Ilich wrote as early as the spring of 1917, "in my opinion, is unnecessary... The present wording of the general part of the program contains a description and analysis of the main and most essential features of capitalism as a socioeconomic system. These features have NOT basically been changed by imperialism and the era of financial capital... The program proceeds--and must proceed--from the simplest manifestations of capitalism to the more complex and HIGH, and from exchange to commodity production, to the squeezing out of the small enterprises by the large, to crises, and so forth, right up to imperialism as the highest stage, which is developing and which has developed only now in advanced countries. This is precisely how things stand in life." Acting in any other way would be "wrong historically and theoretically" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 32, pp 145-6).

Let us pay heed to the arguments which Lenin advanced at the party's Eighth Congress. First, he said, one cannot substitute a characterization of the fundamentals of capitalism with a characterization of imperialism. "Pure imperialism has never existed, exists nowhere and never will exist without the fundamental basis of capitalism. ...If the program were to be written as Comrade Bukharin would wish, this program would be incorrect" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 38, pp 151, 153).

Second, said Lenin, "every paragraph in our program is something which every worker must know, master and understand. If he does not understand what capitalism is, if he does not understand that small-scale peasantry and the domestic handicraft economy inevitably and continually give rise to capitalism--if he does not understand this, then even if he declares himself a communist a hundred times over and shines as the most radical of communists, this kind of communism is not worth a farthing. We value communism only when it is economically substantiated" (ibid., p 179).

Third, Lenin emphasized the international significance of the party program. "In order to be international," he said, "our program must take those class features into account which are economically characteristic of all countries. It is characteristic of all countries that capitalism is still developing in a mass of localities... The capitalist mode of production continues to exist

throughout the world, frequently preserving its less developed forms... A program which gives no mention to the fundamentals of the commodity economy and capitalism will not be a Marxist international program" (ibid., pp 177, 179, 181).

These Leninist arguments were taken fully into account when the third party program was drawn up. The characterization of capitalism and imperialism was retained. But, of course, it was supplemented with a detailed analysis of the general crisis of capitalism and with a characterization of state-monopolistic capitalism.

The reproduction of the Leninist text in the program was very appropriate in the concrete conditions of the beginning of the 1960s. A reminder of some of the initial truths of Marxism-Leninism helped to overcome an uncreative approach to the analysis of capitalist reality, and to make the exposure of imperialism in the party's ideological work more efficient and effective.

The aforementioned Leninist pronouncements retain their methodological topicality even today. We are at the stage of developed socialism, but we must not forget the roots from which contemporary society grows. As historical experience has shown, overcoming private ownership and its consequences is a difficult and long drawn-out affair.

Transferring the means of production from the hands of capitalists to the hands of the people is only the beginning of a long and complex process of turning "mine" into "ours." Negative phenomena, which were spoken of at the December 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, including black marketeering, bribe taking and misappropriation of socialist property, are not simply the results of certain mistakes and blunders, but of an attempt by those with a private ownership mentality to find refuge in the pores of socialist society.

The topicality of the Leninist characterization is also connected with the fact that socialism has long since gone beyond the bounds of a single country. The transition to socialism is being implemented in many countries and the old problem of "who will win?" has been resolved from everywhere. Elements hostile to socialism are growing in a number of socialist countries on the soil of private ownership, although the latter is not on a large scale and would seem to be under the strict control of the state. The socialist countries are still a component part of the world economy, and they feel a definite negative influence from the capitalist system. Of course, imperialism's undermining activities also have an effect, since it has activated its plans for a "social revanche" on an international scale.

Finally, the international significance of the CPSU's theoretical activities has grown extraordinarily at the present time. As Comrade K. U. Chernenko emphasizes, "Every word uttered by the CPSU, and especially its program word, has a very great ring of authority for communists throughout the world." The real features of the world revolutionary process and an appraisal of the contemporary international situation with all the practical conclusions for our foreign policy also emanate from a principled appraisal of the fundamentals of capitalism and its trends and laws at the present stage of its general crisis.

Our time is connected with greatly increased theoretical activity by the party. It is no accident that the problem of drawing up the new wording of the program, which was raised at the 26th Congress, was set in its indissoluble connection with the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory. And at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the exceptionally important role that the new wording of the program is called upon to play in the theoretical, ideological and all the work of the party was emphasized. This must be regarded as a continuation of yet another important Leninist tradition--tireless struggle against depreciation of the role of revolutionary theory and against a narrowly pragmatic attitude and overemphasis of practice in the approach to fundamental questions of party activity.

Thus, as early as at the beginning of the century, some Social Democrats made a great fuss about the need to purify oneself of a "doctrinaire attitude" and "ossification of thought" and triumphantly repeated Marx's well-known dictum: "Every step of real movement is more important than a dozen programs." Lenin exposed these loud phrases as an attempt to move away from "any integral and well thought-out theory" and to inculcate "eclecticism and unscrupulousness" under the guise of theoretical renewal. Lenin saw a dangerous weakening of interest in theory in the rapid upsurge of the revolutionary movement and in the spreading of Marxism. "A considerable number of people, only slightly prepared and even completely unprepared theoretically, have latched onto the movement for the sake of its practical significance and practical successes... Without revolutionary theory," he wrote, "there cannot even be a revolutionary movement. This point cannot be insisted on enough at a time when enthusiasm for the most narrow forms of practical activity is being embraced together with fashionable advocacy of opportunism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 6, pp 23-4).

In our time, particularly in a number of capitalist countries, one has to encounter the same disregard of Marxist-Leninist theory even on the part of those who act under revolutionary banners.

There are still considerable numbers of those who love to "discard" the very fundamentals of a scientific outlook (justifying this by emphasized concern for freedom of criticism and the necessity to draw nearer to practice) and "classical" Marxism and to substitute it with some "relativist" variety" in which there will be no place for the "repellent" laws of capitalism and every concrete situation will be studied according to its own "theory." All this conceals an old illness with which the communist movement has had to come into conflict for a long time--underestimation of the contradictions in capitalism and sometimes a course for practical reconciliation with the class enemy, a course which emanates from this underestimation.

Meanwhile, at every step life testifies not to a decrease, but to an increase in capitalist contradictions, and not to the flourishing and stabilization, but to the disintegration of the capitalist system. Let us take, for example, the turn in the development of the capitalist economy that has been observed from approximately the mid-1970s onwards. Economic growth has fallen sharply, the general rate of technical progress has clearly dropped and new successes in the sphere of robot technology have only served to increase mass

unemployment. A new stage in the deepening of capitalism's general crisis is on hand. This manifests itself in many forms.

During the last decade, cyclical slumps in production have significantly intensified. The crises of 1973-75 and of 1980-82 are, by their depth and duration, the most significant of the whole postwar period. Nevertheless, many bourgeois economists claimed very recently that the crises have been overcome and that the cycle is apparent only in a decrease in the growth rates of production and not in its absolute decline. There have even been some individual Marxists who have thought that it is time to cease theoretically elaborating Marxist theory on cycle and to concentrate scientists' attention upon socialism borrowing capitalism's experience of state leadership and of the forces of market anarchy. It was precisely against these kinds of advocates of "organized" capitalism that Lenin struggled when drawing up the second party program.

An important feature of the contemporary situation in the capitalist economy is also that the cyclical crises have become interwoven with structural and long-term crisis processes. The structural crises have particularly affected the most important branches upon which the boom of the preceding decades was based to a considerable degree (ferrous metallurgy, automobile construction, ship building, textiles, the chemical industry and many other branches). The crises have not even bypassed such a "science-intensive" branch as electronics.

Thus, capitalism is clearly unable to cope with the economic and social consequences of the scientific-technical revolution or to ensure the crisis-free and harmonious development of society's productive forces. The most deep-seated cause of the fundamental conflict between the productive forces and production relations of capitalist society is revealed in the current party program: state-monopolistic capitalism with its sharp edge directed against the interests of the workers class and the broadest masses of the working people.

The reformist illusions of the 1950s and 1960s were based on one variation or another of the concept of "a state of universal prosperity." The expansion of the economic role of the bourgeois state was misrepresented as capitalism's transformation into a mixed economy in which the state shows equal concern for the interests of opposed classes. The nationalized sector, anticyclical regulation, programming of the economy and the state system of social insurance were represented as evidence of development into socialism.

Now, when "Reaganomics" and "Thatcherism," that is, an open offensive upon the standard of living and rights of the working people under the guise of a "return" to free enterprise, have become the predominant trend in bourgeois economic policy and when mass lockouts of the working people are carried out even in countries with social democratic governments, illusions of "universal prosperity" have been completely shattered. However, there are still people who are ready to claim as before that state-monopolistic capitalism has helped to lessen and attenuate exploitation of hired labor and that, even if the degree of exploitation is growing, only sometimes can one hope to turn the apparatus of the bourgeois state to face the interests of the working people by means of social partnership and parliamentary combinations.

But the reality of capitalism refutes these groundless assertions. State-monopolistic capitalism has considerably accelerated the concentration of production and capital and has contributed to the increase in the monopolization of the economy. This has led to an increase in exploitation of the working people both in the enterprises themselves and in the sphere of circulation. The monopolies have opposed the increased organization of the workers class with their complete domination of the means of production, the commodity markets and the labor force. Any formal improvement in working conditions and safety equipment is bought by still greater subordination of the worker to the diktat of the production process, by an increase in the rate of work, by a reduction in its creative nature and by an increase in monotony and intensity. In those cases where, as a result of the scientific-technical revolution, there is an increase in the proportion of mental operations involved in the labor process, the intellectual capabilities of the worker become an additional object of exploitation and a source of surplus value. Capitalism has extended its domination of new spheres of exploitation (academic and medical institutions and scientific laboratories), has drawn new categories of participants in production into the process of exploitation, and makes extensive use of new, more subtle and refined methods of exploitation.

Through persistent struggle, the workers have achieved an increase in their nominal wage, but the monopolies recover this increase by raising the prices of commodities. Thus, the process of exploitation, which begins with the walls of the capitalist enterprises, continues in the trade and services sphere--where the worker is a mass consumer. The mechanism of inflation has become one of the most powerful means of redistributing the national income to the benefit of the exploiting class. The state contributes to inflation by pursuing a policy of budget deficits, issuing depreciated bank notes, maintaining prices for products purchased from the monopolies and freezing wages.

It is sometimes said: How is it, surely it is true, that hired workers in the countries of developed capitalism live materially better now than, say, 50 years ago? Surely the social insurance sphere has expanded, unemployment benefits have increased, and so forth? Yes, this is so, but all this in no way alters the fact that exploitation and the social poverty of the popular masses have increased. Of course, the organized workers class in these countries has succeeded in raising the level of physical well-being, compelling the bourgeois to forgo some of its profits from the production boom and to make concessions in the sphere of social legislation. The striving of the bourgeoisie to cool the class struggle, lessen the dissatisfaction of the popular masses and weaken the attractiveness of real socialism in their eyes has also had an effect.

But not one concession has been made without persistent battles and without frenzied counterattacks and attempts to split the workers class and to take away its achievements at the first opportunity. As before, even the higher level of material well-being essentially lags behind the still more rapid growth of the workers' material and spiritual needs under the influence of the scientific-technical revolution and, the main thing, behind the even more rapidly growing income and wealth of the exploiting classes.

It was precisely these processes that Lenin had in mind when he said that "poverty is growing not in the physical, but in the social sense, that is, in the sense of the disparity between increasing level of the needs of the bourgeoisie and the needs of the whole of society and the standard of living of the working masses" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 4, p 208).

One must also not forget that, as it is emphasized in the Leninist party program, there are long periods when there is an absolute deterioration in the material well-being of the working people. Thus, in the United States, for example, going on official data published in the President's annual state of the union address, the level of real wages earned by production workers has fallen in the last 10 years by 15 percent and now stands at the 1961 level--before the Vietnam war. And unemployment, which then stood at 6 percent, has now grown to 8-10 percent. Such is the real effect of the economic laws of capitalism and of the strategy of class revanche, contrary to the writings of "loyal" apologists of capitalism.

The novelty of the real situation in contemporary capitalism as compared to the situation that existed when the third party program was adopted lies primarily in the fact that objective development has laid bare the most unattractive aspects of state-monopolistic capitalism, has demonstrated its antinational nature and its fundamental incompatibility with the interest and needs of the popular masses and has shown that it is precisely state monopolistic capitalism that is the main brake on mankind's progress.

As early as on the eve of World War II, two trends in the development of state-monopolistic capitalism were clearly defined--its military fascist variation, represented by Germany, Italy, and Japan at that time and the bourgeois-reformist variation, represented by Roosevelt's America. The appearance of these two trends was completely natural. They are apparent even now in the form of two trends in the class strategy of ruling circles in imperialist countries in the struggle against the forces of democracy and socialism. There is the path of open militarism and force, and there is the path of adapting to the realities of capitalism's general crisis--the path spoken of as early as at the 24th CPSU Congress.

What is new in the development of state-monopolistic capitalism during the past decades is that its extreme reactionary trend has grown significantly. This has been reflected in the political superstructure by the "conservative wave" which brought right-wing, militaristically and revanchist-minded forces of the monopolistic bourgeoisie to power in the United States, the FRG, Britain and Japan. In the economic basis, the same trend has an objective base in the form of the increased significance of the military-industrial complex and the transnational monopolies, and the real danger of this will remain in the foreseeable future irrespective of any political shuffles in the theoretical research of contemporary capitalism, because underestimating or somehow smoothing over it would mean turning a blind eye to the colossal danger looming over both the working people in the capitalist countries themselves and the whole of mankind and would signify a lack of understanding of the objective basis of the militarist foreign policy of American imperialism and NATO.

Several stages can be traced in the development of the military-industrial complex. When monopolistic capitalism was only just forming, the military-

industrial concerns really were isolated, although there were also extremely influential exceptions to the general rule. On the threshold of two world wars, the military industry developed primarily in connection with the aggressive plans of the imperialist stages, which aspired to redivide the world.

The military concern became the more or less constant companion of capitalism in peaceful conditions only after World War II, when the arms race developed in the United States, Britain and some other countries. It was then that the military concerns merged with the military clique and with the political apparatus of the capitalist state on a permanent basis. But for the time being, the military-industrial complex found itself, so to speak, on the periphery of the financial oligarchy and played a subordinate role in elaborating the general political strategy of the imperialist states.

A new stage in its development began at the turn of the 1970s. First, from being a subordinate force it became a dominant one with its own precisely formulated economic and political program. In the economic sphere, this has meant that the constant modernization of mass destruction means is ensured, frequently to the detriment of the real interests of national security. A graphic example of this is the Reagan administration's adoption and elaboration of plans for an unabated arms race calculated for decades ahead. In the political sphere, this has meant gambling on a constant increase in international tension, militarist psychosis and the anticommunist "crusade."

Second, an intensive process of internationalizing the military-industrial complex is in progress. The military industry is growing at a furious rate in the West European countries, Japan, Israel, the Republic of South Africa and a number of other states; it is becoming more and more interwoven with the military-political superstructure; and the influence of militarism upon policy is growing. Mutual penetration of the capital of military concerns in various countries, their cooperation in developing and producing new types of arms and the sharing of arms markets in the third countries are all rapidly developing. The military is closing ranks ever more tightly within the framework of NATO. There are inevitably some contradictions between participants in the international arms race, the members of the black alliance of the sword and the money bag assume a common position, one which is fundamentally hostile to the position of arms limitation, detente and the lessening of international tension.

The domination of the military-industrial complex entails serious consequences for the economy and the standard of living of the masses. The systematic growth in military expenditure is implemented at the expense of social appropriations and in the future threatens to completely destroy the system of social insurance formed as a result of the selfless struggle of the workers. Large budget deficits maintain the fire of inflation and swallow up resources for productive capital investments. By drawing means away from the peaceful development of new technology and new consumer goods, the military-industrial complex puts a brake on technical progress as a whole, condemns the economy to low growth rates and leads to mass unemployment and a reduction in the real income of the working people.

In the political sphere, the supremacy of the military-industrial complex nourishes the most extreme reactionary forces. Limiting the material and

spiritual needs of the working people and containing their mass discontent, as well as the rise of the workers and antiwar movement, require such methods of government connected with a direct trampling underfoot of the norms of bourgeois democracy and imply an intensification of mind control, a cult of violence and racism and a chauvinist and military psychosis. As the experience of the 1930s shows, the medium that nourishes fascism can grow extraordinarily rapidly under the conditions of mass social ferment and unemployment.

The influence of the military-industrial complex is explained in particular by its alliance with the most reactionary sections of the multinational monopolist bourgeoisie.

The growth of the importance of multinational corporations in the last few decades is a well-known fact and has been described in literature in detail. However, at present it is not enough to merely describe these corporations. It is necessary to further show what place multinational capital occupies in the general system of contemporary capitalism.

Already Lenin, in his criticism of Sokolnikov, noted the party program's insufficient attention to the international interweaving of capital. "Internationally organized alliances of capitalists," he wrote, "existed also PRIOR TO imperialism. Any stockholding association involving the participation of capitalists of various countries is an 'internationally organized alliance of capitalists.' But as regards imperialism, there is SOMETHING ELSE that is characteristic and that DID NOT EXIST prior to the 20th century, and that is: the economic division of the world among international trusts..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 34, p 370).

Thus, the international trusts did exist at the beginning of the 20th century. What new elements appeared in their development at the end of the century? Above all, as a result of the fact that the concentration of production has reached a qualitatively different international level at which profitable production of a whole series of types of products (especially science-intensive ones) is simply impossible without the amalgamation of national monopolies into international ones, the international unification of the industrial concerns of various countries is now dictated by the production and market requirements and represents an unavoidable response to them.

Since the end of the 1960s, multinational banks, too, have grown rapidly. The largest world banks, that is, the American, West European and Japanese ones, have been drawn into this process. Multinational groups of financial capital and financial oligarchy are being formed and the international industrial and banking giants are becoming intertwined.

Under the conditions under which the power of monopolies have joined the power of the state, the formation of multinational financial capital has also not bypassed the sphere of state capitalism. Representatives of foreign internationally interwoven capital penetrate into the state apparatus. The bankruptcy of the old methods of economic stimulation prompts attempts to coordinate economic policy (and no longer within any relatively narrow limits of regional blocs) and to regulate reproduction on a multinational form.

Marxists do not doubt in the least the fallaciousness of any interpretation of this process in the spirit of K. Kautsky's theory of "ultraimperialism."

As is known, Lenin provided a crushing criticism of that theory. Not disputing the premise that the concentration of production tends to lead toward a "world trust," he resolutely expressed himself against (1) deducing from this the thesis about dampening the interimperialist contradictions and (2) drawing conclusions about a peaceful character of "superimperialism."

In our period, too, the idea of a "world trust" is a hopeless utopia despite the rapid growth of multinational financial capital. If, however, one is to speak about an international association of imperialism of the individual countries, then, as Lenin pointed out, this association is only possible on the basis of: (a) joint struggle against socialism; (b) joint struggle against the forces of national liberation; and (c) joint exploitation of developing countries. Contemporary multinational capitalism is uniting precisely to achieve these goals, something that is explained, among other things, also by the trend toward "Atlantic solidarity" and the attempts to strengthen the economic foundations of the imperialist blocs in recent years.

Lenin particularly stipulated that no association of this type can eliminate the contradictions between national imperialisms. The contemporary reality convincingly confirms this. The interimperialist rivalry is intensifying on all fronts: in trade and export of capital, for the spheres of capital investments and over customs, credit and exchange rate policies. The old forms of contradictions have been joined by new ones, which are connected with the conflict between the interests of the international financial oligarchy and the requirements of the national state regulations.

This new complex of contradictions manifests itself above all in the aspiration of American capital, operating through multinational monopolies and banks, to subordinate to itself the economies of Western Europe, Japan and other regions. The slogans of the struggle against multinational monopolies often conceal a growing resistance precisely against American interference and against American plans for economically subordinating not only developing, but also developed countries. Many countries regard barriers against multinational capital as a means of preserving their national sovereignty and state independence. This is natural because, by virtue of its goals, the multinational financial capital is in principle incompatible with the national interests of ANY capitalist country, including the United States. It is precisely because of its multinational nature that it acts especially destructively against national interests. The multinational monopolies are closing down scores of allegedly unprofitable enterprises, eliminating tens and hundreds of thousands of work places and threatening entire regions of industrially developed countries with deindustrialization. Supporting an unlimited arms race, the multinational military-industrial complexes disregard any considerations of national security and the interests of mankind as a whole, mankind that is seeking a release from the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

Lenin was right a thousand times over in demonstrating that, despite Kautsky, there is no peaceful imperialism and there can be none in any form. The ideology of social revanche against the real socialism, against the countries that have liberated themselves and against the army of hired labor in the capitalist countries themselves joins together the multinational financial capital and the military-industrial complex.

The nature of imperialism is immutable and its interests are incompatible with the interests of mankind. The inspiration provided by the increased topicality of these ideas of Lenin must be given full expression in our literature.

The correlation between the forces of socialism and capitalism has essentially changed in recent decades. World socialism has reached a level at which not only its existence as a system is guaranteed, but at which it also exercises an increasing influence on the objective processes in the entire world, including its capitalist part.

In this connection, in the contemporary nuclear age, the preservation of peace is a pivotal problem without a correct understanding of which and without comprehensively taking it into account in practical activities it is impossible to successfully develop the world revolutionary process leading mankind to communism.

Where does the question of correlation between the internal contradictions of capitalism and the struggle between the two systems stand under these conditions? There can be no room for ambiguity in the answer to this question.

It must be particularly emphasized first and foremost that it is imperialism and its inherent internal laws and not the struggle between the two systems or the historical offensive of socialism that are the sources of military danger. Socialism does not need military expansion and its general path is the path of peaceful construction in the countries where it has triumphed or where its construction is in progress.

The idea of socialism inspires those who advocate the revolutionary transformation of society in the countries that are still dominated by capital. All this requires no special proof, but repeating the truth about the peaceableness of socialism and demonstrating this peaceableness--by the concrete acts and initiatives of Soviet foreign policy--for the general public in the capitalist countries, stupefied by the daily slanders about the "Soviet military threat," is one of the important political-ideological tasks.

It would seem that it also should be clear to every Marxist that it is precisely imperialism and its laws that represent the source of nuclear threat. And yet, again and again it becomes necessary to refute the fabrication about "equal responsibility" of imperialism and real socialism for tensions in international affairs.

The Soviet Union is not engaged in any "export of revolution" or in interference in the affairs of other countries. Socialism cannot be implanted from outside; it only grows on the soil of objective demands of social development of every individual country. It inevitably grows as a result of the internal laws and contradictions of capitalism. The class struggle is, in fact, one of the most striking and obvious examples of these antagonistic and irreconcilable contradictions. No one can stop the class struggle as long as the exploitive society exists. It would be absurd to demand this or to hope for it.

Communists are in favor of class struggle as long as it is inevitable. They are also for peace. However, as every revolutionary well knows, peace does

not come without struggle. The problems of war and peace, Comrade K. U. Chernenko points out, "do not exist on their own. They are inseparable from the world social contradictions and from the development of the class struggle." Peace cannot be obtained from the class enemy by begging for it because the class enemy can only be forced into peace. And once again, it is the strengthening of the forces of socialism and the firm march of the world revolutionary process that can guarantee this. The growth of the might of socialism, the cohesion of the socialist countries, the growing role of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the international communist and workers movement and the mass antiwar struggle of peoples--all these are the factors on which the confidence of communists in the possibility of ensuring peace and curbing the forces of imperialism and war is based. The period of detente, among other things, proved this. The successes of detente were not backed solely by skillful diplomacy but, first and foremost, by the new correlation between the forces of the two systems and, in particular, the recognition by the principal country of capitalism of approximate military parity.

Precisely the recognition of parity and not of social status quo. And if anyone thinks that peace and disarmament can be guaranteed by maintaining the social equilibrium, he is greatly mistaken. Above all, because imperialism itself is not renouncing its attempts to export counterrevolution and restore capitalism. This is part of the nature of imperialism and its aspiration to world domination and to exploitation and repression of the entire world. Real socialism is hated by reactionaries primarily because it is the main barrier on the path to the realization of these imperialist plans.

In other words, the struggles for peace and socialism are inseparable. Communists struggle to preserve human civilization but they also struggle against exploitation of man by man, and the system built on exploitation and oppression is the system that endangers the threat of nuclear war.

Of course, in the contemporary capitalist world, there are those politicians who understand the irreversibility of social changes in the world and sense the necessity and mutual advantage of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.

It was precisely the existence of these forces opposing the military-industrial complex that, in particular, made it possible to achieve a relaxation of international tension. As has been already noted, the contemporary era has produced fascism and the present militarism, but it has also produced Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy. It would be illusory to think that the Roosevelts and Kennedys of the contemporary world will ever become communists or socialists. But they understood the significance of peaceful coexistence for their own people and for mankind as a whole and they understood the danger of political adventurism in our era.

Realism in politics is a principally important component of contemporary international relations. It does not abolish but, on the contrary, presupposes a serious and uncompromising ideological struggle against those who believe in the infinite future of capitalism. As far as communists are concerned, they are convinced that the future belongs to socialism because this is the course of history.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/14

K. U. CHERNENKO'S REPLY TO AMERICAN SCIENTISTS' APPEAL

PM211035 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84)
pp 14-15

[PRAVDA, 20 May 1984]

[Text] Esteemed Sirs:

The appeal which you are again making to world leaders to prevent lethal weapons from being unleashed in space and to avert the appearance of a new direction in the arms race is acutely topical. We understand profoundly the concern expressed by prominent American scientists in this regard.

Space has become a symbol of the grandiose achievements of science and technology. Its peaceful conquest is bearing not inconsiderable fruits. Some people, however, would like to turn space into a bridgehead of aggression and war. It is clear from U.S. announcements that the United States plans to deploy antimissile weapons in space, give scope to the operation of various sorts of antisatellite systems and deploy super-new types of weapons designed for striking at targets on land, in the air and at sea.

The Soviet Union is a firm opponent of competition in the race of any kind of armaments, including space weapons. At the same time it should be understood that in the face of a threat from space the Soviet Union will be forced to take measures in order to guarantee its security reliably. Calculations that it is possible to lay the road to military superiority through space are built on illusions. However, some are unwilling to abandon such calculations. This is fraught with extremely dangerous consequences. To prevent such a train of events, before it is too late, is the direct duty of responsible state figures, scientists and all who are really concerned for the future of mankind.

The Soviet Union again confirms that it is ready to make maximum efforts to see that sinister plans for shifting the arms race into space do not become reality. It is our conviction that a policy aimed at safely protecting space from the deployment of weapons should be the compulsory norm of conduct of states, a universally recognized international obligation.

We are resolutely against the development of large-scale antimissile defense systems, which cannot be regarded otherwise than as calculated for the unpunished implementation of nuclear aggression. There is a Soviet-American

treaty on antimissile defense, without time limit, banning the creation of such systems. It must be strictly observed. The solemn renunciation of the very idea of the deployment in space of antimissile systems would meet the spirit and letter of this treaty and the task of ensuring a peaceful status of outer space in the interests of all mankind. Such a step would be interpreted everywhere in the world as a manifestation of genuine concern for the peaceful future of mankind.

The matter of banning antisatellite weapons is also urgent. Deployment of such weapons would result in sharp destabilization of the situation and to an increased threat of sudden attack. It would undermine the efforts for ensuring trust among nuclear powers. You, as scientists, understand better than anyone else how dangerous all this is.

Urgent steps are necessary before the threatening process of militarization of space becomes irreversible. Here, there must be no place for propaganda tricks or for attempts to gain for oneself temporary advantages of one kind or another. The problem of preventing the militarization of space is a universal human problem. It calls for radical decisions. Such decisions are perfectly attainable. We must fully realize our responsibility to the peoples, and display a will to reach agreement.

In an effort to block the path of weapons into space, we have proposed an agreement to ban the use of force in and from space in relation to earth. Such an agreement would presuppose, in particular, a complete renunciation of antisatellite weapons, including the destruction of existing systems. To make it easier to reach agreement, the USSR has unilaterally declared a moratorium on the launching into space of antisatellite weapons for as long as other countries do likewise.

The Soviet initiative has received broad support in the world. There is no, and cannot be, any justification for a refusal to embark on the drawing up of relevant practical measures. It is necessary to start official talks without any conditions or reservations, aimed at safely blocking all channels of the militarization of space. It is the duty of political and public figures of all countries to promote this just and deeply humane goal. The Soviet Union is full of determination to do everything in its power to see that an appropriate agreement is attained.

With regard to your specific idea, concerning a provision in the Soviet draft treaty on the limitation of the military use of both manned and unmanned spaceships, this could be examined during official talks.

I take this opportunity to wish you success in your noble activity in the prevention of a spread of the arms race into space.

Respectfully,

K. Chernenko

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/14

CONCRETE ACTIONS FOR THE SAKE OF STRENGTHENING PEACE

AU151100 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84)
pp 16-28

[Paper by B. Ponomarev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and CPSU Central Committee secretary, given at the 4-5 May meeting of chief editors and other leading workers of communist and revolutionary democratic newspapers and journals invited by the PRAVDA editorial office in the commemoration of press day; words in all capitals published in italics in the original]

[Text] The serious and alarming events that have taken place in the world arena during the last 6 months confirm the Marxist-Leninist analysis of social development and, at the same time, make it possible to more fully and precisely appraise the present international situation.

The polarization of sociopolitical forces in the world has become even more obvious. The aggressiveness of the most reactionary forces headed by American imperialism continues to grow. This aggressiveness manifests itself in confrontation with the world of socialism and the national liberation movement, and in the sabotage of any reasonable peace-loving policy. Within the capitalist countries themselves, it reveals itself in heightened pressure upon the workers class and the working masses. The worsening crisis of the capitalist system and, of course, the failure of calculations to compel the forces of socialism and peace to back down are the deep-rooted cause of this aggressiveness.

These forces are consolidating, strengthening their positions, and become more active in the face of American imperialism's increasing aggressiveness. This fact is reflected primarily in the firm determination of the Soviet Union and the socialist communist not to permit a violation of the military-strategic parity and in their practical measures adopted with this aim in mind. It is also reflected in the people's noticeably increased opposition to the imperialist policy of aggression and in the heightened activity of frontrank fighters of the antiwar movement opposed to the deployment of American missiles in Western Europe. The adventurism and imperial egoism of American policy have even increased alarm among the ruling circles of the capitalist countries. The antiwar movement has gained support in the form of a clear upsurge in the workers movement and growing rebuff to the large-scale capitalist offensive. The mutual link between domestic policy and foreign policy processes is growing strong as a whole---to the advantage of socialism and peace and to the detriment of imperialism.

However, the specific features of the contemporary period lie in the fact that the "party of war," to use the Leninist definition, is at the helm of the main imperialist power. This party ignores realities and stops at nothing, trying to impose all its systems on everyone.

Possessing a colossal military machine and operating with vast economic and political means, this shameless reactionary group is pursuing a policy that is pushing the world toward a nuclear catastrophe. This policy is of a global nature. It poses a threat both to the Soviet Union, against which the sharp edge of its militarist strategy is directed, and to the other socialist countries, progressive, democratic states, all peoples, all countries, and the very existence of civilization.

I

During the last 6 months, the U.S. administration has significantly increased international tension. And this is causing serious alarm everywhere.

The adventurist credo of American imperialism was once again proclaimed with cynical frankness by U.S. President Reagan in his speech at Georgetown University on 6 April. Military force, he said, whether used directly or indirectly, must remain one of the elements of American foreign policy. Contrary to the "peace-loving" statements aimed at the public, the official U.S. military doctrine is based as before on the possibility of carrying out a first strike in a nuclear war and of gaining victory in such a war.

Having adopted a course to gain military superiority and not wishing to be bound by anything in the pursuit of this aim, the United States wrecked negotiations on nuclear weapons in Europe and condemned negotiations on strategic weapons to fruitlessness.

Outer space is becoming a fundamentally new and particularly dangerous sphere of U.S. military activity. Plans to prepare "star wars" have been set in motion. The U.S. President's report on matters concerned with outer space says: "Measures to control weapons in space are desirable not as an end in themselves, but only if they are conducive to strengthening our potential." Such is the cynical "logic" of the proteges of the military-industrial complex. And if it is not nipped in the bud, all other measures to bridle the arms race--on land, at sea, and in the air--will definitely become inadequate from the point of view of lessening the nuclear threat. Plans to militarize outer space basically signify an undermining of the whole process of limiting nuclear weapons, and primarily of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty [Dogovoro PRO], a treaty of unlimited duration.

The United States is blocking agreement on the prohibition and liquidation of chemical weapons. Now they are doing this with the aid of so-called new proposals. Manipulating the slogan of "comprehensive" control, the United States excludes all private chemical enterprises in its draft agreement on these weapons, while at the same time demanding that the whole chemical industry in the socialist countries, where there are no private enterprises, be placed under control. Washington has had to advance a "peace-loving" chemical initiative in order to pull the wool over the eyes of the world public and, the

main thing, to squeeze means out of Congress for the mass production of binary gas weapons.

The United States is still deploying forward-based forces around the whole perimeter of the Soviet Union even though it already has approximately 600 military bases throughout the socialist countries.

American imperialism has sharply increased its aggressive activities and military preparations in Asia and in the basins of the Pacific and Indian oceans. Japan is being pushed onto the path of a stepped-up arms race and a triangle is being formed between Washington, Tokyo and Seoul. This example particularly clearly highlights the falsity of Washington's assertions that the United States supposedly needs to increase its armed might to repel a military threat. There is no threat posed to the United States in this area, just as there is no threat posed to it anywhere. But American imperialism has scores of bases here and has occupied the island of Diego Garcia for military purposes.

Acting the role of world gendarme and having given itself the "right" to use military force when and where it thinks fit, Washington has elevated terrorism to the rank of state policy. This is now almost the main aspect of the activities of the CIA, the Pentagon and other departments in accordance with Presidential Directive No 138.

The "crusade" proclaimed by the U.S. President is not simply rhetoric but a kind of MANIFESTO OF COUNTERREVOLUTION conceived on a world scale.

The main target in this respect is the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. Economic "sanctions," blackmail, flouting of generally accepted international standards, cynical interference in internal affairs under the guise of the "defense" of human rights, and the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation--such is the political substance of the "crusade" in this direction.

The American administration is resorting to aggression more and more unceremoniously and extensively to suppress liberation movements and liquidate progressive regimes in the Western Hemisphere and in Africa and Asia. American imperialism encourages and supports the aggression of Israel in the Middle East, that of the Republic of South Africa in southern Africa, and the aggressive activities of reactionary regimes in Central America and the Caribbean basin. The threat of American intervention looms large every time the conduct of some people or other does not suit Washington's leaders.

The great lie about a "Soviet threat," rehashed in various forms, serves as a pharisaical basis for this "crusade." The Pentagon's propaganda kitchen recently churned out the third edition of the brochure entitled "Soviet Military Power." Secretary of Defense Weinberger took it upon himself to advertise it. Acting in accordance with Goebbels' recipe: the more barefaced the lie and the more often you repeat it, the more quickly people will believe it. The chief of the Pentagon claims that the Soviet Union enjoys superiority over the United States at almost every level in the arms sphere.

At the same time, the conveyor belt of military production in the United States is traveling at full speed. Military expenditure is being inflated to inconceivable proportions--in 1985 they will exceed \$330 billion. Programs for the nuclear, chemical and space arms race are calculated for decades ahead, that is, they spill over into the 21st century. Such is the social demand of the military-industrial complex, which is interested in a never-ending flow of superprofits.

II

Is it possible to oppose all this? Is it possible to prevent a nuclear war?

The CPSU answers this question in the affirmative. This is because, while the forces of war are becoming more active, the powerful forces of peace are growing in opposition. These forces of peace are: the Soviet Union and the socialist community. Their coordinated foreign policy and their constructive initiatives are reflected in such important joint documents as the Prague Political Declaration of 5 January, the Moscow Joint Statement of 28 June 1983, and, very recently, the communique of the meeting of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs held in Budapest on 20 April 1984;

The communist movement, which is the most consistent and organized anti-imperialist and antiwar force;

The many scores of Asian, African and Latin American countries and primarily revolutionary democratic states and states of socialist orientation. The Nonaligned Movement, which opposes the aggressive and neocolonialist policy of imperialism;

The new mass antiwar movement and the sociopolitical circles contiguous to it;

Finally, the realistic-minded groups and figures in the capitalist countries who understand that there is no alternative to peaceful coexistence in the nuclear age.

The vigilance, firmness, determination and energetic actions of peace-loving forces have yielded results in the policies of American imperialism recently suffering a series of NEW AND MAJOR FAILURES.

First, the United States' calculation to force the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to reconcile themselves to the deployment of new American missiles in Europe and to begin unilateral disarmament fell through. Now everyone can see that Washington's claims, echoed by NATO figures from other capitals, that the Soviet Union would supposedly become "more compliant" if the necessary pressure were applied to it have turned out to be a delusion.

Second, the American administration's attempts to undermine the positions of the socialist community, to split it up and to weaken its united international potential with the help of all kinds of "sanctions" and diversions have also failed.

Third, Washington's policy aimed at breaking up the liberation movement with bandit-like actions in the spirit of "gunboat diplomacy" has become bankrupt. The example of Lebanon and Nicaragua, like Vietnam and Cuba before them, once again shows that the steadfastness and heroism of patriots and revolutionaries are able to inflict defeat even upon an imperialist leviathan like the United States. American imperialism is unable to smother the cause of national and social progress.

Fourth, the imperialist "hawks" are finding themselves in isolation time and again in the UN organization, while the proposals of the USSR and the other socialist countries, which are in harmony with the will of the peoples, meet with understanding and support. The UN General Assembly adopted a declaration at its 38th session, with the overwhelming majority against the United States and some of its allies, which unconditionally condemned nuclear war as a monstrous crime against mankind, and also a resolution demanding the prevention of the militarization of outer space.

Fifth, alarm is increasing among ruling circles in the NATO countries over the American administration's adventurism and the lack of ceremony with which the United States strives to ensure itself dominating and virtually dictatorial positions in the world capitalist system.

Fears that Washington's policy could lead to a nuclear conflict are percolating through to the so-called establishment, that is, to very influential circles in the United States and Western Europe. Although not immediately, they are at least beginning to understand that the Soviet Union and the socialist countries will not be frightened and that the policy of nuclear blackmail is undermining security of the Western countries themselves, including the United States. The policy of building up tension has turned out to be a double-edged sword and one edge has struck the positions of Reagan himself.

Whatever pressure Washington may bring to bear upon the West European leaders and however NATO discipline may influence them, they can see that the burial of detente is fraught with the further weakening of their countries' role in European and world politics. Hence, one has such instances as even some NATO governments condemning the mining of Nicaraguan ports and other piratical actions on the part of the United States, and the idea being spread that, in protecting its own interests, Western Europe should play a particular role distinct from the United States in the contemporary system of international relations.

All this has affected the U.S. administration, forcing it to change its tactics slightly. The signal was given by the President himself, suddenly declaring readiness on 16 January 1984 to work towards an improvement in Soviet-American relations. But more than 4 months have passed since then and nothing, apart from a stream of "peace-loving" demagoguery accompanied by the pushing through of more and more new military programs, has happened.

The U.S. administration is trying to create the impression that some improvements have been made in Soviet-American relations, is organizing a stream of

false information on "numerous contacts" with us, and is generally claiming that things are not really so bad. This is a deception. No improvements have been made in these respects on any serious matters.

In order to demonstrate at least some success in foreign policy in the election year, President Reagan ventured upon a "great expedition" to China. It was conducted with great pomp and presented as a "contribution" to the cause of peace. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is enough to point out that it was precisely at this time that armed provocations against Vietnam were stepped up on the China-Vietnam border, as were those of the Pol Pot followers against Kampuchea. For Washington, American-Chinese relations are a major stake in anti-Soviet plans, in the "crusade" against socialism, and ultimately also against socialism in China.

The entire Reagan administration policy is subjected to sharp criticism by presidential candidates from the U.S. Democratic Party. They stress that a colossal increase in military might will by no means help to restore the United States' shaken prestige and they are in favor of a freeze on nuclear weapons and the ratification of the SALT II treaty and against aggressive operations in Central America. This position is finding broad support within the country.

Reagan's critics say the causes of his policy failures are as follows: incompetence, his anticommunist and anti-Soviet prejudices, the laxity and lack of talent of his associates, false concepts, erroneous tactics and so forth. Of course, all this is true. But the main thing is that the whole policy of U.S. ultrareactionary force, which is aimed at gaining social revanche on a world scale, is unrealistic and defective in its very essence. This is no longer a little mistake, as V. I. Lenin said, of the type "twice two is five," but fundamental class folly of the type "twice two is a stearin candle."

Indignation and anger is growing among the broad circles of the world public, together with the demand that exposure of American imperialism be intensified and that everything be done to make it clear to everyone that the peoples are against Reagan's policies.

III

The Soviet Union has never seen any sense or benefit in the method "spike against spike." The rule by which the USSR is invariably guided can briefly be formulated as follows: firmness and implacability in principled matters affecting the security of our country and its allies and readiness for dialogue which is serious, conducted on an equal footing, and imbued with a sense of responsibility.

This rule is based on two fundamental tenets by which the USSR is invariably guided.

FIRST. The Soviet Union does not aspire to military superiority. But, as the Soviet leadership has said on more than one occasion, it will never

permit superiority over itself and its allies by those who openly boast of depositing socialism "on the ash heap of history."

SECOND. The Soviet Union has also said on more than one occasion that it does not intend to build its own society at the expense of other states or to the detriment of the interests of other peoples. This principle was confirmed by our country's supreme organ in the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 29 December 1983.

The Soviet platform of peace in the existing situation was clearly and precisely formulated by K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at the February and April 1984 Central Committee plenums, in his speech to voters on 2 March, in his answers to questions put by PRAVDA on 9 April, in his speech on 25 April at the meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for drafting the new wording of the CPSU Program, in his speech on 29 April at the Serp i Molot plant, in his replies to addresses by various foreign figures and in talks with them.

In what, briefly speaking, does this platform consist?

Primarily in the continuity of the international policy determined by the 26th CPSU Congress and consolidated at subsequent Central Committee plenums. This "means," said K. U. Chernenko, "that we must do everything in our power to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. It means striving for a real change for the better in the dangerous development of world events. It means moving along the path of equal cooperation between states on the principles of peaceful coexistence."

In accordance with this a whole complex plan of practical actions has been advanced in K. U. Chernenko's speeches.

The USSR makes the following proposals to all nuclear powers:

To pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons;

To come to agreement on a freeze of nuclear arsenals;

To jointly recognize and make compulsory definite standards of conduct for nuclear powers in the international arena and to adopt a kind of "antinuclear code."

The USSR insists upon a complete ban on nuclear testing. The United States must ratify treaties signed long ago on the limitation of underground nuclear testing and on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

The USSR is in favor of Europe being free of nuclear weapons--both intermediate-range and tactical. The deployment of American missiles in Western Europe is an obstacle to this. The Soviet Union insists and will continue to insist that the situation that existed before the beginning of this deployment be restored. Then the necessity for forced countermeasures will disappear and a possibility for renewing negotiations will arise. This position

assumed by the USSR and its allies was once again confirmed by the Committee of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Warsaw Pact member-states in Budapest in April.

The USSR actively strives to reach agreement not to permit the militarization of OUTER SPACE. It introduced a draft Treaty on the Prohibition of the Use of Force in Outer Space and From Space Against the Earth at the last session of the UN General Assembly.

The USSR supports the idea of creating nuclear-free zones in various regions and primarily in northern Europe and in the Balkans.

More than 10 years ago the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries proposed the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of CHEMICAL WEAPONS and their abolition.

The Warsaw Pact member-states have proposed to the NATO member-countries that they conclude a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force and on the Maintenance of Peaceful Relations, begin consultations on this proposal, and also start negotiations on the problem of not increasing, rather reducing military expenditure.

At the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, the Soviet Union placed major problems at the center of attention, problems upon which the question of whether trust will be restored in East-West relations primarily depends. As well as this, the USSR is also in favor of coordinating military-technical measures of trust that are more meaningful in nature and more extensive in scope than former measures.

Despite the United States' refusal to conduct negotiations on reducing the foreign military presence in the Indian Ocean, and despite its reluctance generally to come to agreement on the problems of limiting military-naval activities and military-naval arms, the Soviet Union will continue to persistently strive for this aim. As is well-known, it recently introduced corresponding concrete proposals at the UN.

The Soviet Union consistently acts in support of the efforts of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea to strengthen their fraternal friendship, mutual aid and comprehensive cooperation. The Soviet state is in full solidarity with their constructive initiatives for regulating relations with neighboring countries and for turning Southeast Asia into a zone of peace, stability and good-neighborliness.

Finally, the Soviet Union, as K. U. Chernenko noted again recently, is an advocate of "a real breakthrough in Soviet-American relations and in the whole international situation. We would like such a breakthrough. It is up to Washington."

Such are the main proposals and constructive, realistic ideas that embody the collectively developed policy of the USSR and the socialist community in the world arena.

IV

The contemporary antiwar movement has already demonstrated that it represents a qualitatively new phenomenon that no one can ignore. This movement possesses great moral and political strength and has considerable reserves for further growth.

Following the beginning of the deployment of American missiles in Europe, the antiwar movement must operate under new conditions. The ideological pressure of imperialist services and propaganda organs has sharply increased. A deafening attack has been launched with the aim of demoralizing the movement and instilling the idea of the futility of wasted effort and of the uselessness of street actions, demonstrations, meetings, declarations and protests. A false proposition is being introduced: Europe, they say, "has entered the post-Pershing period" and, you see, the population has reconciled itself to this.

However, expectations that the appearance of American missiles in Europe would deal a fatal blow to the antiwar movement are clearly unjustified. Western Europe is not "becoming accustomed" to American missiles. There is an ever deeper understanding that there Washington plans to use Western Europe as a theater of war where it is prepared to use any weapons, ranging from nuclear to chemical. This understanding and this anxiety were convincingly confirmed by the "spring actions" of the antiwar forces. More than 600,000 people participated in the so-called Easter peace marches in the FRG alone. During the past few weeks, many impressive events of the antiwar struggle in the most widely diverse forms have taken place in the Netherlands, Belgium, Great Britain, Italy, Greece, Spain, France, Portugal, Denmark, West Berlin, Austria, Norway, Iceland, Ireland, Switzerland... And not only in Western Europe but also in Canada, the United States, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand.

The range of people who are active in the ranks of the antiwar movement against American imperialism's aggressive policy is extraordinarily wide. It is possible to list many examples and the names of scores and hundreds of uncompromising activists of the struggle for peace who represent an inspiring example for others. Among such inspiring examples is the antimissile camp of British women at Greenham Common. Neither repression, arrests, nor even the destruction of the camp by the police have broken the will of its participants.

Now, as is well-known, people are concerned because no Soviet-American negotiations are taking place. Washington is demagogically declaring that it is supposedly ready to return to Geneva any day and that the return is up to the Soviet Union. A great deal of noise has been made about the allegedly "new proposals" made by the U.S. President. However, each of these proposals is a cover for the regular program of increasing armaments. In this connection, Washington continues to hypocritically assure both the Americans themselves and its allies that increasing armaments is a "trump card" for negotiations with the Soviet Union.

It is also fashionable among NATO officials to proclaim their readiness for negotiations "without any preliminary conditions." The impression is created that no one remembers that their side has already made the preliminary and even ultimatum-like conditions in very material form, in the form of Pershing II and cruise missiles in the FRG, Britain and Italy.

"...Washington," K. U. Chernenko has noted, "expatiates upon its readiness to resume negotiations. But the question is: negotiations about what? On how many and precisely what kind of missiles aimed against the Soviet Union and our allies can the United States deploy in Europe? We will not go to any negotiations of this kind."

The call "Down with American missiles" is spreading among the fighters against the terrible danger threatening Western Europe. This is the right slogan because the American missiles are the first and foremost reason for stopping the negotiations. And it is precisely the missiles that are the main obstacle preventing the talks' resumption.

Another different method of anti-Soviet propoganda is the claim that the USSR is allegedly against any control over the implementation of agreements and that thereby, you see, it is blocking all accords. But in fact, this is not the situation. The USSR has adopted a very serious attitude toward the issue of control. For instance, it has made a far-reaching proposal on the methods of controlling the destruction of chemical weapons. Reliable measures of verification have also been proposed within the Soviet draft Treaty on Preventing the Militarization of Space. The appropriate control procedures are envisaged by all agreements on the issues of nuclear weapons and their testing signed by the Soviet Union and by all of its proposals on limiting and reducing conventional weapons.

And, vice versa, it is precisely the American administration that wants to keep its armaments outside all control and to subject the Soviet Union to such a "verification" as would in fact amount to military and economic spying. The 3 May 1984 PRAVDA article "On Washington's Speculations About the Questions of Control" discusses all this in detail.

The mass indignation over American intervention in the Middle East, Central America, and other "Third World" regions in combining with the antiwar movement. The trampling underfoot of the very elementary standards of international law and human morals and large numbers of human victims among peaceful populations are provoking feelings of hatred against the policy of state terrorism. The campaigns of solidarity with the peoples of Nicaragua, El Salvador, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Angola and Kampuchea, and with the Palestinian people, represent a major reserve for drawing the masses of people into the antiwar and anti-imperialist struggle, especially in the "Third World" countries.

The actions of the social democratic, socialist and labor parties against the policy of intervention and of increasing international tension and in defense of the idea of detente and peaceful cooperation among states have become increasingly definite and persistent. Many social democratic figures are active

fighters against the arms race and for peace. At the same time, the positions of some social democratic figures include a considerable amount of inconsistency and contradictions and views and appraisals with which it is impossible to agree.

The voice of the opponents of war has been constantly heard at the Stockholm conference. Representatives of antiwar organizations have made quite a few contacts with the conference's participants. There have been meetings, receptions, and interviews in connection with the work of the conference, petitions and requests have been sent to the conference, and so forth. This activity will undoubtedly be further developed during the conference's second session.

The EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICACY of the antiwar movement increase as parties, parliaments, municipalities and influential scientific and social circles become involved in antiwar activities and as the arrows of popular anger are aimed more and more precisely at the imperialist den in all parts of the world: the U.S. administration is directly responsible for hundreds and thousands of victims of "undeclared wars" and for the heavy burden of militarism.

Overcoming the negative phenomena within the antiwar movement is of major importance. The Soviet defenders of peace participate in various international forums where they defend the ideas that unite its participants, unmask false arguments, and explain the USSR's true positions, which are in accord with the main goals of all fighters for peace.

Since the end of last year, the growing social protest of the workers class and the working people has become an important new element in international developments.

Under circumstances of an economic slump and an avalanche-like growth of unemployment at the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, the conservative forces launched a mass attack on the standard of living and the rights of working people and deprived them of some of their former achievements.

However, the ruinous consequences of militarism, the swelling of military budgets at the expense of social programs, the cuts in the civilian branches of production, the trampling of trade union rights and unceremonious liquidations of viable enterprises, sudden dismissals of hundreds of thousands of workers further increasing an already enormous army of unemployed, the growing cost of living, and increasing taxes--all this has stirred up the masses. A turn in the frame of mind of the working people is beginning to show, a turn around militancy, toward determination to act in a proletarian-like way, and toward providing a fitting rebuff to the monopolies.

There are many facts to support this and they are impressive: the nationwide strike of British miners in defense of the coal industry which is supported by other sections of the working people; the march of tens of thousands of Lorraine steelworkers against Paris and other mass actions of French steelworkers and miners, and shipyard and automobile industry's workers against the plans to cut these branches under the proposal for their modernization; the demonstrations of a million Italian workers in Rome which resulted in the

failure of the planned government decree on wage reductions; the general national strike and mass marches of Belgian working people against the policy of "tightening the belt," and the powerful wave of warning strikes, demonstrations and meetings in the FRG for a reduction of the working week. Workers and employees in Portugal, Spain and many other countries are active in defense of the right to work and against dismissals. Whereas, at the end of the 1970s in the capitalist countries, an average of 50 million people participated annually in labor conflicts, in 1983, this number increased to over 80 million.

This growth of social protest also augments the antiwar potential. For, in this connection, the source of disasters and danger is one and the same: imperialism. And as always, the interdependence between its militarist aggressive policy and its reactionary internal policy is best recognized in the course of practical struggle. This year's May Day also demonstrated this. It was different, not only because the degree of activeness of the masses was higher than last year, but also because of the specific characteristic of the interweaving of two main slogans under which millions of people held their May Day demonstrations in the capitalist countries: "Preserve peace!" and "Defend the right to work!"

Or, let us consider the elections for the "European Parliament" around which the party political and ideological struggle is now mainly waged in Western Europe. Communists actively participate in this struggle using preelection conditions to advance their ideas and initiatives among the masses and to unmask those who are really responsible for international tension, the perniciousness of the militarist policy, and also for the economic position of the working people.

The potential of the forces of peace and the opportunities created by the failures of the imperialist policy and by the development of the antiwar struggle and social protest do not automatically lead to success. The communist parties, the international communist movement, and other anti-imperialist forces and, of course, their press, play a great role in this connection. The entire course of history now places before them the task of struggling not only to eliminate exploitation but also to save life on earth itself.

V

However complex the international situation may be, the CPSU has no intention of deviating from its main goal of perfecting developed socialism for the good of the Soviet people. The elections for the USSR Supreme Soviet in March this year confirmed that the CPSU domestic and foreign policies enjoy the full support of the people.

The inexhaustible vital force of the party created by Lenin lies in the fact that it steadfastly follows its collectively elaborated general line. The party confidently advances under the leadership of its Central Committee headed by K. U. Chernenko, prominent political and state figure and communist with the richest experience of ideological and organizational work. The highest organ of the country's state authority unanimously elected him as chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The February and April

Central Committee plenums confirmed the continuity of the party's policy, its firm unity and its indestructible link with the people.

The Soviet society is now at an important and very responsible stage of development. This stage has been marked by such great landmarks in the life of the party and people as the November 1982, June and December 1983 and February and April 1984 Central Committee plenums. The party has once again demonstrated that it has remained true to the behest of its founder Lenin not to become egoistic, to recognize where its strength lies, not to fear to speak about its shortcomings and to learn to overcome them.*

Within a short period, substantial results have been achieved with the will and energy of communists in strengthening order and socialist discipline and liquidating various types of negative phenomena. Extensive and intensive work is in progress to raise the rates of development of the national economy and to overcome the economic difficulties that the country encountered at the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s. The plans for the last year and the first 3 months of this year were successfully fulfilled. The Food Program is beginning to produce first results and the Energy Program and the programs of development of the Nonchernozem regions and the Baykal-Amur-Mainline region are being carried out. Major measures have been taken to increase production and improve the quality of consumer goods and services. A complex program of the USSR's scientific-technical progress in the 1986-90 period is being worked out.

As was emphasized at the April 1984 Central Committee Plenum, what is involved in this connection is a strategy of advance to communism that has nothing in common either with slowness or with leaping over the historically necessary steps of development. The party is soberly appraising the situation. It sees that, on the road to its highest goals, it will still be necessary to solve a considerable number of difficult and great problems related--by their origin and character--to the first stage of communist formation.

In setting the large-scale and difficult tasks, the party placed at the April Central Committee Plenum special emphasis on practical questions of perfecting socialist democracy and the entire Soviet political system to ensure that the sovereignty of the soviets, determined by the USSR Constitution, will be expressed, both in the substance and the style of their activity. The necessity of utilizing to the maximum extent the enormous potential of the soviets at all levels from above to below was discussed also at the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation.

The session of the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted the law on school reform, an act of immense political significance. During several months prior to this, the draft reform was vigorously discussed with great interest by millions of Soviet citizens. Hundreds of amendments and additions were introduced. The draft became a product of truly all-people's referendum. Is this not an example of the socialist and WORKING democracy! The reorganization of the system of people's education is oriented to the future, to preparing the

* V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 45, p 118.

generation that will have to continue the cause of the Great October in the 21st century.

All these and other multifaceted tasks and problems facing our society are reflected in the new edition of the CPSU Program. A very important session of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for Preparing the New Edition of the CPSU Program was held in April under the chairmanship of K. U. Chernenko. It defined the basic principles for preparing this principal ideological-theoretical and political document of the party. This will be the program of perfecting developed socialism, a realistic and balanced program that will be oriented to completely embodying the socialist ideal in activities and in reaching ever new frontiers on the road to communism.

This is the work and these are the concerns with which the party and the Soviet people live today. And this attests better than any words to the profoundly peace-loving nature of the socialist system. Of course, if the international situation were calmer and more favorable, we would advance more quickly and many problems would be solved more easily. However, the situation is one that requires not only high vigilance, firmness, and tenacity but also greater attention to the country's defense capability and to allotting considerable resources to strengthening its security. This is how the CPSU is acting and will continue to act in the future. The decisions of its leading organs clearly testify to this.

Speaking figuratively, the Soviet ship steering the Leninist course in the restless and stormy waters of the contemporary era confidently moves on. Our ship, guided by the experienced helmsman, the Communist Party and its Central Committee, will never deviate from this Leninist course and will steadfastly accelerate its progress.

And yet about another topical moment. There is 1 year to go until the 40th anniversary of the great victory over Hitlerite fascism. A high price was paid for that victory. To this day the Soviet people cannot forget the terrible losses inflicted by the war. For the Soviet people, Victory Day is, as the song says, "joy with tears in eyes."

The 40th anniversary of the victory will be observed in the Soviet Union as an all-people's festivity. The Central Committee has adopted a special resolution, determined a wide program of events, and has set concrete tasks for the press, television and radio.

An ideological struggle around this date is already developing. A concrete example is the 40th anniversary of the landing of the British-American forces in northern France, that is, the opening of the second front in Europe (6 June 1944). Judging by the Western press, it is intended to use that date as an occasion for belittling the USSR's role in World War II and for glorifying the United States as Europe's "savior." Of course, there is an additional aim in all this: to strengthen Washington's present claims to world leadership.

The memory of the sacrifices and feats of the Soviet people and the laws of historical truth and justice demand that we rebuff these plans. Of course, no one has any intention of belittling the significance of the opening of the second front. We will also widely and vividly show the role of the popular

resistance movement in the events and in that final stage of the war. At the same time, we will counter any attempts to instill in the minds of people in the West, and especially in the minds of the younger people who did not experience the war, any false presentation of these events or to paint them in anti-Soviet colors.

The truth is that the conditions for the landing of the allied forces in Normandy were created precisely by the Red Army's victories on the Soviet-German front. The truth is that to an enormous extent, the people of our time owe their release from fascist enslavement and their freedom to the world's first socialist state.

The lessons of World War II are closely linked with contemporary problems, with the struggle for peace and against the arms race, and with the criticism of the U.S. aggressive policy. For today, the United States is deploying nuclear weapons in European countries and in particular in German territory, weapons aimed precisely against the state that made a decisive contribution to rescuing mankind from the Nazi plague.

The progressive mass information media have an extraordinarily important role in the struggle for peace and progress and against imperialism and reaction.

The newspapers of the fraternal parties of the socialist and developing countries play an enormous role. They are the mouthpiece of the ruling parties that are building and strengthening socialism. Major credit must be given to the press organs of the communist parties in capitalist countries. Despite the dominance of monopolies in the sphere of mass information, despite their limited resources, and despite the badgering and persecution by the reactionary forces and, in several cases, the necessity of underground operations, many newspapers of the fraternal parties have become true public forums of the people, organizers of the masses and uncompromising defenders of their interests. The French L'HUMANITE, Portuguese AVANTE!, Indian NEW AGE, West German UNSERE ZEIT, Greek RIZOPASTIS, American DAILY WORLD, Chilean EL SIGLO, Venezuelan TRIBUNA POPULAR and many, many others are widely known and respected in the world. Their contribution to the struggle for peace and the interests of the working people is invaluable.

The Soviet mass information media actively participate in the common struggle. Their first and foremost task is precisely and fully to communicate to the world public the substance of K. U. Chernenko's statements which have a great effect on the minds of people and on world politics. In this connection, we are greatly assisted by the press organs of our friends abroad.

Interest abroad in the works of the Soviet leading figures is growing at this time. The publishing houses in the United States, Japan, India and other countries have started to publish the collected works of K. U. Chernenko.

At present, the CPSU is setting an entire package of major tasks for the Soviet press and for our entire foreign political propaganda and counterpropaganda.

FIRST, to persistently and intelligibly communicate to the masses the very essence and concrete substance of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, the

Warsaw Pact member countries, and the entire socialist community. To unmask the great lie about the "Soviet military threat" in whatever perfidious forms it may be served and with however Jesuitic falsifications it may be surrounded.

SECOND, to unmask the perfidious demagoguery claiming that the growth of the American military power allegedly strengthens peace and to reveal the real goals pursued by the United States and NATO in deploying new nuclear missiles in Europe. And at the same time, to tirelessly promote abroad with sound arguments the understanding of the USSR's honest position on missiles and nuclear weapons and on the question of negotiations, the position that is the only possible one under existing circumstances.

THIRD, to explain widely and in many ways the CPSU's internal policy and activity which are subordinated to improving the material and spiritual life of people, imbued with the ideas of construction, and oriented to high humane ideals, to disseminate the truth about the Soviet way of life, about the truly popular nature of our society, about our grandiose plans for perfecting real socialism, and about the fact that they, these plans and programs are calculated for decades of peaceful construction. And it is already for this one reason alone that these plans and programs are incompatible with any kinds of aggressive and belligerent intentions attributed to us by our ideological opponents.

FOURTH, a constant and aggressive struggle against the "crusade" is one of the tasks of our mass information media at home and abroad. We will continue to rebuff anticommunism and anti-Soviet slanders and the slanders against the fraternal countries and parties, the slanders flowing from the pages of the bourgeois press and from bourgeois radio and television.

FIFTH, in the spirit of immutable proletarian solidarity, our press and radio will continue to widely elucidate the activities of communists, revolutionary democrats and other progressive fighters; they will continue to show by striking examples their courage and steadfastness in the struggle against imperialism, for freedom and independence, for the interests of the workers class and working people of their countries, for real national interests, and for our common international cause. Together with them, we will also actively participate in unmasking the defects of capitalism and its reactionary policy and will demonstrate by facts that the imperialists are wholly responsible for the dangerous situation in the world and that the victims of their policy are the working people.

SIXTH, one of the currently important tasks of our press, television and radio is to widely elucidate the antiwar activeness of the masses, to spread the experience of the struggle for peace in various countries and to counter the attempts to confuse the antiwar movement and to introduce dissension into its ranks.

The CPSU stands in favor of solidarity and cooperation of communist and revolutionary democratic mass information media in the ideological struggle against imperialism and in propagandizing the ideas of peace, freedom and socialism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/14

LENIN ON THE SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84) pp 29-40

[Article by R. Aronov and L. Mikeshina on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the publication of "Materialism and Empiriocriticism"]

[Text] The problems of the dialectic of scientific knowledge, posed by V. I. Lenin in "Materialism and Empiriocriticism," which have drawn the particular attention of researchers, are assuming increasing importance today. It is precisely in this work that Lenin directly addressed himself to the theoretical substantiation of the forms and methods of scientific knowledge and, something which is particularly important today, brought to light the methodological functions of philosophy in the course of its establishment and development.

For the first time in the history of the study of science a profound philosophical study was made of the very nature of the scientific revolution, a study which was far ahead of its time. To this day it remains as an unsurpassed example of the specific analysis of the specific situation which developed in the natural sciences toward the end of the 19th century.

It seemed as though physics had reached completion: it had presented a streamlined and integral picture of the world, according to which all material objects consist of atoms which could no longer be split and had a fixed mass; all processes were reduced to the interaction between atoms, which took place as rapidly as possible. This picture was based on two fundamental laws of nature: the law of preservation of matter and the law of preservation and transformation of energy, as well as the other related laws of classical mechanics. The scientists were convinced that these concepts were sufficient to explain everything which was taking and could take place in the objective world.¹

However, by the turn of the 20th century the natural science views on the world were confronted with important tests. A. Becquerel and the couple M. and P. Curie proved that the atom is not divisible but complex. It became clear that the effect which material objects exerted on each other spread with a finite velocity and that the electron, which G. Thompson had discovered, did not have a permanent mass in the least. Its mass changed with its velocity. The physicists no longer understood their science. Some of them tried to rescue the universal nature of classical mechanics and the concepts based on it. Their efforts were futile, however. Others developed the view

that the materialistic outlook, which had become widespread, was groundless, that the world could not become known, that matter as such did not exist and that all there were were sensations experienced by the experimenter and certain products of the mind of the theoretician, to which nothing real in objective reality corresponded. Such physicists converted to the positions of idealism and agnosticism: a crisis broke out in physics.

In citing the familiar statement by H. Poincare, who had described the existing situation as a "general collapse of principles," Lenin pointed out that "the breakdown of the basic principles themselves proves (Poincare thinks), that these principles are not a copy, a photograph of nature or a depiction of something external in terms of the human mind but the products of this mind" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 18, p 267).² As a result of his study, Lenin reached the conviction that the revolution in the natural sciences had not turned in the least into a collapse of established concepts but had merely discovered the limits of their applicability (within which, as before, they were consistent with reality). The crisis in physics was not a crisis of its materialistic foundations; it was a crisis affecting metaphysics and the obsolete concepts concerning the atom, mass, substance and motion--anything which is described today in the study of science by the fashionable world "paradigm."

Lenin not only studied the crisis and the revolutionary processes in physics but, at the same time, developed the principles and the methods for the study and evaluation of such processes themselves. He made a general philosophical, gnosiological and methodological study of radical scientific changes against the background of and in a dialectical interconnection with evolutionary changes which precede scientific crises. Essentially, along with the solution of other fundamental problems, "Materialism and Empiriocriticism" includes recommendations and requirements concerning the profound dialectical-materialistic interpretation of a phenomenon such as a revolution in science.

The most essential feature here is Lenin's attitude toward the concept of methodology itself. He defended its true content and sharply criticized the approach taken by A. Bogdanov, the empiriomonist, according to whom the term "purely methodological" meant purely symbolic. In Lenin's view the real content of methodology is a reflection of objective reality "the adaptation to which is the nature of human experience and the photograph of which is the only scientific 'methodology'..." (p 281). The contemporary dialectical-materialistic understanding of methodology is based on this crucially important Leninist concept. Methodology consists of a relatively independent specialized area of the theory of knowledge, which studies the principles, methods and forms of scientific knowledge and cognitive activities. At the same time, Marxist-Leninist philosophy as a whole acts as the general and fundamental methodological base of all sciences. The development of methodology fully confirms Lenin's thought according to which his concept acquires a materialistic content only if it "proceeds from the objective nature of science and the acknowledgment of objective reality reflected by science..." (p 312).

Hence the primary fundamental principle governing the study of a developing science, which was not only repeatedly formulated but steadfastly used by Lenin in his work, is the identification and clear definition of general philosophical postulates and foundations of all methodological concepts relative to scientific knowledge. Lenin considered scientific methodology itself as an inseparable part of the general theory of knowledge, totally and basically defined from the viewpoint of scientific meaning and objective significance. That is precisely why in resolving strictly methodological problems, such as scientific theory and its development, changes in the scientific pictures of the world and the crisis and revolution in science, Lenin gave priority to gnosiological problems. Thus, in discussing the study of causal relations in science, he points out that "the truly important theoretical-cognitive problem which separates the various philosophical trends does not consist of the level of accuracy reached by our descriptions of causal relations and whether or not such relations could be expressed in a precise mathematical formula but in whether or not the objective laws of nature or properties of our mind, its inherent ability to recognize certain a priori truths, etc., are sources of our knowledge of such relations" (p 164).

On the other hand, Lenin repeatedly proved that in the case of an idealistic approach to science as well, to the natural sciences in particular, philosophical-gnosiological foundations are equally determining, regardless of how diligently its supporters hide behind various "technical" and "methodological" characteristics of scientific knowledge. This was already discovered by G. Berkeley, who was ready to acknowledge "within the framework of his idealistic theory of knowledge the entire natural science, and the entire significance and reliability of its conclusions." He "needs precisely such a framework and nothing but it in order to reach...conclusions favoring 'peace and religion.'" (p 22). This made it even more necessary to expose the idealistic theoretical-cognitive premises of the methodology of Machists and empiriocritics, who claimed the ability to provide a scientific substantiation of the "latest natural sciences" and the processes occurring within them. Therefore, Lenin considered all problems of scientific knowledge above all on the basis of essential general philosophical positions. This approach, which he developed and applied, must be taken as the first mandatory condition and prerequisite for any methodological study of science as a whole and the scientific revolution in particular.

As the international congresses on the logic, methodology and philosophy of science which have been held regularly in our time indicate, over the past 20 years the problem of the philosophical foundations of methodological analysis has become increasingly relevant and significant. Whereas the Marxist positions in this area have long been defined and clarified and require nothing but their creative application, non-Marxist researchers in the areas of scientific logic and methodology are encountering insurmountable difficulties. This follows from the collapse of the doctrine of logical positivism and the essential difficulties experienced by the "historical school" (T. Kuhn, I. Lakatos, P. Feuerabend and others), which are insoluble above all because of subjectivistic and relativistic trends in their philosophical premises. People who are still quite influential followers of bourgeois methodology, such as K. Popper and his followers,³ as well have been unable

to resolve satisfactorily the problem of "philosophical support" for their methodological elaborations.

The study of materials of recent congresses proves the serious advantage of the Marxist-Leninist approach not only in the formulation of a general program for philosophical-methodological study of science but in the specific implementation of this program: the elaboration of scientifically consistent concepts on the development of theoretical and empirical knowledge. Today Western philosophy is directly confronted with the need to take into consideration in models of the growth of knowledge not only intrascientific ties between theory and its interaction with practical experience but the influence of philosophical, conceptual and other sociocultural factors on this process. However, subjectivistic, relativistic and other similar initial postulates do not essentially allow the solution of such ripe problems. In the final account, the logical-methodological analysis itself is either reduced to a description with the help of formal-logical instruments or is replaced by problems of ethics or social psychology.⁴

Meanwhile, in recent years Marxist scientists have obtained substantial results in their study of the essential genetic aspects of scientific knowledge. Based on Lenin's theory of the scientific revolution and his behest concerning the "dialectical processing" of the history of the natural sciences and technology, the laws governing changes in the foundations of science during its crucial periods were discovered and a system of categories was developed for the reflection of such processes. In particular, concepts of the philosophical foundations of science, the scientific picture of the world, the style of thinking, scientific ideals and norms and scientific research programs, were explained. Also studied were the main stages and forms of scientific revolutions and their objective--logical-methodological, sociohistorical and sociopractical--prerequisites and conditions.⁵

Another most important prerequisite and a crucial requirement which Lenin emphasized is the consideration of science and its components as being in a state of constant development. This applies less to a crisis condition and revolutionary changes in science, which is another subject, than to changes at every moment and within any of the components of scientific knowledge. Lenin formulated this accurately in his second and third gnosiological conclusions, the main idea of which is that "in the theory of knowledge, as in all other areas of science, we must think dialectically, i.e., we must not presume that our knowledge is ready and unchanging but determine how knowledge comes from non-knowledge and how incomplete and inaccurate knowledge becomes increasingly complete and accurate" (p 102).

Lenin fully formulated the principle of the development of knowledge as the dialectics of relative and absolute truth and as the intensified content of philosophical categories (matter, motion, space, time) in relation to and dependent on the enrichment of natural scientific knowledge and the contradictory advancement of the outlook of natural scientists.

Important in terms of understanding Lenin's concept of the scientific revolution is not only Chapter 5, entitled "The Latest Revolution in the Natural

Sciences and Philosophical Idealism," but the entire work as a whole, for its first four chapters as well develop the conceptual apparatus of scientific methodology, needed for the theoretical study of the crisis in physics and the means to resolve it, and explain the nature of forms of knowledge such as concepts, laws and principles, hypothesis and theory, picture of the world and the outlook of scientists. The development and functioning of each of these forms, conceived from the dialectical-materialistic viewpoint, provide foundations and serve as a prerequisite for surmounting relativistic and subjective-idealistic interpretations of the revolution in science and the achievements of the dialectics of revolutionary and evolutionary processes in knowledge.

Lenin considers all concepts in their dynamics and change; he gives priority to their gnosiological (role in man's reflective activities) and ontological (what corresponds to them in objective reality) aspects. Lenin singles out four aspects of the process of shaping of concepts (space in particular): it is "a problem of how precisely, with the help of his various sensory organs, man perceives a space," and "the way, as a result of a lengthy historical development, the abstract concepts of space are developed from such perceptions" as well as "the question of whether or not such perceptions and concepts of mankind are consistent with objective reality independent of mankind" (p 194). Finally, he singles out the need "for firmly and definitively acknowledging the fact that our developing concepts of time and space reflect objectively real time and space" (p 183).

Lenin gave priority to the dialectical-materialistic approach to the interpretation of the nature of concepts. Like Engels, he did not reject "the need and scientific significance of the study of changes and the development of our concepts of time and space" which, however, should be preceded by the systematic solution of the problem "of the source and significance of all human knowledge in general" (p 182). Unquestionably, such a requirement blocks a relativistic, a subjective-idealistic concept of development and the "radical destruction of the old concepts" during the period of the scientific revolution.

Lenin's philosophical assessment of the nature of scientific theory is more relevant than ever today. The steadily increasing complexity of contemporary scientific theory, logical and methodological views on its structure, empirical basis, etc., again and again raise the question of the status of theory and its gnosiological and ontological aspects. For whereas today radical reductionistic trends of logical empiricism have been largely eliminated, instrumentalist and conventionalist interpretations are still quite widespread. We must bear in mind that Lenin's struggle is precisely against such types of idealism in the understanding of theory.

In explaining the views held by the British physicist A. Ricker in terms of the attitude toward the "values of fiscal theory," Lenin cited the following among his thoughts: "The controversial question is the following: ... Should the hypotheses which lie at the base of the most widespread scientific theories be considered as accurate descriptions of the structure of the world around us or merely as convenient fiction" (p 290). In other words, is

theory glued to objective reality and to matter in motion or else, as Lenin emphasized, "in terms of our argument with Bogdanov...it is nothing but 'methodology,' 'pure symbol,' or 'form of organization of experience'?" (pp 290-291). Ricker agrees that from the viewpoint of a convenient fiction theory would "facilitate the memory" and "bring order" in our observations. However, he also believes that the question remains: "...'Could we draw a conclusion relative to the structure of matter itself from phenomena discovered within matter'?" and 'Do we have grounds to assume that an outline of theory...is to a certain extent a copy rather than the simple diagram of truth'?" (p 291).

The answers to these questions become even more important when theory is tested by new facts and discoveries in a period of sharp destruction of old scientific laws, principles and concepts. As a natural scientist, Ricker believed that despite the approximate nature of some theoretical postulates and despite a number of individual difficulties, the theory of the atom is accurate in its essential features; atoms exist not only as auxiliary concepts of physical theory but as physical realities consistent with such concepts in objective reality. Such was the scientist's conclusion. Lenin dwelt quite extensively on Ricker's views, for "essentially, speaking unquestionably on behalf of most natural scientists, he supported the spontaneous-materialistic viewpoint. The essence of his views is that the theory of physics is a photograph (increasingly more accurate) of objective reality. The world is matter in motion, with which we are becoming increasingly familiar" (p 293).

Lenin paid equal attention to the views of another scientist--the Italian physicist A. Rigi--who rejected the tendency to consider theory "a convenient means for streamlining and comparing facts and a guide in the search for further phenomena." "Why does Rigi separate himself here from positivistic and utilitarian trends?" Lenin asked. "Because he, obviously lacking any definite philosophical viewpoint, spontaneously supports the reality of the external world and the acknowledgment that a new theory is not only a 'convenience' (Poincare), and not only an 'empiriosymbol' (Yushkevich) or merely a 'harmonizing of experience' (Bogdanov)..., but a further step toward knowledge of objective reality" (p 278).

Therefore, we have the spontaneous-materialistic concept of many natural scientists, on the one hand, and the positivist "emasculatation" of the actual, the objective content of theory, on the other, which particularly intensifies under the influence of the crisis in physics. Against this background Lenin's belief in the accuracy of the dialectical-materialistic interpretation of theoretical knowledge becomes particularly important. Despite essentially new discoveries, the old (classical) mechanics and the new (quantum and relativistic) physics, were and remain photographs, copies of one aspect or another or one facet or another of objective reality. Even a seemingly extremely abstract science such as mathematics is, in the final account, a reflection of objective reality despite the widespread opposite view.⁶ Lenin's ideas play an essential methodological and conceptual role in the formulation of contemporary dialectical-materialistic concepts relative to the structure, functions and development of scientific theory, becoming

substantially more complex along with the increased complexity of science itself. Today theory is considered the most developed form of scientific knowledge, the central component of which is an idealized object which is a theoretical model of essential links within reality, structured with the help of specific assumptions and abstractions.

Intensive use of mathematical and logical formalisms and the application of mathematical hypotheses and mental experiments enable us in frequent cases to develop theoretical knowledge not directly based on empirical data. In the final account, however, theory becomes the objectively accurate and real knowledge of the world only if it obtains empirical interpretation and confirmation of the fact that it is a "photograph or approximate copy of objective reality." This precisely is "what materialism means," Lenin emphasized (p 281).

Some difficulties in understanding the objective accuracy of scientific theories are also caused by the fact that quite frequently situations develop in modern science involving competing different theories which until that time were quite consistent with empirical data. This brought to light the important stipulation that the process of knowledge is not determined unilaterally by empirical data, that the way from fact to theory is not straight and that some theoretical claims do not directly match one side of the objective world or another. It was thus that contemporary scientific methodology encountered the problems which Lenin identified and assessed at the turn of the century when, in developing the theory of absolute and relative truth, he emphasized that "the limits of the truth of each scientific postulate are relative, expanding or shrinking with the further growth of knowledge" (p 137). In any case, the fluctuation of human concepts regarding the world around us and the "fluctuation of human concepts of space and time refute objective reality of both as little as the fluctuation of scientific knowledge regarding the structure and forms of dynamics of matter refute the objective reality of the outside world" (p 181-182).

Lenin laid these concepts at the base of the view of the scientific picture of the world as a special form of knowledge. "The picture of the world which is truly consistent with natural sciences and materialism" is characterized by the following: "1) The physical world exists irrespective of the human mind and has existed long before man, before any 'human experience'; 2) the mind, awareness, and so on. are a superior product of matter (i.e., of a physical object), and a function of that particularly complex piece of matter known as the human brain" (p 239). The claims of some natural scientists and philosophers to the effect that they include (or not) various phenomena of objective reality in one picture of the world or another are, to say the least, inaccurate, for such phenomena exist objectively and really, outside and despite any type of system of concepts relative to the properties and laws of nature. Actually, it is a question of theoretical images which enable us, on the basis of their interconnection with other elements of the picture of the world, to judge of the interrelationships existing among corresponding aspects of objective reality.

Lenin's view according to which materialism does not in the least mandatorily assert the "mechanical" electromagnetic or any other immeasurably more

complex picture of the world as being matter in motion (see p 296) is of basic importance in clarifying the updating of natural scientific knowledge in the course of revolutionary changes. These forms "merely express the deepened human knowledge of objects, and whereas yesterday this depth did not go beyond the atom and today it does not go deeper than the electron and the ether, dialectical materialism emphasizes the temporal, the relative and approximate nature of all such knowledge of the nature of advancing human science" (p 277).

This view on the nature and development of the structure of natural scientific concepts is the foundation not only of the theoretical study of the history and methodology of knowledge but a critical interpretation of the difficulties and contradictions inherent in many non-Marxist concepts of the philosophical foundations of science. Thus, the contemporary "scientific realists," even in their materialistic version (such as, for example, the noted Australian philosopher J. Smart) cannot combine the changed picture of the world and, as a whole, the very fact of the existing revolution in science, with the continuity of knowledge and the fact that scientific theories reproduce more or less adequately the state of affairs in the objective world.⁷

In analyzing Lenin's criticism of the Machists and the views relative to the statements made by spontaneous materialists-natural scientists and, in a certain sense, "starting from the other direction," it is possible to identify the existing features typical of the nonrevolutionary (evolutionary) period in the development of science. Thus, the excerpts borrowed by Lenin from the article by "rank-and-file Marxists" (I. Dine-Denes), prove that despite the actual state of affairs described by Engels in "Anti-Duhring," scientists have always proceeded from the conviction of the existence of fixed demarcation lines and differences, the static, absolute, indestructible and non-decomposing nature of elements, absolutizing scientific theories and their results, failing to realize that such absolute concepts "are introduced into nature exclusively by us" (see pp 264-265). In revolutionary changes in the views of philosophers and natural scientists are closely related to an awareness and reinterpretation of this situation.

But let us go on. It follows from Engels' familiar view, cited by Lenin, to the effect that "with each major discovery...materialism must inevitably change its form" (p 265) that during the period between scientific revolutions the dominant form of materialism (and, respectively, the understanding of matter, motion, space and time) has been erroneously identified with materialism in general as such. Revolutionary changes in science help us to realize the limited nature of this viewpoint and the adoption of a new form of materialism, consistent with the new scientific achievements. A process of transition takes place from metaphysical to dialectical materialism. The viability of metaphysical materialism is precisely related to the fact that in the period between revolutions in science it appears as a philosophy consistent with the existing level of knowledge of the surrounding world and it is only when looked at closely that it appears as a philosophy which absolutizes this level. That is why it considers science in a "state of crisis" as a "wreckage" and "general collapse of principles." Naturally, this questions the cognitive possibilities themselves of theory and science as a whole.

Lenin cites the situation described by A. Rey, the French philosopher-positivist, which preceded the revolution in science (see pp 268-269), according to which the scientists "agreed among themselves on everything essential," but differed only in the details; science applied unified and coinciding methods of research and interpretation; the scientists acknowledged the fullness and completeness of a specific science; the area of its applicability was extended to the entire objective reality; the legitimacy of a positive science was asserted together with the possibility of a "real knowledge of the material world." Rey characterizes this picture quite originally: "This was not a hypothetical expression of experience but a dogma." In assessing this scientific attachment as a "materialistic philosophy in traditional physics," Lenin emphasized that its proclamation as a "dogma" was the result of ignorance of dialectics and a feature which separated dialectical from metaphysical materialism."

The same scientist characterized the revolutionary situation in science on the basis of the precisely opposite features. On the surface, it is manifested above all in the fact that "extreme differences replaced previous unanimity, differences not in the details but in the main guiding ideas;" numerous schools appeared, the arguments of which were either different or direct opposites of each other (see pp 268-269). Lenin related one more proof of this "honorable positivist" about clear events which proved the distinction between the revolution in science and the previous period of its evolutionary development: "The moment a discovery is made which affects all areas of physics or establishes a major fact either previously unknown or not fully appreciated, the entire aspect of physics changes; a new period begins ... The historian...can easily see a steady evolution where contemporaries see only conflicts, contradictions and divisions into various schools... The crisis leads to the reorganization of physics, without which there would be neither evolution nor progress, without, however, changing the scientific spirit" (pp 323-324).

Although Lenin does not object to such a description of revolutionary events in physics, he cannot agree with Rey's general philosophical stand. In Lenin's view, this is a "pious falsehood," for "Rey the conciliator" does not draw an essential philosophical distinction between the numerous schools which appeared during the period of the crisis, hoping for the victory of the common "scientific spirit." Lenin's position is profoundly principle-minded, for he can see behind the external processes in science the fundamental changes which are taking place within it, which precisely ensure truly revolutionary changes. They include changes in the general methodological scientific foundations and premises; a reassessment of the cognitive possibilities of scientific theory and the objective significance of scientific concepts, laws and principles and of the picture of the world; finally, essential changes in the philosophical views of the natural scientists themselves. All of these basic steps are, as we may see, of a philosophical-conceptual nature and can be taken in a materialistic or idealistic direction, on the basis of dialectics or metaphysics.

That is why we cannot hope, along with Rey and many other scientists standing on the platform of "bashful materialism," that everything will take shape by

itself and that the "scientific spirit" will sooner or later gain the upper hand over fideism. All the processes of the "radical breakdown" and the ways and means of a solution to the crisis should be analyzed and assessed on the dialectical-materialistic level. It is not the "scientific spirit" in general but the "materialistically fundamental spirit of physics, as well as of all modern natural science, which will surmount any and all crises, but only with the mandatory substitution of dialectical for metaphysical materialism" (p 324).

The crisis in science itself cannot be considered in the least an inevitable and philosophically neutral process. The essence of the crisis lies precisely in the "rejection of objective reality outside the mind, i.e., of substituting idealism and agnosticism for materialism" (pp 272-273), and the fact that science and its theory are being misinterpreted from general philosophical positions: all that is seen in science and theory is the process of "creation of signs, notes and symbols" (p 269) and a "purely artificial means of influencing nature" (p 270), abandoning "the direct, decisive and irreversible acknowledgment of the objective value of its theories" (p 324). Hence the need for an efficient philosophical analysis and principle-minded evaluations as a foundation of processes taking place in science, previously considered unquestionable and causing no problems.

"Materialism and Empiriocriticism" provides outstanding examples of such analyses and evaluations. The work identifies above all the reasons for the crisis in physics at the turn of the 20th century and its gnosiological roots. Lenin proved that the new physics encountered objects which, unlike most objects in the area where the old (classical) physics applied, turned out to be impossible to perceive directly with our senses. Under these conditions the heuristic possibilities of the mathematical apparatus of physics were manifested with particular emphasis. The apparatus acquired a role which it did not have in the past of basic source of theoretical models with the help of which physics can describe the characteristics and behavior of material objects it studies. It is precisely the erroneous exaggeration of this role of the mathematical apparatus which leads to identifying material objects and their features with mathematical objects (which are only their theoretical models) and, finally, to Lenin's conclusion to the effect that "'matter disappears' and all that are left are equations" (p 326).

An equally erroneous exaggeration of the relative nature of our knowledge of the world around us, according to Lenin, leads to neglecting their objective content. "All the old truths of physics, so far considered unquestionable and inviolable, turn out to be relative truths. Therefore, no objective truth independent of mankind can exist. Such were the views not only of Machism but of all 'physical' idealism in general" (p 328). Lenin pointed out the essential distinction between the conclusion of the relative truth of knowledge of the surrounding world reached by E. Mach and his followers and their absolutizing of this conclusion. It was such absolutizing, rather than the conclusion that knowledge is relative which caused the crisis in physics. On the contrary, it was precisely the "lack of understanding of the relative nature of all scientific theories, ignorance of dialectics and exaggeration of the mechanistic viewpoint for which Engels blamed the old materialists.

However, Engels...abandoned the old metaphysical materialism in favor of dialectical materialism rather than of relativism which slides into subjectivism" (p 329).

As we know, W. Ostwald's energism supported the thesis of the "disappearance of matter." Ostwald replaced the concept of matter and mind with the concept of energy. However, as Lenin pointed out, in itself Ostwald's energetics approach to physical phenomena contains nothing idealistic. It is one of the varieties of the phenomenological description of phenomena, fully admissible in some stages of the development of science, particularly "at a time when the physicists...had left the atom behind but had not reached the electron" (p 302). The interpretation of the concept of energy, which is at the base of the claim brought forth by energism of having succeeded in "gathering within this concept both matter and spirit" (p 287). (Incidentally, subsequently Ostwald abandoned such unscientific claims unlike his numerous followers who are still trying to revive the idea of energism on the basis of data in modern physics, the physics of elementary particles above all.)

In brief, the crisis in physics, which Lenin characterized as the "dead products" of the revolution which had taken place in that science was, in the final account, the consequence of the fact that the physicists were not familiar with any form of materialistic philosophy other than metaphysical materialism and had not mastered dialectics. "The new physics plunged into idealism," Lenin wrote, "mainly because the physicists were unfamiliar with dialectics. They struggled against the metaphysical (in Engels' rather than the positivistic, i.e., Humist meaning of the term) materialism with its one-sided 'mechanicism,' throwing out the baby with the bathwater" (pp 276-277).

Lenin pointed out that at some stages in its development, exceeding the limits of an area of objective reality, science may encounter properties of material objects and interrelationships among them which may appear "strange" from the point of view of common sense. However, this has never meant that science thereby clashes with materialistic philosophy. "The human mind has discovered a number of strange things in nature and will discover even more such cases, thus increasing its power over it. This is not to say that nature is a creation of our minds or of an abstract mind..." he wrote (p 298).

Many aspects of elementary particles are "strange:" the force of interaction among quarks does not decrease but increases with the increase in the distance separating them; the transformation of quarks into leptons, thus violating the law of the preservation of the baryon charge, predicted by contemporary physics; the responsibility of Higgs [bosons] (based on the theory of low-charge interactions of Ch. Glashow, S. Weinberg and A. Salam) for the existence of a mass of rest in all elementary particles and, consequently, in the final account, in macroscopic and space objects....

Naturally, the scientific discovery of such unusual properties of material objects and interrelations among them conflict with metaphysical materialism which absolutizes such concepts but not at all with dialectical materialism, for one of the essential differences between dialectical and metaphysical materialism is precisely the fact that it "emphasizes the approximate, the

relative nature of all scientific stipulations relative to the structure of matter and its properties, the absence of absolute limits in nature and the transformation of moving matter from one state to another in an impossible way as we see it, and so on" (p 276).

It was precisely on the basis of this viewpoint that Lenin answered a number of questions which physics posed to philosophers by the turn of the 20th century, answers which were clearly confirmed in the course of the further development of science. During a time when the physicists were still unfamiliar with the microworld and assumed that electrons are the most elementary particles of matter, Lenin formulated his famous aphorism: "The electron is as inexhaustible as is the atom..." (p 277), which became one of the most outstanding scientific-methodological predictions. Lenin considered the essence of the transition from the old (classical) to the new (quantum and relativistic) physics in the fact that "our knowledge becomes deeper; properties of matter which previously seemed absolute...and which are now found to be relative are disappearing" (p 275). It was only much later that the natural scientists began to understand that it was a question not merely of the relative nature of knowledge of material objects and their characteristics but the relative characteristics of material objects themselves and that at the beginning of the century they had come across a new situation in which objective reality assumed an entirely different aspect.

Over the 75 years which separate us from the publication of "Materialism and Empiriocriticism," the physicists have frequently assumed to have finally reached some kind of "bottom" of objective reality and discovered its "last bricks." As time went by, however, they realized that such was not the case. The very fact that today quarks or Higgs, for example, claim the role of the most elementary particles of matter, changes nothing. As all previous claimants for this part, although being "the final bricks" in one respect, they may not be in another and it is in that sense that what Lenin said about the electrons applies to them as well: these are complex and inexhaustible objects.

In his philosophical testament--"On the Importance of Militant Materialism"--Lenin presents one of the main conclusions he reached on the basis of his study of the crisis in physics. It is that in order to interpret the philosophical problems triggered by the revolution in the natural sciences a materialistic answer to a basic philosophical problem is insufficient; it requires a firm mastery of dialectical materialism by the natural scientists, without which they would be unable to formulate the philosophical summations.

Reality has offered a full confirmation of Lenin's prediction. Let us cite only one of the many examples in this respect. In his address at the international symposium on "Structure in Science and Art," which took place several years ago in Kronberg (FRG), J. A. Wheeler, one of the most noted theoretical physicists, spoke of the "main paradox in contemporary physics" which, in his view, was that on the one hand "physics proceeds from premises according to which the world exists somewhere, regardless of any type of observation. However, quantum mechanics proves that the world does not exist somewhere regardless of any act of observation. In other words, the world

exists somewhere, regardless of us and, at the same time, it does not exist somewhere independently of us!" (J. A. Wheeler, "Law Without Law," in "Structure in Science and Art. Proceedings of the Third C. H. Bochringer Sohn Symposium Held at Kronberg, Taunus, 2-5 May, 1979." Amsterdam, 1980, pp 133-134).

Actually, there is not paradox whatsoever here, for quantum mechanics does not in the least "prove that the world does not exist somewhere regardless of any act of observation." Quantum mechanics proves something else: the specific nature of the limit of the objective world the characteristics of which it describes, and the qualitative distinction between the characteristics of quantum objects. The difference is that the properties of material objects which act as absolute and existing independently of each other in the area of applicability of classical physics prove to be relative and not existing independently of each other in the area of applicability of quantum mechanics (N. Bohr described these properties of quantum objects as supplementary).⁸

The relative nature of these characteristics of quantum objects is inherent in them objectively-really, outside and independently of any acts of observation, outside and independently of us. The erroneous identification of the dependency of additional properties of quantum objects on each other and their dependence on the acts of observation is the gnosiological root of the "paradox" which Wheeler mentioned.

"...We must understand," Lenin wrote, "that without a firm philosophical foundation no natural sciences or materialism could withstand in the struggle against the pressure of bourgeois ideas and the restoration of the bourgeois outlook. In order to withstand in this struggle and take it to the end with complete success, the natural scientist must be a modern materialist, a conscious supporter of Marx's materialism. In other words, he must be a dialectical materialist" (op. cit., vol 45, pp 29-30).

Lenin's analysis of the scientific revolution at the turn of the century and the conclusions he reached on its nature, mechanisms, objectives, motive forces and philosophical-conceptual and sociohistorical grounds are of essential importance in the study of such problems on the threshold of the future revolutions which will take place in a number of natural sciences. They are of essential importance in the further strengthening of the alliance between the natural sciences and dialectical-materialistic philosophy, for they greatly contribute to the unraveling of the problems which natural science presents to philosophy today and without the solution of which the successful development of natural science becomes greatly hindered. They also are of essential significance to dialectical-materialistic philosophy as well, which always confronts the need to improve its basic concepts through the profound interpretation on the basis of revolutionary party positions of the new results achieved in the field of scientific knowledge and sociohistorical practice.

FOOTNOTES

1. A typical event of its time was the one subsequently recalled by M. Plank, the founder of quantum physics. He had asked his teacher F. Jolly if it made sense to dedicate one's life to theoretical physics. The answer was the following: "Young man, why do you want to waste your life, for theoretical physics is essentially complete..., all that remains is to consider individual cases... Is undertaking such a futureless project worth it?" (quoted from M. Plank, "Yedinstvo Fizicheskoy Kartiny Mira" [Unity of the Physical Picture of the World], Moscow, 1966, p 239).
2. Subsequent references to this volume will indicate page numbers only.
3. On this subject see, for example, the following: V. N. Sadovskiy, "Karl Popper's Logical-Methodological Concept (Introductory Article)," in the book "K. Popper. Logika i Rost Nauchnogo Znaniya. Izbr. Raboty" [K. Popper. Logic and the Growth of Scientific Knowledge. Selected Works], Moscow, 1983, pp 24-28.
4. See "Seventh International Congress of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science. Salzburg, Austria, July 11, 16 1983," Abstracts, Section 6, Salzburg, 1983; "Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science," Abstracts, Sections 6, 8-13, Moscow, 1983.
5. See the works of B. M. Kedrov, V. A. Ambartsumyan, M. E. Omel'yanovskiy, V. A. Lektorskiy, S. G. Suvorov, V. S. Gott, V. S. Stepin, P. S. Dyshlevyy, V. V. Kazyutinskiy and others.
6. Noted French mathematician R. Thom was unquestionably right in claiming in his article "Contemporary Mathematics--Does It Exist?" that in mathematics "the real problem...is the problem of 'ontological justification' of mathematical objects" (MATEMATIKA V SHKOLE, No 1, 1973, p 91).
7. See J. Smart, "Philosophy and Scientific Realism," London, 1963.
8. For further details see VOPROSY FILOSOFII, No 4, 1984, pp 95-102.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/14

MAN AT HIS WORKPLACE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84) pp 41-52

[Article by Yu. Konishchev]

[Text] The Combine Plant imeni K. Ye. Voroshilov in Dnepropetrovsk will be celebrating its 90th birthday next year. The service record of this the oldest enterprise in the country is rich in events (the appearance of a new machine is a landmark in the difficult and, until recently, still manual labor of beet growers) as well as in rewards for the best possible quality and merits: order of the Red Labor Banner, 1971; Anniversary Honor Badge of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU, 1972; Memorial Badge of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee, 1980; Grand Prix of the World Exhibition in Brussels, in 1951 and 1961; and gold medal and diploma of the Leipzig International Fair, 1982. Starting with 1971, for 51 consecutive quarters the plant's collective has been declared winner of the sectorial competition; for 7 consecutive years it has been awarded the Red Challenge Banner of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee, and during 6 of those its name has been inscribed on the All-Union Honor Roll of the USSR Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy.

The beet harvesting combine and the sugar beet loader and cleaner, made by the Dnepropetrovsk combine manufacturers, are the best in the world in terms of almost all economic and technical parameters: cost, price, reliability, specific material intensiveness and high performance quality.

What has made such impressive results possible? Where are the reasons for them hidden? The answer is simple: they are in the people, in every worker at the plant and at each workplace.

The 'Level' of the Approach

A bulletin board with announcements such as "Needed--" with the usual lengthy lists of dozens of skills and professions urgently needed will not be found at the entrance gate of the plant.

What is amazing about this enterprise is that, conversely, for more than 5 years, it has been systematically eliminating jobs and reducing the number of workers. The released workers are used in expanding production facilities or

are placed in other enterprises, while various types of equipment become unnecessary. This applies to hundreds rather than individual pieces. Even more striking, however, are the results. During the past 5-year plan and the first 3 years of the present, the volume of output has more than doubled while, let us emphasize, production costs were reduced and labor productivity increased by a factor of 1.9. It is as though the country was given another plant over the past 8 years, without any particular capital outlays, funds or investments!

As we were told by the Dnepropetrovsk party obkom, the collective achieved this through internal reserves. Naturally, it was assisted by the oblast party organization and the city's scientific forces. However, the main credit goes to the collective with its rich revolutionary and labor traditions.

What were the profound layers of reserves which had to be exposed to achieve such production intensification and refute the view enduring in the minds of some economic managers to the effect that internal possibilities are frequently insufficient and are no more than half-measures?

"The time itself forced us to seek such reserves," said Laureate of USSR State Prize Aleksey Aleksandrovich Pokusa, the plant's director. "The country needed a great deal of sugar. The decisions of the 26th Party Congress and the USSR Food Program directed us, machine builders, to the development of equipment which could fully mechanize the process of growing and harvesting one of the labor-intensive farm crops with minimal losses of the 'sweet roots.' The implementation of this demanding task required new premises and personnel and substantial capital investments. However, the building of new plants is a time-consuming operation. Furthermore, the shortage of manpower could not be resolved with traditional methods. The possibility of filling additional jobs did not exist, for there is no surplus manpower in the city and the oblast.

"This is an acute problem which confronts not only us but the entire country. Every year hundreds of thousands of jobs become available but there is no one to fill them. Therefore, the shift coefficient of the equipment remains low. Is it sensible to have expensive idling machine tools? Furthermore, we lacked additional space in which to install them. As it is, we have only 11 square meters per machine tool, press or machine unit instead of 24 square meters as stipulated by the norm. Briefly, a number of problems had to be resolved."

Such problems were resolved at the plant with the help of the scientific principles of economic management. Above all, an objective idea of the enterprise's reserves had to be gained. The scientific approach to reserves begins with their realistic assessment. By surmounting mental inertia and improving the style and methods of economic management, the Dnepropetrovsk combine manufacturers reached the conclusion that they must begin with the very foundations, with the skeleton of this most complex social, economic, technical and production organism--the workplace. It is here that the outcome of the plan is decided and the high quality of output ensured. All problems of production economics are refracted through one aspect or another

of the workplace and depend on the extent to which it is consistent with the contemporary level of scientific and technical progress. The workplace determines not only the technical but the psychological factors which affect labor productivity and daily life and create a good moral atmosphere.

The decision was made to take a comprehensive inventory or, simply stated, take stock of the workplaces throughout the plant. This was assigned to the plant's scientific organization of labor laboratory, and a long-standing puzzle was resolved immediately. The plant had been spending huge amounts of money for new equipment with low returns. The NOT [Scientific Organization of Labor] personnel realized something which had long been obvious but had remained unnoticed by even experienced production workers as a result of the heavy influence of traditional concepts and habits. The study made by the NOT laboratory opened everyone's eyes: in the majority of cases the results were eliminated by the imperfect condition of the workplaces. For example, a new highly productive machine tool would be installed but the turner would lack even the simplest lifting attachment and would spend more than half his time performing heavy manual operations. Or else he would be unable to work at full capacity because of insufficient light or poor ventilation. The turners, on whom the impeccable work of the machine tools depends, even lacked a joiner's bench. Some workplaces were used for less than half a shift or were totally idle. At one point they had been needed. However, the manufactured items and the technology had been changed while they had been left behind as a "vestige."

The specialists at the NOT plant laboratory not only established the number of workplaces and equipment and drew up the "documents" of these places but, together with the workers, considered what could be done to facilitate and improve their work. Particular attention was paid to rationalization suggestions on improving the labor process. "We reached the conclusion," said Grigoriy Aleksandrovich Cherednichenko, deputy director in charge of economic affairs, "that the main link with which the entire chain of problems could be related was the certification of workplaces. Each workplace was comprehensively studied with the help of engineering methods: was it consistent with the stipulations of standard plans and the scientific organization of labor and was its existence expedient? Could one do without it and, above all, how could two, three or four workplaces be replaced with a single one? Based on the enterprise's standards, which are a kind of internal legislation, a set of engineering solutions was drafted and applied on reducing the number of workplaces by installing more progressive equipment and applying the latest technological processes.

The certification covered four areas: workplace equipment and servicing; labor planning and conditions; labor divisions and cooperation; and labor norming. Each of these was broken down into another four smaller elements. For example, labor planning and division was broken down into general workplace planning, sanitary-hygienic conditions, aesthetic requirements and labor and recreation regimen. What do sanitary-hygienic conditions, for example, consist of? They consist of noise and light indicators in the shop, temperature, the condition of the air and the convenient location of tools, i.e., factors which contribute to normal and safe work with the lowest possible level of fatigue.

The work place was not certified if it failed to meet the requirements of even a single indicator. The following dilemma arose: should the workplace be improved to the level of the standard design (if necessary for production purposes) or eliminated? As a result of this operation numerous unnecessary workplaces were "discovered," and eliminated not only without any harm but to the benefit of the production process (for example, the installation of one combined machine tool relieved 10 workers who previously used general-purpose machine tools). In a 5-year period 670 workplaces were eliminated and 584 workers released. This year the collective has pledged to eliminate another 100 workplaces.

"Whereas many workplaces have become 'vestiges'," Grigoriy Aleksandrovich went on to say, "the same could not be said of the machine tools. This too required some thinking. For many years we followed the principle that we could do without even the most necessary items but not without surplus equipment. We collected all equipment issued to us. If we were issued a machine tool, whether we needed it or not, we took it, just in case. And that same machine tool would remain in the shop, aging morally and physically and no one dared to write it off although this should have been done long ago..."

Looking at the plant's facilities somehow on the outside, exigently and self-critically, we realized that we had a large number of machine units which were not only morally and physically obsolete but were simply unnecessary in terms of the technological process. As a result, several hundred machine tools were proved to be unnecessary. They were dismantled and sold to kolhoz and sovkhoz workshops and to small enterprises. These were mainly general-purpose lathes which are irreplaceable in repair operations but are ineffective in series production. It was thus that in the course of a few years we sold 650 equipment units worth about 4 million rubles. We used this money to purchase highly productive machine tools and units and opened dozens of workplaces based on progressive technologies. By expanding the area serviced, reducing workplaces and replacing underproductive with progressive equipment, we released some 3,000 square meters of production area of which we had always needed. A considerable percentage of this area was used for amenities, rooms for psychological relaxation and as recreation areas. In other words, we used it to create better conditions for the workers.

The certification of workplaces is only part of the economic mechanism for upgrading production efficiency. It is an organic part of the comprehensive system of production quality control and efficient resource utilization (KSUKP and EIR), which was developed by the Dnepropetrovsk machine builders together with scientists from the local university. It combined everything best and progressive currently found in the country's enterprises: the "Dinamo" method, the Shchekino and VAZ experience, the Lvov and Saratov systems, etc. Naturally, even before the application of the system a great deal had been done at the plant to improve the utilization of capacities, to develop and produce new and more advanced machines, to upgrade production quality, to strengthen discipline and to create a stable collective. However, no comprehensive approach had been applied in resolving production and economic problems. The steps which had been taken were isolated and uncoordinated. For example, we would install a highly productive automatic machine

but the pieces it received were manufactured according to the old system and were obviously insufficient. We would make rapid progress in one item while falling behind in another and would be forced to concentrate all our forces on "tightening up" the rear. Frequently decisions were made on a trial-and-error basis. No precise, accurate and substantiated economic reasoning was available. What would be the result of an innovation and what would new equipment yield? The comprehensive system enabled us to control and ensure the solution of all basic current and long-term problems confronting the collective. It encompassed progressive economic management methods codified by the enterprise's standard and mandatory for every plant worker.

Planning and accountability were streamlined and strict supervision over the observance of the requirements of the normative-technical documents was organized. As a result, the level of performing discipline improved, the responsibility of the subunits and individual workers was enhanced and interaction between them in the production process became more efficient. Everything began to operate in an organized and synchronized fashion. This system enabled us to enhance the moral and material interest of the individual workers not only regarding the quality and efficiency of individual labor but the results of the work of the brigade, sector, shop, department and entire enterprise. Briefly, this is a set of interrelated and balanced organizational, engineering-technical, economic and social decisions in which everyone, from the worker to the director, is interested in improving quality and conserving resources.

Quality control and the efficient utilization of resources take place at all stages and levels of enterprise management: production development, preparations for production and series output, and machine operation. They are based on six interrelated scientifically substantiated principles: planning, organization, control, accounting, analysis and evaluation, and regulation. In addition to enhancing the technical standard and quality of output, this system enables us to resolve problems relative to increasing labor productivity, improving the utilization of basic productive capital, reducing outlays of raw and other materials per unit of output and as a result, increasing the output of high-quality goods. The system covers virtually all aspects of economic management of the enterprise as a whole and its structural subdivisions, including socialist competition and the use of manpower, material, energy and financial resources. The organization of the competition among piece-rate workers is an example. Some 2,500 workers are struggling to increase labor productivity at their workplaces. More than 2,000 are competing for faultless output and 316 of them have earned the title "Excellent Quality Worker" and have been granted the right to apply their personal seal--the signature of a master.

One of the best brigades at the plant is that of fitters-assemblymen headed by Ivan Petrovich Povirennyy, laureate of the USSR State Prize. The work of the assemblymen is responsible and requires mental and physical stress. At this finishing operation the machine assumes qualities which subsequently invariably affect its use: will it be obedient or capricious, reliable or become stuck at each rut. Everything depends on the skill of the fitter-assemblyman, whose "handwriting" will become familiar to many beet growers

in the field. It is here, in the assembly area, that a pass is issued to the machine and the person who "signs" it is important.

Eight members of I. P. Povirenyy's brigade had their personal seal, something like their own Emblem of Quality. The technical control department does not check the parts and assemblies they produce. This is the highest trust which could be awarded to a working person not only by the technical control department but by the entire plant's collective. The right to a personal seal indicates a tremendous moral growth! Such a person deliberately assumes a tremendous individual responsibility for any breakdown of the machine in the field, caused by a substandard part. He guarantees the excellent work of the item. This guarantee is not only the result of experience and skill but a new moral principle which entitles the Working person, with a capital W, to universal respect.

"We understand our duty and responsibility," Ivan Petrovich says, "and try to work so accurately and beautifully that we ourselves could admire it, the way a painter admires his own painting or a designer his creation. If such is the case no defects or breakdowns would occur...."

Added to other measures, the competition for faultless output has made it possible totally to eliminate cases of allowing rejects to pass through. For the past 11 years no complaints have been filed by the rural workers for machines produced by the Dnepropetrovsk Combine Plant.

Everyone Becomes an Economist

However advanced the system of accounting, labor organization, planning or management may be, and whatever potential possibilities it has, the first criterion of its merit is the result, the actual benefit. Even the most superior materials, advanced equipment and progressive technology cannot provide a 100 percent guarantee of high quality unless the worker is interested in it. Success in any project is ensured only when it involves the participation of the entire collective and when interest, initiative and creativity are manifested by managers, employees, chief specialists, workers, engineers and technicians. In order to have real benefits, the mere discovery and determination of "profound reserves" is insufficient. They must be utilized. Consequently, the practical organization of the project must meet the requirements of the system. It is a question of tangibly upgrading all indicators and achieving maximal results on the basis of scientific principles. Improvements must not amount to 2 or 3 percent. It is necessary above all drastically to upgrade labor productivity, profitability and capital returns. The quality, reliability and power of the machines must be raised to such an extent as to make them superior to worldwide standards or to similar items.

This is because frequently production reserves remain unused only because of the inability to see and use them quickly, as a result of a gap between economic and technological work and simply the inability to count. Today, however, the ability to count is an art which must be acquired by workers, foremen, technologists, designers, shop chiefs and the chief engineer. Without it no new way of economic management is possible nor could the principles

of true cost-accounting be mastered, which would ensure the best correlation between outlays and results in all plant sectors. That is why the plant's party committee and administration have emphasized extensive economic studies, for the sake of taking better into consideration and utilizing the collective's reserves and possibilities and to upgrade the economic knowledgeability of all its workers and specialists. This rapidly yielded tangible results.

The Dnepropetrovsk people, for example, successfully resolved a problem which had been discussed for many years: intensity of planned assignments. Appeals adopt stepped-up plans yielded no results, for many people were afraid of taking a risk. If such plans were not fulfilled the collective would lose its bonus which would not compensate for material rewards from additional profits (the 13th salary).

The personnel of the economic service and the labor and wages department suggested a system for material incentives for the adoption and implementation of stepped-up plans. Sectorial and intraplant interests were closely interwoven within it. A plan intensity coefficient was introduced--a ratio between planned assignments for the current year and accountability results of the previous year; indicators on the basis of which intensity and material incentives could be assessed were defined. From a large number of various indicators those which directly affect the end work results of the enterprises were chosen. For example, in the main shops four indicators became leading: size of the industrial-production personnel (labor productivity), wage fund, production cost and capital returns. All of them determine production efficiency and encourage intensive development. For example, if a shop would adopt a plan which is 10 percent more intense than that of the plant the amount of the bonus is increased by 5 percent of the overall amount; the opposite happens when a lower plan is adopted. At this point risk became justified and the loss of bonus because of a stepped-up plan was eliminated. The previous fears were replaced by the real possibility of earning a higher bonus. Furthermore, motivated by the possibility of losing the bonus, throughout the year the management and the entire shop collective are steadily increasing the volumes of output, reducing outlays and lowering the value of productive industrial capital by reducing workplaces and carrying out assignments with fewer workers. In other words, the entire collective earns its additional bonus by upgrading the quality of its actual work and intensifying its output. As a result, during the first 3 years of the current five-year plan capital returns increased by 11.9 percent; on 1 January 1984 they equaled 2.81 rubles per ruble of capital assets, or twice the sectorial figure. The equipment shift coefficient here reached 1.53, which is also higher than the sectorial average.

The economic and material incentives, which had now become efficient tools in the struggle for increased labor productivity, reduced production costs and improved quality, reasserted themselves in a new fashion.

"It must be pointed out," G. A. Cherednichenko pointed out, "that there is a direct relation between the level of the quality of organization of labor norming and incentive and the growth rates of productivity. The higher the quality of labor norming, the technical substantiation of output norms and

the frequency with which they are upgraded, the more the growth rates of labor productivity increase. Although the simultaneous review of output norms was eliminated in 1956, we reach the annual assignment on lowering labor intensiveness during the very first quarter. We try to review as many norms as possible, for failure to review them for long periods of time means 'preserving' the attained level of labor productivity."

Here assignments on the growth of labor productivity and volume of output per workplace are issued even to the individual workers. Bonuses are awarded to the worker or the brigade for their implementation. The average wage, which matches the average for the sector, is earned at the plant through intensive work and high rates of growth of labor productivity. Suffice it to say that the average wage growth rates per 1 percent increase in labor productivity were 0.16 percent for the first 3 years of this 5-year plan or lower than the average for the sector by a factor of 4.7. Last year labor productivity at the plant increased by nearly 5 percent while wages...declined by 0.5 percent.

Such figures are not customary. Could the reason be that here everyone has become an economist in his job? Reality has brought economics to the foreground and made people aware of it and of the logic of accurate computations. Otherwise neither the spirit nor the sense of the decisions of the 26th Party Congress and CPSU Central Committee plenums could be understood. The party considers economic criteria the main and most important feature of work. The plant's collective, its political nucleus--the party members--above all, understood this properly.

...The sector where SPS-42 beet-loading machines were assembled was considered the enterprise's bottleneck. Its small area made conveyor belt assembling difficult. The 56-member brigade barely managed to assemble one machine per two shifts. But then the young party member Dmitriy Pavlovich Vykhoanets was appointed head of the fitters-assemblers brigade. He had long drawn attention to himself by his workstyle, distinguished by a combination of professional skill and economic wisdom.

"Initially the work was hard," Dmitriy Pavlovich recalls. "Things were particularly tight in putting transporters together. We could assemble two or three elevators per shift. We realized that we had to develop an efficient production rhythm, plan everything accurately, assess each individual operation and save valuable minutes. Together with the shop's mechanics we designed and made special racks which made assembling the elevators more convenient. The result was that we were able to eliminate one workplace and today five to six elevators can be assembled per shift. The same occurred in assembling the main frame: in the past two workers put three assemblies together per shift. Today they complete six."

D. P. Vykhoanets suggested that a combined complex brigade be set up on a two-shift basis. Unnecessary workplaces became immediately apparent. The brigade was reduced to 24 people. As to productivity, whereas in the past one person assembled an average of 0.8 machines, now he could assemble four! A full high-quality beet loader comes off the conveyor belt in 1 hour. The brigade has submitted eight rationalization suggestions with savings totaling 100,000 rubles per year.

Other similar examples could be cited. At the stamping-welding shop the brigade headed by V. F. Militsa replanned its sector. Three workers were released, two presses were dismantled, output increased by 9 percent while labor productivity rose by 10 percent. Savings totaled 12,000 rubles. Quite recently, 42 people were engaged in cold stamping. They were not always able to meet their assignment and occasionally had to work during their free days. Following a thorough study of the entire technological process, the brigade suggested that eight underproductive machine units be removed and two new presses be installed instead. As a result, the number of readjustments declined by 20-22 percent and six workplaces were eliminated.

Similar changes occurred in the cone manufacturing sectors. The cone is the main working part of the sugar beet-harvesting combine. It is precisely the cone which loosens the ground and allows the pickup header to extract the beets easily and without damage. Its manufacturing included 15 operations. A total of 54 persons worked at 19 workplaces in three shifts. However, the service life of the cone was short and it had to be replaced three times per harvesting season, which is a difficult operation. Valuable time was lost at the peak of the harvest and the sugar content in the beets dropped as a result of harvesting delays.

A set of measures suggested by designers, technologists and rationalizers was developed and applied, totally changing the cone manufacturing technology. Currently only three operations are necessary. Twelve workplaces were eliminated and the staff was reduced by 14 people. The service life of this part was tripled and today replacing it during the harvest has become virtually unnecessary. Savings from the use of cast cones exceeded 2 million rubles.

Here the practice of combining technological with economic research has become firmly established. For example, it took three machine tools to make one of the combine's parts. The operation was both unproductive and unprofitable. Technologist V. D. Mel'nik and adjuster A. P. Agapov assessed the entire process of this operation, concluding that it could be simplified without lowering the quality of the part. This led to the elimination of two workplaces and two machine tools....

This type of economic approach enabled the machine assembly shop alone to reduce its personnel by 72 people in 3 years. In other words, the new system of indicators made it possible to implement the most important economic principle of working with minimal outlays and maximal results.

The Dnepropetrovsk experience proves that hand-in-hand with the workers, every specialist must look for reserves and turn on a daily basis to the treasury of popular experience, worker initiative and cunning. It would have been hardly possible to implement all such steps and achieve such results with orders issued by the administration had there been no collective interest. The sober and realistic approach, which excluded arbitrary and unsubstantiated decisions, was felt in all areas. It became crystal clear that everything depends on the initiative, on the socialist enterprise of the entire collective rather than on separate although outstanding individuals.

Thus, for example, how was the brigade form of labor organization firmly established here?

"The plan kept increasing," says Hero of Socialist Labor Aleksey Andreyevich Kulakov, chairman of the brigade leaders' council, "and its implementation was no simple matter. As we stirred our tea, we began to think. This 'unsweet' sugar was the result of hard work. We too were helping agriculture but whenever we would leave a village, I admit, our eyes were downcast. With the old labor organization we could not sharply increase the volume of output. We would be looking for tools or demanding scarce parts or even throwing tantrums. Our experienced comrades, the so-called 'kings,' requested assignments consistent with their high grade, i.e., which were profitable. Therefore, the output of 'profitable items' far outstripped the planned figure although the amount of finished goods was inadequate. Obviously, why produce 100 bolts if matched by only 50 nuts? 'Unprofitable' items let the entire plant operate on starvation rations. But why work for the warehouse instead of the consumer? The collective had to change its way of thinking. It was necessary to prove that work based on a common order would benefit all. Proof had to be provided through substantiated studies and accurate computations. On the eve of the war the brigade worked on the basis of a common order. The DIP produced a daily volume of output which amazed the designers of the machine tools. The saying now is that the times made this necessary. However, have the times ever been such as to dampen our ardor? What does a common order mean? It means that everything is subordinated to the common objective--to the end result. It is when the collective is not simply a brigade but represents a united, creative search, exigency and individual responsibility for resolving common problems, when it embodies everything included in the concept of 'workers' honor,' and a feeling of duty. A worker's honor is, if you wish, a feeling of being the master of the country and being responsible for everything, not only for oneself, but for the brigade, the shop, the plant and the city. When such moral qualities become an inseparable part of everyone the brigade becomes the type of united collective which can perform even the most complex operation. The brigade's aktiv, the party members above all, found a way to prove the advantage of the new method. Scrupulously, second by second, together with the norming workers, the workday of the individual workers was "photographed" and it immediately became clear that most of the time was wasted as a result of lack of organization and sometimes improper interrelationships. This hindered the establishment of a suitable psychological climate.

After a close study of the experience of the Kaluga Turbines Plant, we decided to apply the brigade form of work based on a single order, adapted to our own circumstances.

The clearly formulated assignment made it necessary for the brigade to ensure the manufacturing of assemblies which the plant needed at any specific time. Many people realized that no fruitful work could be done in the collective without mutual trust and comradely support. The manufacturing of more profitable and less labor-intensive items was no longer emphasized. Parts were no longer produced on an impersonal basis. Idling was totally eliminated and the work became more rhythmical....

Whereas several years ago more than one-half of the commodity output was produced during the last third of the month, today the figure has declined to 33.3 percent. In other words, today the rhythm coefficient has reached the figure 1. This is important, for in the more complex intra- and intersectorial relations a great deal depends on rhythmical work: marketing, profits, and prompt financial accountability. The enterprise's economic indicators rose at a headlong pace. For example, during the first year of work according to the new method, the cog-cutting brigade headed by A. A. Kulakov increased its output by 16 percent while labor productivity became 27 percent higher.

Eighty-three percent of the personnel in the main and 100 percent in the auxiliary shops apply the brigade forms of labor organization and wages. All brigades are paid on the basis of a single order and earnings are divided in accordance with the labor participation coefficient; two-thirds operate on a cost-accounting basis. Currently all brigades, sectors and shops meet their output norms. The norms are also faced with less staff, for the workers have an interest in this: the wage fund is fixed and broken down by year for the entire five-year period. Cadre turnover has declined sharply and has totally disappeared in some brigades. There is no absenteeism. Working time losses per worker per year average about 2 hours, or lower than the sectorial average by a factor of 8. This form of labor organization and incentive was adopted on the initiative of the collective itself.

"The comprehensive system," noted Vitaliy Alekseyevich Bugayev, plant party committee secretary, "raised the quality of the work in the collective. The quality of labor is, above all, an indicator of duty and responsibility. It is a feature of the personality of the working person worthy of admiration not only in terms of production but on a broader, moral level, in which the shoots of communist labor become visible. It is when the worker begins to work without looking back, with full dedication, without concealing reserves. It is when the worker begins to do more than was required by the shift assignment, without any order but from personal conviction and initiative. The comprehensive system and the brigade organization of labor harmoniously combined the interests of society, the collective and the individual and achieved their main objective: work at capacity strength."

On the Basis of the System for Moving Ahead

Dozens of beet loaders and combines are lined up ready for shipping out at the plant's yard, their blue paint shining like Ukrainian skies in springtime. Vadim Georgiyevich Kuz'minov, deputy chief of the head design bureau for beet harvesters, slowed down his walk as he passed in front of one of them:

"Sugar beet growers throughout the country are thankful for this six-row self-propelled machine. It has earned the reputation of being the best in the world. This is the fourth time it has been granted the state Emblem of Quality. Whereas our first-born, the single-row SPG-1 trailer, took 10 hours to harvest 1.4 hectares in sugar beets, this one can harvest about 2 hectares an hour. The former was operated by a crew of three, whereas this one

requires a single operator. Just imagine, labor productivity has increased by a factor of 30! The combine has essentially new running parts unlike any others in the world. The machine operates with an automatic pilot instead of being driven by the mechanizer. The less the mechanizer becomes involved in driving it the better the quality of the beet harvest becomes. In 1980 our specialists were awarded the USSR State Prize for its design...."

Vadim Georgiyevich spoke so interestingly that we were surrounded by a group of tourists, for the plant is visited by a large number of delegations. He ended up by giving an improvised lecture for the group....

All types of work ennoble man. However, work performed with joy and pride creates a particular impact, when a person is aware that it is needed, and that its results are awaited in the country's fields. The more so since reaction to the plant's output has been only positive. Here is the text of a telegram sent by M. F. Myskov, manager of the Sudzhansk Production Association in Kursk Oblast: "The SPS-4.2 beet loaders produced by your plant have proved to be highly efficient and reliable. They are deservedly rated as being of superior quality. Our rayon has 8,000 hectares in sugar beets. It needs more than two beet loaders. We urge you to help the rayon and, on an exceptional basis, ship to us another beet loader" (let us note parenthetically that one such machine can load 200 tons of beets per hour and was awarded a gold medal in Liepzig).

N. V. Usov, chief engineer at the Kolkhoz imeni Ya. M. Sverdlov, Vyselkovskiy Rayon, Krasnodar Kray, wrote enthusiastically that "the RKS-6 root-picking self-propelled machine is reliable and simple to operate. It allows us to harvest the sugar beets in accordance with agrotechnical requirements and with minimal losses, even at night. The beets harvested with this machine are so clean that they can be delivered to the plant without further manual cleaning. After the sugar beet harvest the MTZ-80 tractor, which generates the power for the machine, can be used in other agricultural operations..."

What type of road was followed by the Dnepropetrovsk machine builders since 1948 which led them to outstrip the best models in the world? Today every second beet-harvesting combine in the country is produced by the Plant imeni K. Ye. Voroshilov. The plant successfully applied the modular principle of a power generator, a problem which puzzled the developers of machine systems for many years. The RKS-6 self-propelled combine and the SPS-4.2 beet loader were designed to work in combination with the Belarus' tractor. After the beet harvest the tractor is uncoupled, put on wheels and can be used for other types of work.

These machines are much cheaper and lighter than any foreign models. Ever since their production was undertaken 7 years ago, the norm of rolled metal outlays was lowered from 5.2 to 3.7 tons for the combines and from 5.4 to 4.3 tons for the loaders.

All in all, specific rolled metal outlays per millions rubles of commodity output were reduced from 950 to 375 tons, or by a factor of 2.5. The quality of the machines has improved steadily. They have become lighter, more economical and more reliable. Currently 82.5 percent of the entire output has

been awarded the Emblem of Quality. The metal thus saved is used for the production of above-plan machine units. Even technological and finishing waste is used in the manufacturing of pieces and spare parts.

These results have yielded great economic advantages to the sugar beet growers in the country. Whereas during the 10th Five-Year Plan as a whole savings totaled 75.5 million rubles, they will reach 78.3 million in 1983 alone.

However, even such highly efficient items have been left behind, so to say, by the Dnepropetrovsk combine builders. The plan practices the outstripping system. It looks not only at the immediate future but is already creating the machines of the future, the drawings and pictures of which can be seen in the designers' portfolios. New and updated power-saturated sugar beet harvesters and more efficient loaders will be produced between now and 1990. They will ensure the high quality harvesting and loading of the beets particularly under extreme growing conditions. They will include the MSK-15 mechanized assembly line for the storing of sugar beet seeds, picking trailers and self-propelled machines operating on the basis of an essentially new conserving technology involving a two-stage beet-cutting, combines with a rotary mechanism for picking the beets and hydraulic-powered combines and beet loaders.

The plant's collective is striving toward a new economic management level. It intends to make a quality leap by converting from the certification of the individual workplace to that of the entire existing machine manufacturing technology! This will require a reconstruction and expansion of the areas. After this has been accomplished, the enterprise will triple its output of machines which are so greatly necessary for the successful implementation of the Food Program.

However, many problems and snags appear at this point.

"Within this time," says Grigoriy Petrovich Chubarchuk, chief of the capital construction department, "we must make capital investments in excess of 95 million rubles. However, the construction workers are short of production capacities and even the available ones are used at other projects. Unless the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Heavy Construction takes efficient steps, the assignments will not be met during the remainder of this five-year plan...."

Let us frankly say that other problems which hinder the collective's highly productive work exist as well. For example, the plant operates at a pace which outstrips the one reached by the ministry as a whole by a factor of 2 or 3, but its funds are no different from those of all other enterprises and the wages paid are average for the sector. Obviously, the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building and the local party and state bodies must study this situation carefully and resolve these and other problems.

In creatively resolving the problems set by the party and the government and implementing obligations backed by precise computations, comprehensive analysis and economic knowledge, in the first 3 years of the five-year plan the collective was able to reach a higher quality level and gain experience in improving production, planning and management. Today, in the fourth year of

the five-year plan, it is working with greater confidence and increasing its output with the lowest possible outlays.

In competing for the ahead-of-schedule implementation of the Food Program, the combine manufacturers resolved to make 1984 a year of shock work and adopted a counterplan which calls for overfulfilling the annual assignment for higher labor productivity by 1.3 percent, reducing production costs by an additional 0.6 percent and manufacturing a variety of items worth an additional 600,000 rubles from materials thus saved.

The practical results achieved by the Dnepropetrovsk machine builders confirm the existence of tremendous opportunities in our labor collectives. In his speech at the February 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Comrade K. U. Chernenko pointed out that "the greatest, one could say the inexhaustible reserve for our progress is our ability to see promptly and to support popular initiative in the broadest meaning of the term--from an economical and creative attitude to the work at the workplace to active participation in the management of the state and society. To one extent or another our economy owes all of its major accomplishments to the creative initiatives of labor collectives and to their own counterplans." The Dnepropetrovsk experience is an outstanding example of such a creative initiative. Here people who are curious and who search are at work. Unquestionably, they will make a worthy contribution to the creative achievements of the developed socialist economy.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/14

INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF THE BRIGADE CONTRACT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84) pp 53-64

[Article by P. Lomako, USSR minister of nonferrous metallurgy]

[Text] At the end of last year the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU considered the question of the further development and enhancement of the efficiency of the brigade form of labor organization and incentive in industry and past corresponding decrees. These decrees make it incumbent upon ministries and departments, managers of associations and enterprises and party and trade union organizations to analyze thoroughly the condition of the use of the brigade method of labor organization and incentive and to take steps to ensure the systematic development and enhancement of its effectiveness. Currently the workers in nonferrous metallurgy are working on the implementation of this stipulation.

The brigade "form of labor organization and incentive was given a pass to life on the initiative of front-ranking collectives," Comrade K. U. Chernenko pointed out. "It was born in the very thick of the masses and is the result of the social creativity of the people.

"An efficient way of increasing labor productivity, typical of our system, was developed. A proper method was found for combining the interests of the individual worker, the collective and society. This is one of the basic problems in socialist construction from the economic, sociopolitical and educational viewpoints."

Nonferrous metallurgy is one of the most important basic industrial sectors which largely determines technical progress, the pace of development of the entire national economy and the strengthened defense capability of the country. Its fast growth was triggered by the extensive development of electrification, machine building, instrument making, radio electronics and aerospace, rocket, nuclear and space technology. The need for aluminum for canning farm products, the construction of grain storage facilities and other quickly constructed installations is increasing. An increasing number of nonferrous metals with high aesthetic properties and with the property of being combined with various other materials are being used in the production of consumer goods.

The working people in the field of nonferrous metallurgy are resolving major problems during the 11th Five-Year Plan. Great importance is ascribed to

strengthening the ore base of the sector and the building of new and reconstruction and expansion of operating enterprises. This enables us to improve the ratio between the raw material base and metallurgical output and better to satisfy the needs of the country for nonferrous metals. A set of large-scale organizational and technical steps is being taken, aimed at surmounting the negative influence on the level of labor productivity and production efficiency of the lowered metal content in extracted ores and the worsened mining-geological conditions in mines and quarries.

In planning the further development of nonferrous metallurgy, one of the most important steps which the Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy has taken has been the necessary organizational work to make brigades the main form of labor organization and the primary unit in production management.

Since the beginning of the 11th Five-Year Plan, with every passing year nonferrous metallurgy has been fulfilling its planned assignments and increased its volume of industrial output.

Last year the collectives of nonferrous metallurgical enterprises and organizations fulfilled their plans for the production of aluminum, rare metals, rolled metal, items made of carbon materials and procurements and processing of nonferrous metal scrap and waste, the plan and additional assignment on the production of cultural and household commodities and planned assignments on labor productivity, production cost and profits. The plans for the production of nonferrous metals, hard alloys, chemical fertilizers and most types of chemicals were fulfilled. Goods worth hundreds of millions of rubles were marketed above the plan.

The sector assumed socialist obligations for 1984 according to which thousands of tons of nonferrous metals and alloys are to be produced above the plan, to fulfill the annual plan for production marketing by 13 December, to reach a 1 percent above-plan increase in labor productivity and additionally to lower production costs by 0.5 percent.

From the very first days of the year the working people in nonferrous metallurgy undertook an extensive search for reserves, as a result of which they were able to overfulfill their planned obligations for the above-plan increase of labor productivity during the first quarter: the obligations were overfulfilled by 2 rather than 1 percent and obligations on lowering production costs were met. The purposeful and stressed work of the enterprises and steady supervision and aid on the part of all-union industrial associations and ministries are guaranteeing the fulfillment of assumed obligations.

Worker brigades, which already account for 65 percent of the workers in the sector, are making a decisive contribution to reaching these indicators.

Socialist competition for increasing labor productivity and fulfilling the 1984 assignments and the 11th Five-Year Plan as a whole ahead of schedule, initiated by 15 front-ranking brigades, has become widespread at nonferrous metallurgical enterprises and organizations.

After a close study of the nature and specific conditions of the production process, the leading brigades decided to ensure for 1984 above-plan increases in labor productivity ranging from 2 to 10 percent, to fulfill their monthly production assignments by 1 to 3 days ahead of schedule, to lower outlays of normed materials, raw materials and power resources, to raise the coefficient of equipment used by the brigades by 5 to 10 percent and steadily help related collectives to do stable work.

The brigades are successfully meeting their obligations. For example, the Komsomol-Youth ore-mining brigade at the Khrustalnenskiy Ore Mining-Concentration Combine, headed by A. K. Kupriyanov, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy, pledged to increase labor productivity by 5 percent above the plan. Instead, since the beginning of the year it has actually increased it by more than 6 percent.

The initiative of the frontranking collectives was supported by thousands of sectorial brigades, the overwhelming majority of which work on the basis of a single order (normed assignment). As confirmed by practical experience, it is precisely in such brigades that labor productivity increases faster, resources are spent more thriftily, greater interest is shown in end results and greater control is exercised over the measure of labor and wages.

The combined comprehensive brigade of smelters at the Nadezhdinskiy Metallurgical Plant of the Norilsk Ore Mining-Metallurgical Combine, headed by Yu. N. Krasovskiy, is one of the best. This brigade operates under the difficult conditions of the development of new technology and complex equipment. The efficient organization of the work in the use of a continuing technological process is made possible as a result of total interchangeability of personnel and common interests which exclude reasons for usual reciprocal claims which previously occurred with changing shifts. The brigade members have submitted several rationalization suggestions which reduced the time for filling the bucket with metal, increased the reliability of the equipment and reduced metal losses in smelting. The brigade mastered plant indicators ahead of schedule.

The experience acquired in ferrous metallurgy convincingly proves the expediency of the comprehensive dissemination of the brigade form of labor organization and incentive.

To this effect, in coordination with the Metallurgical Industry Workers Trade Union Central Committee, the Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy drafted a comprehensive program for the development and improvement of the brigade form of labor organization and wages at enterprises and organizations for 1981-1985. The program includes specific assignments on the application of this progressive form by all republic management organs in nonferrous metallurgy, all-union industrial associations and subordinate enterprises. The assignments are based on a detailed study of the organization of the work, which was made on the instructions of the Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy as early as 1980 by the Center for the Scientific Organization of Labor and Production Management in Nonferrous Metallurgy (TsNOTtsvetmet). Furthermore, a program was drafted on the main trends to be followed in upgrading the efficiency of the brigade form of labor organization and wages.

This is above all a means of orienting production management toward brigades, i.e., toward the timely preparation for and drafting of their planned assignments, both current and long-term; organizing the accountability of the results of brigade labor and providing information on attaining the stipulated indicators; insuring the brigades with raw and other materials, power, equipment and instruments in amounts needed for the successful implementation of planned assignments; introducing rationing cards for basic materials and opening thrift accounts; providing the brigades with repair, transportation, control and other services.

Secondly, this calls for the self-management of primary labor collectives and their active participation in enterprise management, ensuring a permanent staff and organizing the selection and training of brigade cadres. As Article 18, "Basic Rights of the Brigade Production Collective" of the USSR Law on Labor Collectives stipulates, it is very important to ensure the full exercise of brigade rights in staffing them, the appointment of the brigade leader, wage distribution and possibility of participating in making administrative decisions through the brigade and brigade leader councils.

The organization of wages based on a single order (normed assignment) in accordance with end results and the distribution of earnings among brigade members in accordance with the labor participation coefficient (KTU) are major prerequisites for upgrading the efficiency of brigade work. According to the sectorial program, on the basis of improved intraproduction cost accounting, brigade cost accounting and its superior form--brigade order and (in accordance with the features of continuing output) the most efficient forms of the brigade organization of labor--combined comprehensive brigades--are being applied.

The directors and chief engineers of all the enterprises, and the heads of the republic nonferrous metallurgy management bodies and all-union industrial associations are personally responsible for the implementation of these programmatic assignments.

The development of the brigade form of labor organization and wages is systematically considered by the ministry's collegium and the councils of association directors; the implementation of their resolutions is monitored.

A sectorial conference of mining enterprise workers, which considered in detail steps to improve the brigade organization of labor in ore mining, took place in Tashkent in 1981. During the conference Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy managers met with brigade leaders in the leading sectorial enterprises. A frank discussion on the reasons which are hindering the application of the brigade method took place. Shortcomings in ensuring the stability of brigade membership, planning brigade activities, labor norming and wages and procurements of raw and other materials and spare parts were exposed. Specific steps were taken on all such problems raised by the brigade leaders at the meeting. Regular meetings between heads of the ministry, members of the collegium and association managers, on the one hand, and brigade leaders, on the other, help more rapidly to eliminate shortcomings in the development of the brigade organization of labor and to accelerate the dissemination of progressive experience.

Nonferrous metallurgy is a sector using complex multiple-stage technology. That is why the choice of the most suitable forms of brigade organization of labor and wages, which take into consideration the specifics of individual production facilities, requires the constant and profound study of progressive experience. The comprehensive program for each subsector assigned base enterprises for the development of the most efficient brigade forms of labor organization and incentive and for training specialists and brigade leaders in progressive practical experience at such enterprises.

Such base enterprises included the Chelyabinsk Zinc Electrolysis Plant, the Zaporozhe Titanium-Magnesium and the Uchalinskiy Ore Mining and Concentration Combines, the Pure Metals Plant and a number of other leading sectorial enterprises which had achieved high production results in recent years largely as a consequence of the development of the brigade form of labor organization. Thus, labor productivity at the Pure Metals Plant, where 90 percent of the workers are organized in brigades, increased by 17.5 percent in 1983 alone.

During the past 3 years most base enterprises organized sectorial schools in which progressive experience in upgrading the efficiency of the brigade organization of labor was studied by shop, sector and brigade managers working in related enterprises. Increasing attention is being paid to studying the experience acquired in the development of the brigade organization of labor within the system for the economic training of the working people. For the students of "Collective Forms of Labor Organization and Brigade Cost-Accounting" course, offered at communist labor schools, sectorial recommendations were drafted which concentrated on progressive experience in organization brigade work planning and assessment, improving wages and labor incentives, the practice of the use of KTU and other most important problems of activity of worker collectives.

The study of the condition of the organization of labor organized by the sector proved that although many metallurgical production facilities used a traditional form of labor organization and wages, based on the use of large machine units and equipment systems serviced by groups of workers, some enterprises gave the names of brigades to collectives of shifts and sectors without a brigade leader and brigade council. Previously such collectives had not been issued planned assignments or established even a minimum number of cost-accounting indicators. The wages and bonuses of members of such brigades are in many cases determined individually, in accordance with indicators and bonus sizes differentiated by profession. Such collectives were not primary units in the production management system in the full meaning of the term and have failed to reach the necessary growth rates of labor productivity and proper organizational and educational influence on production results. In fact in such brigades, responsibility for production results is lower than in brigades headed by brigade leaders.

The following example shows the advantages of brigades paid on the basis of end results for single orders. In 1983 the title of USSR State Prize laureate was awarded to V. I. Plakhov, head of a comprehensive brigade at the rolled metals shop of the Artemovskiy Nonferrous Metals Processing Plant. In 1983

the brigade was assigned the manufacturing of a very labor-intensive and difficult copper band which was previously made by workers whose wages were based on individual results. Previously, some members of the brigade were paid for rolling the metals, others for pickling and cleaning and others again for cutting. In the final account, no one was held responsible for defects or low output of usable items. The creation of brigades paid on the basis of a single order for finished output delivered to the OTK [technical control department] greatly changed the attitude of the people toward their work. Every brigade member mastered several skills. Comradely mutual aid and tutorship became the norm in the collective. Today V. I. Plakhov's brigade is successfully coping with assignments and has the right to its personal seal which guarantees the production of high-quality goods only.

The Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy pays particular attention to the application of the brigade contracting order, for it is precisely this form of brigade cost accounting which ensures the greatest interest and responsibility on the part of the labor collective and its individual members for upgrading production results and enables every working person to be most fully aware of the social and economic advantages of collective work.

Let me point out that the brigade contracting method was applied in non-ferrous metallurgy as early as 1979. The experience of those who initiated the method in the nonferrous ore enterprises in Kazakhstan, the Transbaykal and Yakutiya convincingly proved that this method would make it possible to increase labor productivity in mining operations, which are the most labor-intensive technological stage in nonferrous metal production, and would accelerate the development of ore mining. It was for that reason that the ministry approved a standard regulation on the brigade contracting method for such enterprises, which call for increasing the interest and responsibility for improving end results on the part of the brigade and the administration. This substantially accelerated the dissemination of brigade contracting in ore mining. The number of contracting brigades increased by a factor of 2.5 over the past 4 years.

The best results are achieved by the large comprehensive combined brigades, to which contract orders are assigned not for the fulfillment of individual technological operations or reaching a specific volume of mining operations but for extracting the amount of metal stipulated by the plan. The contracting is for an entire year and calls for the implementation of the entire set of operations required in metal extraction. The comprehensive brigade at the Polyarnyy Ore Mining and Concentration Combine in Magadan Oblast, headed by V. G. Grechko, USSR State Prize laureate, consists of 52 underground miners. The collective, which was one of the initiators of the sectorial socialist competition, has been working on a contract basis since 1979 and has steadily overfulfilled planned assignments for metal extraction. The brigade fulfilled its annual plan on 9 September 1983 and the assignment for the first 3 years of the 5-year plan even earlier, on 15 June 1983. The brigade members have applied a number of suggestions on extending the service life of the equipment. For example, they have designed their own scraper buckets which they repair themselves and engage in preventive repair services between shifts. Such a concerned attitude enabled the brigade to save on various

materials, equipment and electric power worth 344,000 rubles in 4 years of contract work. That which is to the advantage of the state is also to the advantage of the individual worker in a contract brigade, whose monthly earnings, thanks to bonuses for saving no resources, have reached 67 rubles. The brigade council is doing good work and is actively participating in formulating the plan for mining operations, organizing the socialist competition, strengthening labor and production discipline, improving the condition of safety equipment, and establishing the labor participation coefficient of the individual workers.

Practical experience indicates that the use of the contracting method has yielded good results in concentration factories as well.

Thus, a combined comprehensive brigade was set up at Concentration Factor No 3 of the Yakutalmaz Production Association, which included the personnel of four technological shifts in the sector and a repair worker team. The brigade, totaling 85 people, as stipulated in the norms, was headed by the experienced concentration worker and party member Hero of Socialist Labor R. I. Tomilova. In April 1981 this collective signed a contract order. In less than 3 years the brigade's labor productivity increased by 20 percent. In 1983 it saved electric power and materials worth about 50,000 rubles. The brigade is successfully fulfilling all stipulations of the contract although it is six members short. As a result, the average wage of its members increased by 11 percent.

Every year more than 10 percent of the workers at nonferrous metallurgical enterprises are upgrading their skills at courses on the study of progressive labor means and methods. The experience of R. I. Tomilova's brigade was studied at such a course, as a result of which a comprehensive combined brigade was set up at the concentration sector in March 1982, also working on the basis of the brigade contracting method. This brigade included the workers of all four technological shift links and a repair worker team. The brigade successfully fulfilled all planned assignments for 1982 and 1983 although it reduced its personnel by 6 percent. During the fourth quarter of 1983 alone the brigade lowered production outlays by 46,000 rubles. From the bonus earned for such results the brigade council allocated 1,500 rubles for bonuses to 13 engineering and technical workers who had made the greatest contributions to the collective's achievements.

Factory chief A. G. Zbaratskiy and the entire engineering and technical personnel of the enterprise are extensively involved in the application of the brigade contract at Concentration Factory No 3.

The experience of this factory and a progressive method of labor organization are being applied by the other subunits in the association. The use of brigade cost accounting at Concentration Factory No 12 increased the efficiency of brigade work and reduced idling of technological equipment by 20 percent and attained a 17.2 percent increase in labor productivity during the first 3 years of the five-year plan. The same type of labor organization helped to lower violations of labor and production discipline by a factor of 2.5, cadre turnover by a factor of 1.5 and working time losses compared to the periods

which preceded the use of the contracting method. The desire of the workers to master all fine points of professional skills and to broaden the area of services has increased: the 125 brigade members mastered related skills. In 1984 more than one-half of all technological personnel in the association's concentration factories are already members of collectives applying the brigade cost accounting method. The brigade contracting method is being successfully applied at other production subunits within the association which was awarded the Red Challenge Banner of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee for its 1983 work accomplishments.

Reality has convincingly proved the importance in socialist production of the role of frontrunner--the patriot, the individual who is not only convinced of the rightness of our cause but who totally dedicates himself to its implementation. One of the initiators of sectorial socialist competition is the famous drilling brigade in the same association, headed by S. M. Denisenko, bearer of the Order of the Labor Red Banner. This collective, which practices the brigade contracting method and operates two SBSH-250MN drills, drilled nearly 170,000 linear meters through difficult rock strata in 1983 and every month fulfilled its assignment 2 days ahead of schedule. The contract helped the drill operators to master the related skills of electric fitter and mining equipment repair worker, electric welder and hoist operator more rapidly. Currently specific brigade members who have mastered the various elements of the structure and are ensuring their reliable work are responsible for the condition of the most important assemblies of the drills. The rationalization suggestions submitted by the members of the brigade headed by S. M. Denisenko and by the brigade leader himself helped to increase drilling speeds and to improve the reliability of the hydraulic power system; they accelerated the starting of machine tools at low temperatures in the winter and facilitated their servicing. According to the norm the brigade must consist of 16 members. However, it is able to fulfill its assignments with 14. It has shortened the time for auxiliary operations by 30 percent and drilling speed per meter by nearly 25 percent.

However, the brigade contracting method is important to us not only because of economic results. Its social and moral influence is particularly substantial. The contract helps to mold a new type of managers of labor collectives. Sergey Mikhaylovich Denisenko is an example of this. He is 32 years old, with 15 years' labor seniority and he mastered the skill of drill operator 10 years ago. S. M. Denisenko is an able instructor and educator, but it may be more accurate to describe him as the educator of the entire brigade, which is characterized by an atmosphere of comradely mutual aid and exigency. Naturally, however, a great deal is contributed by the brigade leader, who willingly shares all the secrets of his skill with the young workers. S. M. Denisenko has trained six young drilling machine operators and assistant operators. Some of them have themselves become brigade managers. M. P. Pun'ko, for example, heads another leading collective of drillers.

S. M. Denisenko's brigade is sharing its experience with all drillers in the quarry. The training course on the brigade's leading experience helped to

improve the work indicators of the entire quarry collective. S. M. Denisenko is chairman of the council of brigade leaders of the ore mining and concentration combine and deputy chairman of the association's brigade leaders' council. He is also member of the combine's and the association's party committees. He also finds time for the children in the sponsored school. He himself is a correspondence student at the Irkutsk Polytechnical Institute. The nonferrous metallurgy sector has many such true leaders of labor collectives!

Naturally, they develop as excellent production organizers, and the CPSU Central Committee decree on steps to upgrade the efficiency of the brigade method of labor organization and incentive, which stipulates the creation of conditions which would facilitate the managers of new-type brigades to acquire high and secondary specialized training, is quite timely.

The educational role of the brigades and their influence on retaining young people on their jobs are of particular importance in our sector. The point is that in recent years the number of workers 45 years old and older has increased at nonferrous metallurgical enterprises. Whereas they accounted for 24 percent of the total in 1977, in 1983 they accounted for 27 percent. Furthermore, at enterprises in several subsectors, such as the copper and polymetallic industries and nonferrous metal processing, workers over 45 account for about 35 percent of the staff. Consequently, intensifying the professional guidance of secondary school graduates, as the Basic Directions of the Reform of General Education and Vocational Schools stipulate, with a view to encouraging them to join nonferrous metallurgy enterprises and the improved vocational training of workers at school or on the job must be combined with steps aimed at keeping young people in production work as speedily as possible. Unquestionably, the new-type brigades--the best collective instructors of young people--play a decisive role in the implementation of such tasks.

It is very important that the successful work of the comprehensive brigades which have contracts on planned metal extraction has made it possible to convert from the brigade order to a contract which extends to all primary labor collectives in the mining sector, including the engineering and technical personnel. The cost-accounting mining sector, which signs a contract order with the enterprise's administration, may include not only mining brigades but the personnel of transportation, repair and other auxiliary services. All accounts between the enterprise and the cost-accounting sector are based on the amount of extracted metal at a price per unit of output stipulated in the contract. The bonus is paid only after all contractual stipulations have been met. In 1984 the ministry drafted a regulation on the cost-accounting sector which mines on the basis of a collective contract and is paid for end labor (metal) results. This regulation is already applied at 16 sectors, quarries and dredging units of mining enterprises.

The application of the collective contract method increases the interest of all workers in improving the end results of their labor, for the contracting order includes a system of labor incentive and material responsibility for cost-accounting results of collective activities.

That is why the ministry is creating and will be improving organizational and economic conditions for the development of brigade cost accounting and brigade contracting for ore mining operations, used by 33.7 percent of the miners in 1983, as well as in other production facilities. A great deal remains to be done to improve the planning of brigade work and metallurgical enterprises, particularly in secondary nonferrous metallurgy and nonferrous metal processing plants.

The labor collectives must conduct steady educational work and convincingly prove through examples that the brigade form of labor organization and wages, based on high labor, technological and plan discipline, alone has very extensive possibilities of upgrading the economic efficiency of the production process. This is the most important task in building developed socialism. It is important to organize the accounting of outlays of material and fuel and energy resources within each brigade as rapidly as possible as well as control over equipment work and repairs. This is the most important prerequisite for the use of true cost accounting in production. This will require a great deal of production management efficiency and concreteness, particularly on the higher levels, and extensive energizing of the efforts of the technical and economic services and the material and technical procurement and transportation bodies. This directly applies to the republic management organs, the all-union industrial associations and, naturally, the central apparatus of the Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy, whose personnel must ensure all the necessary conditions for the highly productive work of the brigades. Commitment, precision and high responsibility must become the main criteria in assessing the contribution of individual engineers, economists and employees to the overall project of increasing the influence of comprehensive brigades on upgrading economic efficiency in the work of production sectors, mines, shafts, shops and enterprises. This is a nationwide project to which everyone must contribute.

The all-union planning, procurement and transportation organizations must actively participate in resolving problems of upgrading brigade production efficiency.

In implementing the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Further Development and Enhancement of the Efficiency of the Brigade Form of Labor Organization and Incentive in Industry" and the USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU decree "On Measures for the Further Development and Enhancement of the Efficiency of the Brigade Form of Labor Organization and Incentive in Industry," the ministry drafted a standard regulation on brigade cost accounting at nonferrous metallurgical enterprises, in which along with methodical recommendations on organizing the planning of brigade work a procedure is stipulated for the stimulation of cost accounting results of their activities and the obligations of functional services and officials on the organization and application of brigade cost accounting have been concretized. The regulation calls for issuing to the brigades planned assignments on volumes of output, variety, labor productivity (as a rule in physical indicators), wages (wage norms per unit of output), qualitative and technological production indicators, and outlays of raw materials, materials and fuel and energy resources. The brigade's planned assignments must be closely related to the indicators of the sector, shop and enterprise as a whole.

Developing the brigade form of labor organization and taking steps to increase its efficiency are subjects of particular attention on the part of the ministry's collegium and the heads of all-union industrial associations. Ministry officials visiting enterprises mandatorily consider such problems. It is largely thanks to this practice that the brigade form of labor organization and wages has become basic, even at nonferrous metallurgical enterprises which previously used the method of individual organization of the work.

Thus, only 38 percent of the workers practiced collective labor methods in nonferrous metal processing in 1980. Currently more than 60 percent of the processing workers work in brigades many of which successfully use the advantages of the brigades of a new type in achieving high technical and economic indicators.

In the past the individual form of labor organization predominated in hard alloy production as well. However, by 1983, 86 percent of the workers at the Kirovgrad Hard Alloys Plant which, in accordance with the comprehensive sectorial program had become the base enterprise for the development of the brigade organization of labor at the Soyuztverdosplav Production Association, were working in brigades. Most of the brigades are paid on the basis of a single order (normed assignment) for final output. Ninety-five percent of the brigades have brigade councils and almost 80 percent of the collectives apply the labor participation coefficient (KTU) in the distribution of brigade earnings. The plant will reach the level of labor productivity planned for the end of the five-year plan in 1984. The entire increase in the volume of output in labor-intensive types of work is being achieved without any increase in personnel. The combined comprehensive sintering brigade, which was set up at the beginning of 1981, became one of the initiators of the sectorial socialist competition. K. A. Buslayev, a young party member, who has mastered several related skills, heads the brigade, all of whose members have secondary technical training. In 2 years of work the brigade increased its volume of output by 40 percent and labor productivity by 60 percent. As a consequence of applying the brigade cost-accounting method, in 1983 alone raw and other material savings totaled almost 11,000 rubles and 195,400 kilowatt hours of electric power were saved.

How was the collective able to achieve such high results? The creation of a combined brigade, paid on the basis of end labor results, ensured the unity of interests of sintering workers working the different shifts, which is quite important in upgrading production quality and eliminating time losses during shift changes, for the sintering cycle takes about 2 days. With the help of the plant's engineering services the brigade members mastered the skills needed for repairing the complex equipment. They reduced the length of repairs by nearly one-half and significantly extended the service life of the equipment between repairs. All brigade members became active rationalizers, who are collectively developing and applying suggestions aimed at the automation and mechanization of production processes. For example, the brigade itself designed the reconstruction of the furnace floor. This enabled it to increase its productivity by 50 percent and to apply the containerized hauling of the output. After the brigade members earned their certificates

entitling them to drive electric hoists and operate telfers, hauling operations became fully mechanized. All of these measures enabled the brigades significantly to expand its service area. Whereas previously the sintering workers managed two-three furnaces, today the brigade services as many as five. Such are the advantages of brigade cost accounting and worker initiative.

The brigade does not train the working people at work only. The beneficial influence of the collective is manifested also during collective recreation, in studies and in raising the growing generation. As a rule, the brigade members share interests and frequently develop family friendships. At the aluminum plant in Bratsk, the titanium-magnesium combine in Bereznikovo and at other enterprises sports competitions among shifts and brigades are particularly popular. Entire brigades visit cultural clubs and sportsgrounds together. Friendship within the brigades contributes to success in the socialist competition.

Enterprise managers and party, trade union and Komsomol organizations play an important role in the organization and development of brigades. Their day must begin with a review of the results of the brigade's work. They must systematically visit the labor collectives. Such precisely is the method practiced by Ye. D. Samusik, director of the Bereznikovo titanium-magnesium combine, V. P. Levanov, the combine's party committee secretary and G. A. Naymushin, its trade union committee chairman. The 100 party members in the brigade, many of whom have worked more than 15 years at the combine, deserve great credit for the labor successes of the combine, which is among the repeated winners of the all-union socialist competition. Party membership at the Kirovgrad hard alloys plant has increased by one-third over the past 2 years. Currently 70 percent of all brigades include party members and more than 20 percent of the brigades have party groups. This is the result of the daily organizational work of the party committee and the enterprise's management.

Currently the brigade has become the basic primary unit in the production management system and the party and public organizations in most enterprises in the sector. The comprehensive intensification in the party's influence in these collectives is contributing to the realization of the economic, social and educational advantages of the brigade form of labor organization. Participation in the accountability and election party conferences and meetings held in Moscow, Leningrad and Tajikistan and in Monchegorsk, Kolchugin, Norilsk and others and in the organizations of the Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy enabled the sectorial managers not only to become more familiar with the life of the brigade members at enterprises but also to help the party members to define more accurately the basic trends for production intensification. Thus, for example, the accountability and election party conference at the Kolchugin nonferrous metal processing plant resolved to restore the tradition of a monthly review of economic results of primary labor collectives and to make fuller use of the suggestions submitted by the working people on work improvements. It was entirely justified for the CPSU Central Committee to recommend to ministers and other managers systematically to participate in meetings and other events of primary party units and labor collectives.

As a rule, the most respected and reputable workers, technicians and engineers--party members familiar with production conditions--head brigades, brigade councils and brigade leader councils in decisive production sectors. Through their personal labor example they train their fellow workers in a conscientious attitude toward labor and in achieving high labor results, aware of V. I. Lenin's view that it is under socialism that "for the first time the force of an example gains the possibility of exerting mass influence" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 191). It is thus that the progressive vanguard role of party members is put to practical use.

Contemporary production conditions, ever increasing technical availability and the scale of the brigades formulate strict requirements regarding the knowledge of junior commanders--the brigade leaders. For that reason, for the past 3 years the sector has been training brigade leaders and their backups, who must attend a "brigade management" course, use of the brigade organization of labor in nonferrous metallurgy, methods for the distribution of collective earnings, pedagogical foundations of managing a labor collective, problems of developing a moral-psychological climate in the brigade, foundations of labor legislation, labor and equipment safety and many other subjects.

More than one-half of all enterprise brigade leaders have been trained at such courses and have acquired the necessary knowledge for successfully managing primary labor collectives. This five-year plan all brigade leaders in the sector's enterprises, link leaders and brigade members who are considered a reserve for promotion to managers of labor collectives will undergo such training. This creates a reliable reserve of workers who can perform the difficult yet honorable role of leaders of production brigades.

The enterprises in the sector have energized the training of members of comprehensive brigades in additional skills. The frontranking collectives have already reached virtually total interchangeability. For example, 90 percent of the members of the combined comprehensive cost-accounting milling workers brigade consisting of 50 workers, headed by Ye. K. Slyusenko, at the sheet metal sector of the Artemovskiy Nonferrous Metal-Processing Plant, have mastered a second skill. Starting with 1 January 1983, the brigade has had the right to a personal seal with which it guarantees the quality of finished goods delivered to the warehouse. This enabled it to release six OTK controllers. It is important that within that time no single complaint has been addressed to the plant on the quality of the items produced by the brigade. With the help of fitters, who service the technological equipment, the brigade members make preventive examinations and current repairs of the equipment, as a result of which the equipment utilization coefficient reached 0.95 and labor productivity increased by 10.1 percent in 1 year.

It was no accident that this collective was declared the winner of the all-union socialist competition of brigades of workers in leading professions in nonferrous metallurgical enterprises for 1983, while Ye. K. Slyusenko was awarded the title "Best Plant Foreman."

The experience of the milling brigade at the Artemovskiy Nonferrous Metal Processing Plant and the combined comprehensive brigade in the main building of the Uchaly Concentration Factory, headed by Senior Foreman F. Ya. Akilov, which won the all-union socialist competition in honor of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR and which initiated the 1984 sectorial socialist competition, confirms the expediency of including in the consolidated brigades working on a single order and using complex technology, engineering and technical personnel and assigning them the management of labor collectives. The ministry is persistently working on the further study and dissemination of this progressive experience which contains substantial reserves for improving labor organization and upgrading its productivity, reducing production costs and improving production quality. The struggle which has developed at the nonferrous metallurgical enterprises for upgrading the efficiency of the brigade form of labor organization and incentive, and the organizing role which the sectorial comprehensive program plays in this project have yielded results. In the course of the first 3 years of the five-year plan savings exceeded 21 million rubles.

The 30,000 brigades which work at mines, quarries and enterprise shops have become a truly progressive shock detachment of the working people in the sector, which sets the tone in the development of the socialist competition for ahead-of-schedule fulfillment and overfulfillment of plans. Seventy-two percent of these collectives work on the basis of the progressive system--with a single order--compared to only 52 percent at the beginning of the five-year plan. The number of comprehensive and combined brigades and cost-accounting collectives using the brigade-contracting method has increased. The implementation of the ideas and stipulations of the 26th CPSU Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums is beneficially affecting this major undertaking.

However, we can also clearly see shortcomings in planning, accounting and stimulating brigade labor. Thus, 33 percent of the brigades at the Soyuzmed' All-Union Industrial Association are without annual planned assignments. Not all collectives using the brigade contracting method are implementing the stipulations of their contracts. For example, one of the associations in Magadan Oblast had about 100 such brigades in 1983. The ministry is making daily efforts to eliminate such shortcomings.

It is very important to note that in the brigade form of labor organization, in a number of cases the consequences of the unbalanced nature of plans and shortcomings in material and technical, transportation, power and other services to primary labor collectives is felt more sharply. We must always accurately determine whether the nonfulfillment of planned assignments by a brigade has been the result of objective reasons or the inefficiency or disorganization of management services. This calls for increasing the responsibility of the managers of enterprises, all-union industrial associations and administrations of the Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy for creating the proper conditions for productive brigade labor.

The ministry's collegium and party committee, the enterprise managers and local party and trade union committees steadily supervise the condition of

this work in the sector and monitor the specific contribution of every worker in its implementation. The Komsomol organizations are most actively participating in the life of Komsomol-youth collectives.

According to already established practice, this year the ministry is sponsoring a conference at the USSR Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy on exchange of experience in the work of brigade leaders. Socialist competition winners and frontranking collective managers will describe the brigade cost-accounting method and the application of new and progressive labor organization methods. Particular attention will be paid to determining and eliminating reasons which reduce brigade labor efficiency.

The miners and concentration and metallurgical workers, who are persistently applying all the best features from the experience of progressive enterprise brigades, are working for the successful fulfillment and overfulfillment of the planned assignments for 1984 and the 11th Five-Year Plan as a whole and their socialist pledges and for supplying the national economy with non-ferrous metals.

In formulating and implementing plans for their actions, the Soviet people always check them against the course charted by the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent plenums of the party's Central Committee, a course aimed at intensive development of the economy, further enhancement of the well-being of the Soviet people and strengthening the defense capability of our great homeland.

In the course of his meeting with the voters, Comrade K. U. Chernenko said "In production the Soviet person must act as a full and responsible owner." In implementing the party's instructions, the working people in nonferrous metallurgy are making the brigades the basic method of labor organization in production.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/14

GENIUS OF RUSSIAN CULTURE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84) pp 65-73

[Article by V. Kukharskiy]

[Text] The name of the great Glinka reminds us of the entire Russian school of composers. We link to him the advent of a new historical period in the development of Russian culture. Glinka proved himself as one of the greatest and unique personalities in art. His contemporaries justifiably described him as the "dawn of Russian music," which marked the beginning of an amazing blossoming of national classical music. What makes his exploit even greater is the fact that at its very source Glinka was able to create immortal works which have retained a tremendous life-bringing power to this day, fully expressing the spiritual genius of the Russian people and becoming powerful peaks, the roads and paths to which are difficult to traverse even by the most outstanding musicians.

Glinka is invariably rediscovered by each new generation of Russian composers and his works seem to be written not in the past but during their own lifetime, for they were and are unique, perfect and profound, full of greatness and untold beauty at all times. Toward the end of the 1870s, in preparing Glinka's opera scores for publication, N. Rimskiy-Korsakov recorded the following entry in his famous memoirs: "Letopisi Moyey Muzykal'noy Zhizni" [Chronicles of My Life in Music]: "I knew and worshipped his opera even before that. However, as I edited the scores for printing, I had the opportunity to go through Glinka's style of execution and orchestration, down to the last small note. My admiration of and reverence for this brilliant person had no limit. How delicate, simple and natural was everything he composed! ... I thirstily absorbed his entire style.... To me this was a beneficial school which led me to the path of contemporary music...."

In precisely the same way Glinka "led onto the path of contemporary music M. Mussorgskiy, P. Tchaikovskiy, A. Borodin, M. Balakirev, S. Rachmaninoff, A. Glazunov and other great composers of our past native musical culture and the classics of our Soviet period: S. Prokof'yev, D. Shostakovich, A. Khachaturyan, R. Gliere, Yu. Shaporin, N. Myaskovskiy, Z. Paliashvili, U. Gadzhibekov.... Whenever they strove toward the unknown and to "new shores," they approached the eternally living Glinka as a close contemporary of theirs, checking their searches against the ideals of nationality, realism and humanity, exhaustively interpreted in his works, and penetrating the secrets of his wise and refined mastery.

During his lifetime Glinka experienced the joy of recognition and the hidden or open hostility of the powers that be, the world of the aristocracy; nor was his private life smooth. The future composer spent a happy childhood and adolescence in the Smolensk area, in the Novospasskoye village, not far from Yelnya. He was the offspring of an old family line whose ancestors had numbered many great warriors. Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka was born in 1804. His many talents were revealed at an early age: he painted well, displayed a rare gift for foreign languages, loved to read travel books and enthusiastically described to his family the wonders of the world which tempted his imagination. It was as though a "secret premonition" existed, hinting that Glinka's fate would involve extensive wandering in his constant thirst for the discovery of new "musical worlds" as well as the bitter need to flee from the oppressive atmosphere of Tsar Nicholas' rule.

The youngster's most vivid impressions had to do with music. Since the age of 6 he eagerly listened to the ringing of church bells ("and I was able," as the composer later wrote, "skillfully to imitate the bell ringers by striking two copper wash basins"); this began in his native Novospasskoye village and, subsequently, in Orel, to which the Glinka family had fled during the invasion of Napoleon's armies, followed by their inglorious retreat on the road to Smolensk. He also acquired a solid music education and self-education. From an early age Glinka, who had an unusually sensitive pitch, had absorbed the Russian melodies sung to him by a pleasant young nanny; the boy also listened to the touchingly sad songs of girls as they mowed the hay, the ancient playful songs of the peasants and the music of the serf orchestras, which had trained many outstanding self-educated performers and were true keepers of Russian national culture, songs above all. Glinka spent many years in a folk song environment, spending his summer holiday at home during his schooling as a boarding student at the Petersburg Pedagogical School, and after graduation.

Many years later, Glinka was to recall that "my uncle's orchestra was to me a source of the greatest enthusiasm. When it played for dancing...I would take a violin or a small piccolo and mimic the orchestra.... At lunchtime it usually played Russian songs.... I particularly liked these sad and tender sounds...and it is perhaps these songs which I heard in my childhood which became the first reason for the fact that subsequently I began to develop primarily Russian folk music."

Glinka's creativity was born in the element of folk songs. "Music is my soul," the small Misha once told his family. He could have also said that songs became the soul of his music. He did not forget it in Petersburg, where he plunged into improving his mastery of the piano with then-known pianists, where he practiced the violin and studied harmony and counterpoint by himself.

Glinka willingly visited the homes of an ever-broadening circle of acquaintances, where there was always music, popular romances were being performed and chamber ensembles and orchestras performed the works of Western European composers. He made a particularly close study of these works during his summer trips at home, playing various instruments and conducting his long-familiar uncle's orchestra.

Glinka's first romances came out in 1824. They became popular among Petersburg's music lovers. Nevertheless, the composer's main objective at that time was to study Russian art as profoundly as possible and comprehensively to master foreign classical condition.

The incredible rapidity with which Glinka reached the highest level of musical professionalism, as though instantaneously rising over his predecessors and contemporaries, some of whom were first-rate talented masters, may seem strange initially. Actually, everything was explainable and was the result of a number of historical and cultural premises. It was they who favored the blossoming of Glinka's genius. His wise and classically disciplined mind reached insights in the area of already formulated ideas and ideals in the creation of a domestic music trend, never before implemented on such a gigantic scale.

Glinka and Pushkin were men of Russian culture of the Decembrist period. Better than anyone else they were aware of the scale of the sociospiritual and artistic legacy of the 18th century. Let us recall that it was that century which brought to life comprehensively educated and thinking intellectuals-educators and that the last third of the century gave us Radishev, Derzhavin, Fonvizin and Krylov, outstanding architects and painters and a galaxy of great dramatic actors, who tried to bring art closer to reality and to reproduce its phenomena in original national forms.

Professional music groups--the predecessors of the Bol'shoy and Mariin theaters--appeared in Petersburg and Moscow on the wave of the democratization of culture. P. Urusov, the founder of one of them, was granted permission "to be the landlord of all theater performances in Moscow." He pledged "to bring good Russian actors..., and circumstances permitting, a good ballet." From the very first decades of their existence the theaters drew the exceptionally great interest and attention of the public with their new national repertory and the staging of characters and situations of popular life. This repertory was created by the talented Russian composers V. Pashkevich, Ye. Fomin, M. Matinskiy and M. Sokolovskiy, and later by S. Davydov. It was on the basis of their works and, subsequently, the operas of A. Verstovskiy that a performing school of singers was developed, which combined the freedom and warmth of folk songs and the melody of the Russian speech. A natural Russian style of operatic singing and stage performances developed, which enthused the democratic raznochintsy of both capitals.

Choir singing blossomed. The works of its creators--the outstanding masters D. Bortnyanskiy, M. Berezovskiy and others--developed and updated the age-old traditions of this type of art basic in Russian musical culture.

Glinka's sensitive and selective ear absorbed all of these impressions. He tested their value to himself by the extent to which they organically came close to songs during the first stage of Russian musical professionalism, with their live, "natural" folk harmony. It was not a question of simply turning to folk songs but of mastering age-old traditions of images, of national characters and of the spirit and the awareness of the people and the people's lives, expressed in folk songs.

Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka was a most highly educated man of his time. A friend of his, Academician P. Dubrovskiy, a Slavic philologist, wrote about him that "one could only be amazed at his extensive knowledge of European literature and art. He captivated me with his remarks on works of Spanish poetry and painting."

Glinka possessed tremendous knowledge of Western European music. His range of interests was inordinately broad. He loved to listen, perform and study profoundly, with enviable persistence, the works of Gluck, the outstanding reformer of 17th-century opera, and the music of Cherubini and Megul, who reflected in their works the heroic and democratic nature of the mass celebrations of the age of the French Revolution, Handel, Beethoven, Weber, Berlioz.... In terms of anything truly great, which struck the imagination, Glinka singled out Mozart, with his sunny talent, harmonious perception of the world and bright romanticism. He shared these features himself. Glinka felt close to Mozart as a brilliant composer of melodies, the first to turn a prominent, complete melody into a basis for the development of larger forms.

To Glinka mastering the traditions of European musical culture was a profound and delicate process of steady accumulation of artistic impressions and the study of the craft of music exigently, in accordance with his own aesthetic position selected by his creative consciousness. That is precisely why the great composer succeeded where the Italian C. Cavos (the lyricist of Dogli-kin's "Ivan Susanin") and others among his predecessors had failed: instead of subordinating the wealth of Russian national music to the prescribed norms of Western European techniques, he used such techniques to provide a free and dynamic manifestation of the unique originality of Russian musical tonality, melody, rhythm and harmony. "He clearly realized," Academician B. Asaf'yev wrote, "that Russian peasant songs and Russian urban music are not a frozen capital...but...tonality and rhythm concealing as yet unused energy."

Glinka developed the idea of creating a major national work toward the end of his stay in Italy (1830-1833), a stay which had assisted him greatly in mastering the folk-national foundations of the best works by Italian composers and the melodic expressiveness of the great operatic form. He studied the art of singing extensively and successfully. However, it was precisely the penetration within the folk-national Italian musical culture and, by contrast, his sharp rejection of the "calculated charlatanism" of the representatives of the universal-rootless Italian "ear-pleasing," aimed at cheap success among cosmopolitan music lovers, and the profound and long-strengthening awareness of the unique beauty of Russian melodies that naturally led Glinka to the firm conviction that an artist should seek his own truth and his natural musical expression by drawing his inspiration from the artistic creativity of his own people.

One of Glinka's important thoughts found in his famous "Notes" is that "I did not write but thought a great deal. All the songs I wrote to please the population of Milan... convinced me only of the fact that I was not following my own way and that I sincerely could not become an Italian. Yearning for the fatherland led me gradually to the idea of composing like a Russian."

Still ahead of him were studies with S. Dehn, the Berlin theoretician and the vivid impressions of musical Vienna. However, his national consciousness and feeling of patriotic duty to Russian art matured and strengthened further and further.

Glinka's close ties and shared interests with Pushkin, Gribeydov, Gogol', Krylov, Vyazemskiy, Del'vig and other poets around Pushkin, and the painter Bryullov, contributed to the fast molding of his personality and his ideas of life. Going back to Glinka's school years as a boarding student, let us recall that Wilhelm Kuhelbecker was one of his teachers, and the fact that Ryleyev was a member of the circle of this Decembrist, writer and poet, developed in the youngster the lofty ideas of patriotism and nationality, for which the Decembrists were fighting. On the day of the December uprising Glinka was on Senate Square and it was precisely in his apartment that they came looking for Kuhelbecker, who had disappeared after the defeat. Throughout his life Glinka never lost his great sympathy for the participants in the Decembrists' movement.

While abroad, Glinka composed fragments of a future opera ("the most important thing is the proper choice of a subject which, whatever the case, must be unconditionally national. This applies to both the plot and the music: I want my dear compatriots to feel at home..."). Back in Petersburg he settled on a plot related to Susanin's exploit. On this subject he consulted with V. Zhukovskiy. A more important fact, however, was that Glinka was perfectly familiar with Ryleyev's "Ivan Susanin" and shared its true patriotism, infinite loyalty to one's own people and readiness to take up their defense. As Asaf'yev points out, Petersburg's raznochintsy circles persistently claimed that Glinka's opera appeared if not directly on the basis of Ryleyev's old advice, in any case under the influence of his poetry. Naturally, the straight line which led to "Ivan Susanin," the native heroic-tragic opera, originated in Ryleyev's poetry rather than Cavos' opera on the same subject, in which primitive-nationalistic feelings of allegiance were praised. "Ivan Susanin" was the title which the composer himself gave to his opera; it was renamed on Nicholas I's instructions.

The insurmountable need to write a Russian opera triggered in Glinka a tremendous flow of creative forces. The overall layout of the work and the characters and basic dramatic lines were created and defined quickly. The composer developed the heroic-tragic picture of Susanin's death with particular depth: "The scene in the forest left profound marks on my imagination. I found in it a great deal of something which was original and typically Russian." The "typically Russian" in this scene, as in the entire opera, was embodied above all in the powerful heroic character of Ivan Susanin, a Kostroma muzhik, whose exploit was an expression of the nationwide idea of resistance and rebuff of enemy invasion. Mussorgskiy was to say subsequently that "Susanin was not a simple muzhik: he was an idea, a legend, a powerful creation of necessity (perhaps historical at that time)."

The nature and essence of the individual roles became clear and a premonition of an unparalleled and very new event became apparent during the rehearsals in which Glinka participated alongside the famous singer's O. Petrov, A. Petrova-Vorob'yeva and other actors.

The premiere of "Ivan Susanin," which took place in November 1836, will forever remain part of the history of Russian culture. Everything in this first work of a domestic opera classic is striking, such as the truly national character of its musical language, the "identification" by the broadest possible public of virtually every single melody, as though familiar from childhood, although the composer had almost entirely avoided the original folk melodies. Arias and songs from the opera spread among the democratic strata and became part of musical life with inordinate speed.

Glinka's contemporaries picked out the melodies of their native land in his opera and his keen perception of folk intonations, the spirit of the people among whom they were born and the very nature and structure of popular thinking and feeling.

V. Odoyevskiy, one of the founders of Russian classical musical studies, pointed out that Glinka was able to create "a new and previously unheard-of musical character and to raise folk melodies to the level of tragedy."

This penetrating view is quite significant. For the first time Glinka's opera identifies the folk song as a mirror of popular life. Through songs the national Russian character is revealed in its natural combination of sincerity and warmth of simple human feelings which are so close to every person, and with the enthusiastic praise of dedication and spiritual firmness. Folk songs give birth to melodic forms on a scale which makes Glinka's musical ideas striking. Suffice it to recall the lofty and beautiful melodies sung by Antonida, Vanya's songs, the suburban scenes, the duet between Susanin and Vanya and the numerous ensembles. This variety is crowned by accurate and profoundly national melodic recitatives, full of tragic greatness, and Susanin's aria "They Sense the Truth..."

Glinka created an integral drama with outstanding skill, by including in his opera a chorus which represents the people. Major vocal, ensemble, choir, dance and orchestra (in the field scene) parts blend in a continuous integral musical and stage progression. I particularly emphasize this in order to object to the tradition which has now been established of eliminating from the final scene the trio-requiem for the dead Susanin, which is preceded by the brilliant "Glory" chorus. Glinka's contemporaries themselves enthusiastically spoke of the trio as the embodiment of "the most dramatic idea" in an opera, in which the composer, displaying the truly brilliant ethical feeling of a playwright (a feeling rooted in the people!) creates a contrast between the expression of feelings of universal victorious exultation and the mourning for the fallen hero. Today this highly moral principle is embodied in the words "Nothing Is Forgotten and No One Is Forgotten." It is a pity that the theaters sin against this wide truth which expresses the grateful historical memory of the people; it is a pity that we still have to speak of unjustified interference with the texts of domestic classical works, including Glinka's "Ivan Susanin." Incidentally, in this case the Bol'shoi Theater as well substituted its own addition to Glinka's original, the premiere of which took place in 1945 and was dedicated to the great victory.

But let us go back to V. Odoyevskiy and cite his wise words written immediately after the first performances of "Ivan Susanin": "What happens with Glinka's opera is something which has long been sought but not found in Europe: a new element in art and a new historical period: the period of Russian music."

The views on the opera expressed in reactionary circles were different. Inevitably, F. Bulgarin published his libelous and ignorant articles in SEVERNAYA PCHELA. Spiteful things were being said in the fashionable salons on the subject of that "foul coachman's music" which "can be heard on every street and in every tavern." With biting humor, Glinka answered this in his "Notes": "This is good and true, for, in my view, coachmen are more sensible than gentlemen."

Despite Glinka's rather uncertain situation, worsened by an irregular private life and a hasty marriage followed by a divorce from a woman whose spiritual interests were alien to him, an age of powerful progress of his creativity and blossoming of his outstanding skill began with the creation of "Ivan Susanin."

The premiere of the opera "Ruslan and Lyudmila" took place in the autumn of 1842. Glinka's two operas differ in terms of lyrics, development and conflict. They are similar by virtue of their great epic principle which elevates "Susanin" above the purely historical opera, while "Ruslan" goes beyond the romantic-story opera. The tremendous layers of the spiritual life of the people and their wisdom are brought to light in "Ruslan" with the help of an extremely rich national-fable symbolism. Bayan's masterly songs, the ballad of the wise Finn and the first part of Ruslan's aria ("O Field, Field, Who Sowed You...") lift us above commonplace human passions and take us into the world of the high poetry of folk tales which touch upon the profoundly intimate problems of human life, ancient tales of sharp folk awareness of the inevitability of trouble and the dark forces which block man's road to happiness. All we have to do is listen to the wise harmonies of the orchestra, with their wisdom and the simplicity of their greatness, the first phrases of the monologue of Ruslan, the Russian hero, and the battlefield on which the "grass of oblivion" has grown and his thoughts on the mortality of human life to become aware of the tremendous sad yet stern epic power which fills this unusual music.

However, the feelings for the homeland, opposition to evil and readiness to engage in a noble defense of the Russian soil are insurmountable and sacred. The second part of Ruslan's aria, Bayan's wise prophesies ("Sadness is the prerequisite for joy") and the incredibly striking epic music expressing nationwide joy in the chorus finale of the opera, singing the Russian heroes and Russian heroics recreate (as does the powerful "Glory Be" in "Susanin") the harmony of human and national life, praising the light of truth and the triumph of life and the future great destiny of Russia.

It is thus that, setting aside the youthful irony of Pushkin's story-poem, Glinka harmonized in his opera the essence of the works of the great poet--radiance, the aspiration to express the wise inner harmony of man and awareness of his high purpose as maker of the homeland's destinies.

Pushkin was described as the sun of Russian poetry. Glinka became the sun of Russian music.

Melodic richness as an efficient means of characterization became even more noticeable in the opera "Ruslan and Lyudmila." The characters of Ruslan, Lyudmila, the good fey Finn, Bayan, the arrogant pseudohero Farlaf and others arise in the consecutive development of scenes, arias and epic songs, warm and intimate and close to the human heart. Melodies develop freely, unrestricted by the framework of the so-called "German Elaborativeness" which the composer rejects and in which not the melody itself and its inner development but intellectual efforts to "redraft" and "shift" the elements of the theme become the essential feature which gives birth to scholastic routine. Glinka's melody flows freely, entirely opening itself and its characterization, dictating the flexible and most expressive form assumed by each scene and picture and the opera as a whole.

Glinka's operas marked the beginning of a new phenomenon in global musical art--the Russian epic opera. This line, which rose to the level of "Susanin" and "Ruslan," was extended in the operas of a "powerful handful" of composers who legitimately considered themselves Glinka's direct successors: Mussorgskiy's "Boris Godunov" and "Khovanshchina," Borodin's "Prince Igor," Rimskiy-Korsakov's "Legend of the Invisible City of Kitezh" and Prokof'yev's Soviet musical classic opera, "War and Peace."

The thought that "the Russian people are always on guard!" is powerfully emphasized in virtually all of them. The people--the noble creators of a great state--are guarding its borders. The epic operas assert the idea of repulsing enemy invasions and the idea of expelling the enemy from the sacred soil of the fatherland but not waging wars of conquest. It is thus that the best works of Russian music reflect as in a mirror the most important law in the history of the Russian people, who have never encroached on foreign land and foreign countries but have always been ready to give a proper answer to all enemies.

The same topic remains relevant today, when hysterical voices are frequently heard provocatorily insinuating that the threat of a new destructive war comes from the Soviet state. This makes the development of one of the greatest traditions in domestic culture, whose roots go back to ancient Russian literature and to the 19th century, which was the golden age of Russian musical classics, even more important. However, this tradition is being somewhat restrained, for many decades separate us from Prokofiev's "War and Peace." Fortunately, musical endings dealing with the historical destinies of the people and the past, present and future of the great country and the revolutionary tempests and storms which hovered over Russia and which changed its aspect live in the profound and strong choral works of Georgiy Sviridov and his tremendously meaningful cycles of songs which gained popularity. They also live in works of similar genres created by other talented masters.

So far operas have not dealt with broad epic summations, although I do not agree with the skeptics who have failed to notice that in recent years as

well good operatic works have been created, a significant share of which in union republics. They may be few but they do exist. It is true that we cannot fail to be concerned by a trend according to which some operas on historical topics acquire a certain external impressiveness, in the style of Meyerbeer, in which entertaining intrigues and striking situations on the stage predominate at the expense of the profound development of the major characters and strong human feelings and essential features of folk life which, as we know, was alien to Russian opera. We note a lighthearted substitution of operas by works containing a bigger or smaller dose of music, of the musical type, a genre which is quite worthy and popular and has its specific features. Therefore, would it not be better for a composer familiar with such features to write good and valuable musicals rather than describe as an opera that which does not even reach the level of a musical? Also worth noticing is the fact that appeals from the highest composer rostrum to pay particular attention to contemporary topics and revolutionary history in most important genres such as operas are not so frequently supported by practical achievements, including by those who launch such appeals themselves.

Nor should we forget Glinka's traditions in terms of moral and ethical aspects. It is no accident that the great descendants of this great initiator considered him the conscience of Russian music.

Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka blazed new paths in any area touched upon by his genius. No less important than his operas in terms of Russian and world music is Glinka's poetic lyricism--his songs and romances. He composed melodies of imperishable beauty, loftiness and nobility, which sink into the hearts as the most intimate and warm words of truth, love or loyalty in friendship. True music lovers are unlikely to remember as many other favorite romances and songs as "I Remember a Wonderful Moment," "Do Not Tempt Me in Vain," "The Flame of Desire Is Burning in My Blood," the lofty dramatic "Doubt," the ballad "Night Inspection" and impetuous "Marching Song." The composer turned to the best poetry of his time. However, his musical lyricism reflects most profoundly and sensitively the unique charm of the humanness and amazing harmony of Pushkin's poetry.

Glinka's operas, romances and songs molded many generations of outstanding Russian singers. As an amazingly expressive singer and wise teacher himself, he created the Russian singing school with its truthfulness, psychological depth, dramatic scope and development of traditions which reached their peak in the national and universal phenomenon which Fedor Shalyapin became.

The orchestral mastery of the composer was truly perfect. It has come to us not frozen but eternally alive and fresh, continuing to captivate us with its superior classical simplicity, clarity, artistic exigency, inspired themes and melodies and most delicate shades of timber, rhythm and dynamic contrast. The scores of both operas and their overtures, particularly the brilliant bright "Ruslan" overture ("which begins and ends with a fist," Glinka wrote about it, emphasizing its heroic scope), "Night in Madrid" and "Aragon Dance," and the famous "Kamarinskaya," in which, for the first time in Russian symphonic music, such a profound contrast is shown between two elements of

popular songs, are all great works which continue to be enjoyed by music lovers and remain a superior school of composition mastery.

Let us particularly mention "Waltz-Fantasy," a work of incredible beauty and delicacy, with its charming lyrical melodies which impart gentle sadness, dreaminess and a touching romantic feeling. The lyrical and melodic wealth of this orchestral miniature is inexhaustible: each melody is a complete character and, at the same time, a new color, a new shade in expressing a common noble and lofty feeling. Here as well, in his first Russian waltz, Glinka opened the path to Tchaikovsky's ballet work; there is a direct connection from the "Waltz-Fantasy" to the most poetic waltzes of S. Prokof'yev in the opera "War and Peace," Khachaturyan's "Masquerade" by Lermontov and G. Sviridov's music to Pushkin's "Blizzard."

Glinka's work extends to yet another area which laid the beginning of a great and strong tradition. As a Russian artist inspired by progressive national ideas, he showed a tremendous interest in the musical cultures of other nations. Glinka was perfectly familiar with Ukrainian songs which he valued and whose beauty he understood, something which was reflected, in particular, in the score of "Ivan Susanin" and some of his songs. "He could happily blend in his work," wrote Gogol' about "Susanin," "two slavic pieces; one can hear the speech of a Russian and that of a Pole: one reveals the expansive motif of the Russian song while in the other we hear the precipitous motif of the Polish mazurka."

Glinka's works gave birth to one of the most poetic phenomena in Russian art --Russian oriental music, a subject subsequently undertaken by all Russian classical composers. During Glinka's time an interest in "orientalism" existed in Western European countries as well, as a fashion. Some composers produced some kind of conventional stylized fictional "orientalism" instead of identifying the true features of the musical cultures of the peoples of the Orient. The explanation is simple: the elements of the musical Orient were quite distant from the norms of European music; they were unknown, for which reason their true patterns were not understood. Glinka's brilliant "breaches" into the true nature of the melodic, rhythmical and colorful wealth of Oriental music were based on his desire to understand the national musical thinking of the peoples of the Orient. He carefully collected folklore originals from the Caucasus and the Transcaucasus, Crimea and Persia. During his trip to the Caucasus he gained a mass of impressions on the colorful life of the people and studied the nature of their dances and songs as they performed and sang them. That is how Glinka created his uniquely beautiful images of the Orient, which, I repeat, have not lost their accurate national originality to this day: the character of Ratmir in "Ruslan," the Persian chorus and the colorful dances in the enchanted gardens by the Black Sea.

This well applies to Glinka's profound study of the life, the nature of the people and the large number of folkloric works in Spain, which he heard and recorded in his travels around that country, giving birth to the Spanish overtures "Night in Madrid" and "Aragon Dance" in which no single characteristic of Spanish music, with its outstanding rhythms and ornamental melodic coloring was missed.

Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka was born 180 years ago. A great deal has changed since then in the social perception of his art. The revolution exposed millions of people to culture and made Glinka's works their own.

Ever new generations of composers in our multinational country are learning from Glinka loyalty to their native culture; they are educated in the legacy of his mastery and principles of nationality and patriotism, so passionately and fully expressed in his immortal works. They learn from him the highly moral and civic attitude which the artist must display toward his duty to the people.

Allow me to conclude by citing the great Soviet composer Dmitri Shostakovich: "If we consider what was the main manifestation of the inordinate power of Glinka's creative genius, and what was the main feature in the revolution which he made in Russian music, we inevitably come to what makes the very basis of his art: the most profound knowledge which the composer had of the spirit of nationality, the highest synthesis of Russian folk songs with most outstanding individuality as a composer. Glinka teaches us the true and profound understanding of the nationality of art. This great artist and patriot teaches us how to serve the homeland and mankind."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/14

INEXHAUSTIBLE SOURCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84) pp 74-80

[Article by Doychin Doychinov, secretary of the Plovdiv Okrug BCP Committee and chairman of the Plovdiv Okrug Bulgarian-Soviet Friendship Committee]

[Text] Plovdiv is one of the oldest cities in southeast Europe. In the course of its 1,000-year history it has experienced times of tempestuous blossoming and terrible dislocation. However, its spark of life was never extinguished. The city's streets remember the footsteps of the Thracians, Romans and Goths. Proof of the upsurge or decline caused by the invasions has accumulated here over the centuries, layer upon layer.

States crumbled one after another, empires broke down, beauty turned to ashes, rebel blood soaked the Thracian chernozem, but the thirst for freedom and justice remained unquenchable.

Today Plovdiv is the second most important Bulgarian economic and cultural center.

More than a quarter of a century ago, the people of Plovdiv added to the traditional symbols of their city--the grandiose hills and the Maritsa River--the huge figure of a Soviet soldier watching over the peaceful toil of the renovated city. Not far from him, on the same hill, stands another granite monument, that of the Russian soldiers who participated in the liberation of the city from five centuries of Ottoman slavery. These two monuments--to Alesha and Father Ivan--are symbols of two epics, symbols of hope and of tremendous love for the brothers-liberators.

Today no one knows who was the first to give the stone soldier on Plovdiv's hill the affectionate name Alesha. To everyone he was one of the millions who trod the paths of war which, decades before that, had been taken by his grandfathers. The people of Plovdiv named this site Liberator's Hill and it became a sacred place for every Bulgarian.

The warm love and gratitude to the Russian people and the country of the great Lenin have entered deeply the hearts of our people, becoming an intrinsic part of their very essence. This love has been transmitted from generation to generation with their mother's milk and legends about Father Ivan and the dragoons of Captain Burago. The history of the Plovdiv party organization as well, which was founded more than 90 years ago, is inseparably linked

to the Russian revolutionary movement, Russian Marxist thought, the Russian proletariat and the invincible Leninist doctrine.

Ivan Zagubanskiy, a courier for Lenin's ISKRA, was born in the Plovdiv area, as was Pavel Nonchev, one of Lenin's close fellow workers during his exile in Switzerland. Another person from this area was Koycho Kasapov, who was the commissar of the international division formed in Odessa at the start of 1918.

Even during the most difficult and dark days of monarchofascist dictatorship, the working people in Plovdiv Okrug preserved their sacred and pure love for the great land of the soviets. One of the first Bulgarian-Soviet friendship societies to be founded was in Plovdiv, as early as the autumn of 1934. Considering the impenetrable political darkness which prevailed in Bulgaria at that time, such societies were true centers of patriotism and internationalism.

Monuments to Bulgarian-Soviet friendship on Plovdiv soil are not made of granite and marble alone. They are embodied in plants and factories, the rhythm of modern technological production lines and the high efficiency of comprehensive bilateral cooperation.

Contemporary socialist Bulgaria is clear proof of the fruitful strength of the friendship between the Bulgarian and Soviet peoples and between the BCP and the CPSU. The successes achieved by socialist Bulgaria would have been inconceivable without our precious friendship with the great Leninist party and our comprehensive integration with the Soviet Union.

The study, popularization and application of Soviet experience and the extensive use of Soviet scientific and technical accomplishments are of exceptional importance in the implementation of the party's strategy of struggle for high quality and efficiency and comprehensive economic intensification.

The results of our work confirm the conclusion that along this way, without any particular capital investments, we can achieve rapid socioeconomic results and ensure real and effective ideological influence.

Plovdiv Okrug maintains direct friendly relations with the Moldavian SSR while Plovdiv is the sister city of Leningrad, the city-hero. Our cooperation is steadily broadening and becoming richer with new forms and a new content. Relations between party, economic and public organizations and collectives are dynamically developing and intensifying. A number of qualitatively new phenomena have become apparent in recent years in the process of rapprochement with the Soviet people in labor and international socialist competition.

Let us consider, for example, the development of the production of electrical equipment, which is the direct result of the international socialist division of labor. Today such items produced in Plovdiv are successfully used in many countries throughout the world. One of the reasons for this is that Soviet experience is at the base of the production of the dozens of models of connectors, starters, switches and relay regulators. The USSR is one of the largest producers of electrical equipment in the world. Technologies for the

production of relay regulators, starter coils and starter switches for Lada-model cars were developed on the basis of cooperation between the Plovdiv people and specialists at the Stavropol Department of the Scientific Research Electrical Equipment Institute, the Automobile Instruments Scientific Research Institute in Moscow and the Volga Automotive Plant in Togliatti.

The workers at the Petur Chengelov Plant in Plovdiv maintain close friendly relations with their colleagues at the Skorokhod enterprise in Leningrad and the Zorile Shoe Manufacturing Association in Kishinev. They have signed contracts for production and scientific and technical cooperation, which were approved by our countries' respective ministries. The collectives of Bulgarian and Soviet shoemakers exchange worker groups, technological documentation and samples on a planned basis.

Several years ago the collectives of the Plovdiv Design Organization and Kishinevgorproyket signed a contract for mutual aid and cooperation. This provided new opportunities for the study and application of achievements in urban, housing and civil construction and joint developments. On the basis of the contract the people of Plovdiv designed the Marriage Palace with a hall for newborn babies, which has now been completed in the Moldavian capital. The people of Kishinev designed a large motion picture theater which will be built in Trakiya, one of the youngest Plovdiv residential areas.

The railroad workers in the Plovdiv marshaling yards are improving train coupling technologies and their work on the basis of the experience of their colleagues in Lyublin, near Moscow. In 1983 they reduced the stay of cars in transit by one hour, which led to a significant increase in freight car turnover. The okrug's agricultural workers as well are studying and extensively applying progressive Soviet experience. For the past few years they have used the experience of growing corn from hydrophobic seeds, developed at the Zavety Lenina Sovkhoz, Stupinskiy Rayon, Moscow Oblast. Such seeds make more efficient use of the spring moisture in the soil and of the potential of high-yielding strains and hybrids of this crop which has a long vegetation period. The average corn yield in the okrug has exceeded 80 quintals per hectare.

Plovdiv Okrug is a traditional rice-growing area. It accounts for nearly 70 percent of the total rice harvest in the country. In the spring of 1976 we were visited by a group of mechanizers from Krasnodar Kray. Over a 2-year period the Soviet specialists shared their experience in the use of essentially new industrial technologies in rice growing. Armed with this experience, as early as 1979 the Plovdiv rice growers achieved results very close to those of the people of Krasnodar. Last year average rice yields of 57 quintals per hectare were achieved at the Georgi Dimitrov Scientific-Production Complex.

Fruitful cooperation is developing between scientific workers. Thus, as a result of joint efforts of specialists from the Maritsa Vegetable Crops Institute and the Institute for Planned Acclimatization in Sadovo and related Soviet scientific organizations, a number of new high-yielding strains of vegetables, wheat, corn, rice and tobacco were put to practical use by the agroindustrial complexes.

The achievements of the Nonferrous Metallurgical Institute and the Dimitur Blagoev Nonferrous Metals Combine in Plovdiv are based on the rich Soviet experience. Improved technologies for electric smelting of roasted copper concentrate and copper refining in hot fuel oil and natural gas, a new technology for the comprehensive extraction of metals from ore concentrate and the production of some types of semiconductor materials are the result of the joint efforts of Soviet and Bulgarian specialists. About 15 percent of the scientific associates of the institute received their education in the Soviet Union and a significantly larger number of people have specialized in Soviet institutes.

The Plovdiv Okrug BCP Committee focuses its attention on the use of a comprehensive approach to the study, popularization and utilization of Soviet experience which contributes to economic intensification, improved organization of the work, training and upgrading cadre skills, strengthening socialist discipline and actively mastering the achievements of scientific and technical progress.

We try purposefully to enrich and increase the variety of means through which progressive experience can be used under our specific conditions. This is particularly important, for it helps to assert and develop in every working person a feeling for the new, interest in the search for more efficient work methods and daring and initiative. The okrug party committee directs the party and other public organizations toward improving individual work with every worker and specialist, with young people in particular, and to helping them in the study and mastery of progressive experience.

The okrug Bulgarian-Soviet friendship committee plays a major role in popularizing the successes of the USSR, the invaluable experience of the CPSU and Soviet society and the promotion of the Soviet way of life.

Qualitatively new features in the development of the international socialist competition have appeared in recent years. The movement "Worker Guarantee for Goods Produced for the Soviet Union" enjoys exceptionally great popularity and comprehensive support among the masses. The collectives of the largest Plovdiv enterprises, such as the Rekord Motor Cars Plant, the Maritsa Textile Combine, the Rodopi Tobacco Combine, the Alen Mak Cosmetics Factory, the "memory systems" plant, the Andrey Yurukov Knitwear Factory, the Petur Chengelov Shoe Factory, the Bulgariya Clothing Factory, the Georgi Dimitrov Scientific-Production Complex and many others fulfill their obligations to the land of the soviets with a high feeling of international responsibility.

The Plovdiv Okrug Bulgarian-Soviet Friendship Committee uses various methods for the successful development of this movement, such as competition reviews, exchange of experience, method classes with the aktiv and meetings and talks with labor collectives. A number of enterprises have developed special systems for recording the results of the movement and encouraging frontrankers.

Through its ideological education and mass cultural work the okrug Bulgarian-Soviet friendship committee tries to see to it that the essential BCP line of further comprehensive cooperation and rapprochement between Bulgaria and the

USSR is not only understood but also that it becomes the conviction and motivation of all working peoples.

In accordance with our specific conditions, we seek and apply methods for developing in the working people awareness of their high social responsibility for fulfilling production assignments and contractual obligations to the Soviet Union. In this respect the activities of dozens of Bulgarian-Soviet friendship clubs are of great ideological importance. They are promoting the increasing involvement of workers and specialists in various forms of international socialist competition. The popularization of Soviet leading experience plays a central role in the ideological education work of obshtina and rayon Bulgarian-Soviet friendship committees.

We clearly realize that one of our primary tasks under the current international circumstances is to bring to light the profound nature of the firm and consistent Leninist peaceable foreign policy, which is actively promoted by the CPSU and the BCP, and to help intensify the struggle against anticommunism and anti-Sovietism in all areas. Particularly useful in this respect are the days of Leninist peace policy annually sponsored in the okrug. The obshtina party organizations in Plovdiv, Karlovo, Asenovgrad, Rakovski, Sadovo, Stamboliyski, Krichim, Kalofer, Brezovo and Khisara actively participate in such activities. A variety of methods are used, such as topic evenings, meetings with active fighters against fascism and capitalism and with Soviet veterans, radio broadcasts, photographic exhibitions, motion picture lectures, and others.

With the specific methods and means of their ideological work, the okrug and local Bulgarian-Soviet friendship committees are enhancing the level of the class, patriotic and internationalist upbringing of the working people. They are strengthening their awareness of the indivisibility of love for their homeland and love and gratitude for the CPSU and the USSR, feelings which are profoundly inherent in the spiritual nature of the Bulgarian people.

The numerous meetings between representatives of the USSR consulate general in Plovdiv and other Soviet citizens, on the one hand, and the labor collectives in all okrug obshtinas, on the other, Bulgarian-Soviet friendship celebrations and days dedicated to Georgia, Estonia, Moldavia, Turkmenia, Tajikistan and other Soviet republics, within the framework of the International Plovdiv Fair, organized on our initiative, have contributed to popularizing the successes of the land of the soviets and acquainted the working people with the implementation of the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress.

Meetings with Soviet people are particularly useful. Interesting and fruitful work is being done in this area by the Rodina Soviet Citizens' Club. More than 550 meetings with groups of Soviet tourists following the itinerary "On the Path of Combat Bulgarian-Russian and Bulgarian-Soviet Friendship" have been held in labor collectives, schools, VUZs and scientific research institutes over the past 3 years. Talks within the program of "Friendship Over the Centuries," practical science conferences on the Leninist Komsomol and new manifestations of socialist patriotism and internationalism in youth

upbringing, discussions of Comrade Todor Zhivkov's three-volume work "Friendship Through the Ages," scientific sessions, "Great Fraternity" quiz shows and other measures yield great ideological and education results.

Interaction between the Bulgarian-Soviet friendship committee and the okrug and local Komsomol committees was improved in the spirit of Comrade Todor Zhivkov's letter to the Komsomol Central Committee and his speech at the 14th Dimitrov Komsomol Congress. We benefitted from international meetings with the participation of members of societies for friendship with the Soviet Union and youth organizations in fraternal socialist countries.

Mastering the Russian language is an objective need for the Bulgarian people. It enables them to become more familiar with Soviet reality, learn more quickly of Soviet achievements in material and spiritual areas and expand their world outlook. Our work in popularizing the Russian language, particularly among the young generation, is noted by the aspiration to develop a new approach and use new ways and means of instruction aimed at raising their quality and efficiency to such a level that the Russian language becomes the second spoken language in Bulgaria.

Currently more than 9,000 people in our okrug are engaged in extracurricular studies of the Russian language, a significant percentage of whom are pre-school-age children. The number of specialists in various sectors who are studying the Russian language has increased substantially.

The 12th BCP Congress paid great attention to the development of socialist culture as one of the important factors in shaping a many-sided and, in the future, comprehensively developed individual.

The okrug BCP committee pays particular attention to intensifying relations with the Moldavian SSR and Leningrad in the area of cultural exchanges with socialist countries.

Direct cultural contacts with the Moldavian SSR were organized in 1970. Fruitful exchanges are taking place between music schools and higher educational institutions in Plovdiv and Kishinev and between the philatelic societies of the two cities. During that time the forms of our cultural exchanges have become enriched above all through reciprocal participation in 10-day celebrations, festivals, competitions, etc. The results of such cooperation become particularly clear during Bulgarian culture days in Moldavia and Moldavian culture days in Plovdiv.

Leningrad days, dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR, were celebrated in Plovdiv in September 1982 with the participation of more than 200 guests. Four exhibits came from Leningrad. The famous academic Malyy Theater for Opera and Ballet, a chamber choir and a children's group from the Pioneer Palace imeni A. A. Zhdanov gave performances in Plovdiv and Plovdiv Okrug. A number of meetings were held between working people and Soviet production frontrankers, trade union and Komsomol activists and members of the Soviet-Bulgarian Friendship Society. All in all, more than 40,000 Plovdiv residents directly participated in the celebration of Leningrad days.

The Leningrad days were a major political and cultural event in Plovdiv and Plovdiv Okrug. They left ineradicable marks on the minds of the working people in industry and agriculture, the scientific and artistic intelligentsia and the youth. They were a true celebration of Bulgarian-Soviet friendship and a confirmation of the tremendous reputation enjoyed by the Soviet people, their way of life and their culture among our people.

Many Plovdiv cultural institutions have established creative contacts with similar organizations in Leningrad and integration processes between the fraternal cultures have become even stronger. Cooperation contracts were initialed between the Plovdiv Drama Theater and the Leningrad Academic Drama Theater imeni A. S. Pushkin, the Plovdiv Opera and the Academic Malyy Theater for Opera and Ballet, the Ivan Vazov National Library and the State Public Library imeni M. Ye. Saltykov-Shchedrin, the Plovdiv Ethnographic Museum and the Museum of Ethnography of the Peoples of the USSR and the Museum of the Revolutionary Movement and Leningrad's Museum of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Contacts were established between the newspapers OTECHESTVEN GLAS and LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA. Composers from the city on the Neva composed songs about Plovdiv, which were included in the repertory of a number of amateur and professional vocal collectives.

Creative contacts and exchange of experience between representatives of Soviet and Bulgarian culture and art are increasing and intensifying with every passing year. Since 1977 Plovdiv has been the city in which LITERATURNAYA GAZETA days are being celebrated in Bulgaria. These celebrations, four of which have already been held, are considered by the people of Plovdiv great holidays.

The particular interest shown by our people in Soviet periodicals and literature is confirmed by the fact that in 1983 the okrug's population received more than 211,000 copies of Soviet newspapers and journals by subscription.

Soviet literature has always been properly represented in the plans of the Khristo Danov Publishing House in Plovdiv. Every year it publishes about 20 Soviet books and tries to acquaint the Bulgarian readers with works reflecting the most characteristic trends of the literary process in the Soviet Union. The Bulgarian readers become familiar with many major Soviet authors precisely with the help of this Plovdiv publishing house.

On the occasion of the approaching 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism, the publishing house has begun to work on a series of "Victory" books, which will include 10 of the most significant Soviet works on this topic. It is possible to say that a special trend has also developed in familiarizing Bulgarian readers with contemporary Soviet Leningrad literature. Thus, a collection of stories was published and a collection of poems by Leningrad poets is under preparation.

The series "Recollections," which includes major Russian and Soviet poets, was initiated in 1982. The first book was about Blok and recollections of Yesenin are being printed. This series contributes to the variety of the overall range of published topics and meets the great interest of the readers.

We try to present the broadest possible range of writers from Soviet union republics. In particular, we are planning the publication of a collection of Tajik and Moldavian authors. Our publishing house is in direct contact and maintains a business cooperation with the Kartya Moldovenyaske and Literatura Artistike publishing houses, with which it is engaged in the joint publication of many new works.

Every year Plovdiv sponsors 10-day periods dedicated to Soviet books and motion pictures. Meetings are held between our creative workers and men of the arts in Moldavia and Georgia; anniversaries of Soviet poets, writers, playwrights and actors are celebrated. The okrug also celebrates festivals of Bulgarian-Soviet friendship in Asenovgrad and Karlovo, Voevodino and Nayden-Gerovo villages and elsewhere. The traditional "Alesha" Russian and Soviet song festivals held in the okrug are distinguished by their strong emotional impact.

Currently preparations for Plovdiv days are under way in Leningrad and the Moldavian SSR, dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the socialist revolution in Bulgaria. They will be major comprehensive projects which will present our culture extensively and comprehensively. Such days enable us to display the achievements of the Plovdiv people on an unprecedented scale and promote the further rapprochement between the cultures of our fraternal countries.

Loyal to the behests of Georgi Dimitrov, the BCP has strengthened Bulgarian-Soviet relations and made them the core of its general line drafted at the April 1956 BCP Central Committee Plenum. This friendship has acquired new dimensions today. Processes of comprehensive rapprochement are developing between our countries and peoples; increasing common elements are appearing in the fields of economics, politics and culture. This strengthens feelings of reciprocal trust and broadens our awareness as representatives of socialist nations.

Our current successes are the results of our toil. However, they would have been impossible without fraternal Soviet aid. That is why today as well, as we formulate our plans for the future, our confidence is based not only on our own forces and increased opportunities but also on the increasingly close rapprochement with the great Soviet Union.

If today, in the year of the 40th anniversary of the 9 September victory, we are full of pride in our achievements and are daringly looking at new, as yet unconquered, peaks, all of this is possible because our constructive toil is supported by and drawing strength from the eternal and inexhaustible source --Bulgarian-Soviet friendship--which is a priceless acquisition of socialist Bulgaria.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/14

CERTAIN PROBLEMS OF THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE AND THE SHAPING OF A NEW CULTURE
IN VIETNAM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84) pp 81-91

[Article by Ha Xuan Truong, Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee member and head of the CPV Central Committee Culture and Arts Department]

[Text] On the Historical Characteristics of Spiritual Culture in Contemporary Vietnamese Society

Under the leadership of the Communist Party of Vietnam, a country previously dominated by feudalism and colonialism, having bypassed the stage of capitalist development, a direct transition to socialism is taking place. North Vietnam took the path of socialist construction in 1954. However, the peaceful period proved to be quite short. Actually, until 1975 the life of our people was almost entirely governed by the laws of war and its revolutionary struggle was, essentially, a struggle for national independence and unification of the homeland. It was only after 30 April 1975 that the revolution in our entire country truly entered a new stage. The fourth and fifth CPV congresses defined the content of this stage and its specific objectives. The Fourth CPV Congress indicated that in order to build socialism the Vietnamese working class and working people must make three revolutions simultaneously: in production relations, in science and technology and in ideology and culture. The scientific and technical revolution is the key revolution, while that in ideology and culture is a major motive force. In a country such as Vietnam, this revolution has exceptionally complex forms. This is determined above all by the features governing the development of our society.

Until August 1945 the characteristic feature of our country was the steady and inflexible struggle it waged against foreign aggression and oppression and for national independence as well as the stubborn and persistent struggle waged by the peasant masses to defend their fields and forests from the elements and to create material and spiritual values. The history of Vietnam--from its primitive-communal system to feudalism--had never experienced the type of revolutionary changes which had taken place in a number of countries, particularly between the 16th and 19th centuries, when the revolutionary bourgeois movements in Europe radically destroyed the feudal social order. At that time the feudal system in Vietnam had only reached the peak of its power, after which the process began to decline. The feudal upper crust took the path of national treason. At the turn of the 20th century, when a tempestuous development of science and technology began in Europe, Vietnamese

society was still living in the darkness of a colonial semifeudal system. The national bourgeoisie was immature and its political and cultural programs were of a reformist and halfway nature.

A new page in history began with the creation of the Communist Party of Vietnam. The main problem which the party of the working class had to resolve was to make the country independent and free. Everything it did in culture and the arts until 1945 was aimed at promoting the development of progressive and democratic culture. Essentially, however, these efforts were governed by political objectives.

The new sociocultural revolution was started with the victory of the August revolution and the founding of a state of workers and peasants; its prime task was to struggle against the population's cultural backwardness.

During the two wars of resistance (against the French colonizers and the American imperialists) we achieved substantial successes in developing a new culture and laid the foundations of many of its elements. However, due to the fact that the main forces were concentrated on the struggle against the aggressors, most cultural and social problems could not be resolved completely. Limited conditions largely prevented us from resolving a difficult and complex problem such as eliminating the negative phenomena created by petty production, phenomena which we inherited from the feudal and colonial systems.

These features make clearer the tremendous role of the socialist revolution we made in the area of ideology and culture and the nature of its deep meaning, its length and its complexity. This circumstance was pointed out at its party's fourth and fifth congresses. In order to implement the resolutions of the congresses, the Vietnamese people had to accomplish a "great cultural rebirth" in a new spirit, in the spirit of the working class, displaying persistence and courage and using scientific methods. The splendid values of natural culture are being revived and inherited. Negative features and restrictive traditions are being criticized and the new spiritual values of the socialist age are being created.

The political accountability report submitted by the CPV Central Committee to the Fifth Party Congress notes that "...our socialist revolution is taking place in difficult international circumstances. The militant imperialist forces, headed by U.S. imperialists and Chinese expansionists and hegemonists, involved in a joint conspiracy, are gathering strength for a counter-offensive on the global revolutionary movement and mainly on the Soviet Union and the socialist commonwealth. In Southeast Asia the Chinese reactionaries and the imperialist forces are aiming their attacks at Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea." They are engaged in a secret, fierce, many-sided, subversive war against the Vietnamese revolution. In this undeclared war our enemies, displaying cruelty and treachery, are combining legal with semilegal methods and using elements of reactionary and decadent culture and literature to corrupt our society and influence our party workers in an effort to undermine the prestige of the CPV--the decisive factor in the victory of the Vietnamese revolution. The enemy is rallying its former stooges and is trying to unite the reactionary forces abroad and within the country.

Today approximately 1 million Vietnamese live in more than 40 different countries. Eighty percent of them are people who left Vietnam after 30 April 1975. Our enemies are actively working among them. There are as many as 25 centers in the United States engaged in the dissemination of recorded cassettes with music hostile to the Vietnamese revolution. The Voice of America has special broadcasts entitled "Vietnamese Music from Overseas," through which it promotes musical compositions by Vietnamese refugees. More than 150 different newspapers and journals are published in the Vietnamese language in different countries and are controlled by reactionaries. Between 1980 and 1982, every month tens of thousands of copies of newspapers, journals and other propaganda materials of antisocial content, promoting capitalism and the American way of life, reached Vietnam clandestinely through various channels. Poems, songs and false rumors are being used for slanderous purposes; Western radio stations produce tendentious broadcasts entitled "The Vietnamese Society." People are encouraged to flee from the country with the help of all kinds of "codifications" and "letters of guarantee" which also include special pills against seasickness.

Tens of thousands of recordings of loud Western music and "refugee songs" are being channeled into the country, duplicated and sold mainly in Ho Chi Minh City. As a result of omissions in cultural management, here and there low-taste music, which was previously used for the dissemination of reactionary ideas, is being revived; hostile and decadent publications were stored and disseminated by bookstores. Collections of reactionary poems, noisily advertised abroad, were secretly taken out of the country. Various "study circles" and "music groups" were set up for obviously unseemly purposes....

Despite the updated content and modernization of technical facilities, all of these traps set by American imperialists and the international reaction are "classical" in their nature. However, more refined methods are being used as well. Thus, for example, T-shirts can also be a means for the dissemination of pro-American advertising. Notebooks, calendars and packaging are used for propaganda purposes. The activities of ideological enemies leave nothing to chance.

Some works which criticize negative phenomena in our society are used by the enemy as a double-edged weapon: first, to neutralize the active influence of truly justified and extremely necessary criticism; second, to turn criticism into a weapon for dissidence. That is why our workers in literature and the arts try to display a more sober approach to their works. It is important to analyze and study our society from the scientific and artistic viewpoints. However, we must be aware of the close link between enemy intrigues and negative elements and clearly distinguish between features introduced by our ideological enemies and the results of our shortcomings and, on this basis, to formulate the corresponding methods for our struggle.

Under the circumstances in which in our country, in the south in particular, exploiting classes remain and philistinism is widespread, it is very difficult to avoid the restoration of obviously negative phenomena in the fields of culture, literature and the arts. The question is how maximally to restrict such manifestations of bourgeois and feudal culture so that they can

be definitively eliminated subsequently and to prevent them from developing into a particular "trend" which would restrict the socialist principles and become an open ally of the enemy in subverting the gains of the revolution.

The major and complex problem of religion, which affects millions of people, has always been and remains a part of the struggle against enemy intrigues on the cultural and ideological fronts. This question cannot be ignored.

On the ideological level we are struggling against idealistic views and the actions of individuals who use religion for political purposes. However, we respect and protect the freedom of religion of the population, considering it one of the possible social requirements which depends on the material and spiritual living conditions of the society. On the one hand, we are working to preserve the most valuable architectural monuments and works of art in the field of religion; on the other, we distinguish between a policy of respect for the freedom of religion and the struggle against reactionary ideas and against those who use religion to undermine our system. Previously, on the one hand, in the southern part of Vietnam many patriotic believers courageously fought the pro-American puppet regime; on the other, the U.S. imperialists spared neither efforts nor means to use religion as a tool of aggression and stupefying the people. They tried to instill obscurantism and to carry out their aggressive political plans with the help of religion. "Clergymen" were sent to us who, while observing religious practices, disseminated among their parishioners reactionary political ideas and encouraged a passive way of life. Through the skillful use of various methods they drew over on their side the young generation, including the intelligentsia.

Extensive and patient efforts must be made, requiring extensive persuasion in ideology, culture and the social area in order to free some of our compatriots from ideological and spiritual captivity. Scientific atheism must be comprehensively disseminated. We must extensively promote scientific knowledge among the population. We are still doing too little in our practical work and even in what we do we use routine propaganda and education methods whereas the religious organizations find more lively methods which reach every person; the clergy are highly trained. They quickly change their working methods depending on the situation. It is necessary to distinguish between religion, on the one hand, and superstition and prejudice, on the other. Since our objective is to improve ideological and cultural work, we must do everything possible to draw some of the population away from the influence of the church and, at the same time, firmly struggle to fight all types of superstition and prejudice, particularly those which are related to activities which harm the health and life of the people or undermine the public order.

The struggle for resolving the "who-whom?" problem on the cultural front in Vietnam is part of the overall struggle between socialist and capitalist ways of development. Because of existing specific historical conditions Vietnam is several decades behind the level reached in the other socialist countries. Whereas the fraternal countries have already undertaken to build developed socialism, we are still at the initial stage of transition to socialism. That is why, guided by their party, our people must also deal with problems

which the more developed fraternal socialist countries are now resolving in the struggle against bourgeois culture and the intrigues of imperialism, headed by the United States.

Although contradictions exist among the capitalists, the bourgeoisie of all countries acts within a single front against the communists and socialism. On the cultural and ideological front the bourgeois reactionary governments spare no effort to undermine the socialist countries and progressive trends and to promote a "peaceful evolution." The capitalists are setting up all kinds of research centers and are using their ideological specialists intensively "reworking" Marxism and studying the mentality of the various population strata in the socialist countries, including Vietnam.* Naturally, however, their purpose is not to promote socialism or to support Vietnam. These specialists lay a claim to exclusive "objectivity." A large number of various "isms" have appeared, and although they criticize capitalism, they also attack socialism. It is loudly being proclaimed that a solution to the capitalist crisis has been found allegedly making it possible to avoid that which in the language of our ideological enemies is described as "limitations," "arbitrariness" and a "dead end" of socialism and the "Soviet model." Of late they have praised Eurocommunism, supported the Solidarity trade union in Poland, etc. The interests of the struggle for a new socialist culture in Vietnam demand that our intelligentsia and men of culture block such intrigues on the basis of the scientific Marxist-Leninist methodology and in a spirit of aggressiveness and criticism of reactionary theories. In this connection we must convincingly prove the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism.

We consider studying the experience of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and coordinating our actions with our brothers and friends in this struggle a vital requirements of the revolution in ideology and culture. This is reflected in our party's foreign policy activities as well.

The struggle between socialism and capitalism in resolving the problem of "who-whom?" runs through Vietnam's entire social life. The documents of the Fourth Party Congress state that "this is a process in which transformation is combined with construction and is done for the sake of construction and when construction is part of transformation and transformation is part of construction, although construction is dominant. It is a process of eliminating the old while simultaneously creating the new from the foundations to the roof. We must create new production forces and new production relations. We must create a new economic base and a new superstructure, a new material life and a new spiritual and cultural life. It is a process of sharp and difficult class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between the capitalist and the socialist ways of development."

Our party believes that the victory of socialism on the cultural front is not only determined by the struggle in this area but that it also depends on the overall revolutionary struggle in all areas, the socioeconomic in particular.

* We make a distinction between such pseudoscientists and the true scientists who, although supporting views and positions different from ours, try to study the history and the people of Vietnam profoundly and objectively.

The new culture and the new person are the overall results of three revolutions. Furthermore, the process of creating a new economy and a new system is also a process of shaping a new culture. It must be crowned with the victory of socialism on the cultural front. This will be manifested essentially in the fact that the Marxist-Leninist ideology will be asserted in every society. The Vietnamese working class must intensify its vanguard role in the organization and management of social life, the creation of a new culture and the education of the new person; the SRV socialist intelligentsia detachment will be loyal to the ideals of the working class and will voluntarily and consciously accept the party's leadership and dedicate its talent to the cause of the revolution.

In order to secure the victory of Marxist-Leninist ideology we must organize systematic Marxist-Leninist education from the bottom to the top. We must not only wage a comprehensive struggle against the bourgeois ideology of neocolonialism but also firmly criticize vestiges of feudal views which are still strong in Vietnamese society. We must expose the reactionary nature of Maoism in all respects. The age-old stagnation of the old Vietnamese society, which ended in 1945, and the fatal role of Confucianism had a strong influence on this society. The consequences of this stagnation--from small-scale production to a corresponding way of life with its looseness, patriarchal customs, hierarchism, bureaucratism and red tape, are still extant. A comprehensive ideological struggle must be waged in order to assert a proletarian ideology.

The size of the Vietnamese working class has shown a substantial increase over the past years. Workers and technicians, numbering more than 1.7 million, play a leading role in industrial production. Nevertheless, the working class accounts for a small percentage of the population. Our economy is essentially low-output agrarian in nature. Although small and established in a semi-feudal colonial country, the Vietnamese working class was trained by the communist party, which was created and tempered by Ho Chi Minh; that is why it adopted Marxism-Leninism at an early age and learned how closely to combine patriotism with internationalism. That is precisely why the working class is the most progressive class which expresses the interests of the nation. It is the booster of historical progress and is leading an increasing number of intellectuals, for which reason it must actively prove itself in all cultural and spiritual areas. It must prove its vanguard role in managing all cultural activities and in the creation of new cultural values.

Our party emphasizes the leading role of the towns, the large ones in particular, in shaping the new culture, building the new countryside and strengthening ties between town and country, thus preserving the vanguard role of the working class. In order to strengthen the alliance between workers and peasants, the working class must not only involve the peasants in large-scale production but help them and set an example in the creation of a new cultural life. It implements this guiding function through the state. However, at the same time, through its own activities and way of life it must prove its vanguard role in terms of the peasantry. Our party requires that in all cultural institutions of the state of dictatorship of the proletariat the role of the working class is fully realized and that plans and work

methods be developed consistent with the objectives of the socialist cultural revolution according to which the worker is the central, the leading figure in society, while its ideals--the ideals of socialism--become the aesthetic ideals of the people.

As to strengthening the role of the working class in shaping the new culture, the party considers the creative study of the experience of the working class in the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries an important factor in upgrading its ideological and scientific and technical standards.

A new culture can be created only by a new intelligentsia. That is why our party and state face a task of tremendous importance: training an intelligentsia from a worker environment, while simultaneously attracting members of other strata and reeducating the old intelligentsia. The Communist Party of Vietnam has trained and nurtured a large unit of intellectuals loyal to the revolution and tied to their class and nation. A great deal is demanded of the intelligentsia as we enter the period of the socialist revolution. In this connection, we must bear in mind that a struggle for "grey matter," for the mind of the people, is taking place in the world. Imperialism, American above all, is allocating huge funds and is doing everything possible to bribe the intelligentsia, to take the "grey matter" from other countries, the developing ones in particular. That is why our party is training the intelligentsia, its youth detachment above all, in the outlook of the working class by providing all the necessary conditions to link it closely to the life of the country, the working class and all working people.

Some Problems of Building the New Culture

It was in 1943 that the country's communist party drafted its first cultural program, known as "Theses on the Development of Vietnamese Culture." The theses formulated the basic principles of the forthcoming and long-term trends in the development of the new culture. "The culture which must be asserted by the Vietnamese revolution," the document states, "will be a socialist culture." It was pointed out that under Vietnamese conditions it was necessary above all to make a political revolution, followed by a cultural one. The implementation of this concept began with the August 1945 revolution. Although the two great wars of resistance lasted more than 30 years, the Communist Party of Vietnam, which was in power, always considered the creation of a new culture one of the most important trends in its activities. Thanks to this, today the basic factors of a new culture exist in Vietnam: labor has become the highest measure of human dignity, Marxist-Leninist ideology has assumed preponderant positions and excellent relations have been developed among people. These are the foundations of the new society on which the new way of life is based. The cultural standard of the population is rising with every passing day; the detachment of socialist intelligentsia, which has a great deal of energy and creative capabilities, is energizing its role and culture is becoming a truly leading force in the building of socialism.

Young and vital literature and art, socialist in content and national in nature, were born directly from the flames of the revolutionary struggle in

our country; their main features are party-mindedness and nationality. The new literature and art made a great contribution to the cause of national liberation, earned international recognition and, as was noted in the documents of the Fourth CPV Congress, "assumed their worthy place in the leading ranks of the anti-imperialist literatures and arts of our age." Vietnam's culture, literature and art continued to develop after 1975, as a result of which very good results were achieved in a variety of areas. Popular culture, information-propaganda work and patriotic education were developed extensively. Many houses of culture, clubs and libraries were built with state and household funds. The movement for a new cultural life in our districts became widespread following the example of (Hai Hau) District.

Some progress was made in professional literature and the arts. New genres in graphic forms and methods were added and topics were broadened in literature and the arts since the country's reunification. The authors of works of art continued their intensified development of revolutionary war topics. At the same time, they are studying a number of other aspects of social life and asserting the spirit of revolutionary heroism. Furthermore, they are depicting the daily life of the people, which is of great importance in the education of the new man. As in the past, our literature and art try to inspire the people, to praise the new life and to struggle against negative phenomena in society. Works have come out which expose the base actions and intrigues of Beijing's expansionists, who, conspiring with the American imperialists, are trying to undermine peaceful construction in our country.

As a whole, the development of literature and the arts in Vietnam after 1975 has been healthy. The creative workers, who are surmounting difficulties, have made strenuous efforts over the past period to make literature and art consistent with the tasks of the new revolutionary stage.

Naturally, however, artistic activities in our country have not been exclusively positive. Insufficient awareness of the fierce nature of the class struggle at the initial stage of transition to socialism, taking into consideration the situation within the country and in the international arena, have resulted in the appearance of some distortions and unhealthy trends in literature and the arts in recent years. These phenomena were severely criticized at the Fourth Party Central Committee Plenum. A certain "commercializing" of literature and the arts and the old vulgar tastes have been revived in some theater and concert performances. "Attractive" motion pictures are being made and some films have even promoted a taste for a consumerist way of life. In the graphic arts we are also concerned by phenomena such as neglect of major topics and pursuit of "foreign market" demand.

The leadership provided by many responsible party and state bodies was inconsistent with the new requirements. Furthermore, some hasty assessments have been made in literary developments, in the sense that occasionally the achievements of literature and the arts during the resistance period were underestimated and no distinction was made between revolutionary and non-revolutionary literature and art. The reason for the distorted way of thinking of some individuals was that these people, who thirsted for change and were dissatisfied with existing shortcomings, used wrong methods in their

activities. During the period of a sharp class struggle they feared to speak of party-mindedness. Although the party demands of the creative workers to master revolutionary reality and act as fighters, these individuals insisted one-sidedly on the "liberation of the individual." When it was necessary to intensify the systematic struggle for uprooting the vestiges of neocolonialist culture, they expressed doubts, afraid that literature and art may lose their "diversity."

The same people made methodological errors as well: they wanted to surmount weaknesses. However, they questioned from the very beginning the basic principles of the literature and art of socialist realism; they wanted to reach new heights but relied little on achieved successes and their belief in their chosen path was not quite firm.

A process of renovation and search for the new is taking place in artistic creativity. However, the insufficient influence of guiding factors leads to the appearance of views which border on formalism or "commercialization," which is particularly noticeable in concerts.

Literature and art need constant renovation. The period of such renovation was experienced in Vietnam. Between 1945 and 1975 the most important phenomenon in literature and art was that their creators plunged deeper into the life of the people in depicting the struggle and production work of the working people, headed by the communist party, and choosing the working people as the topic of their creative work. The party's views on literature and art prevailed and provided an impetus for their development and shaping.

There is no vacuum in ideology and culture. Unless revolutionary trends assume leading positions they will fall prey to counterrevolutionary trends. Furthermore, our enemies are not passive contemplators. They try to open "breaches" in socialist culture. After the liberation of South Vietnam we have made a great deal of effort to change the old neocolonialist culture. So far, however, its influence remains rather tangible and it cannot be abolished within a short time interval.

Even during the time of the puppet regime, the South Vietnamese intelligentsia was waging a decisive struggle against neocolonialist culture, directing its sight toward socialist North Vietnam. The South Vietnamese population, which was liberated in 1975, joyfully accepted revolutionary literature and art, which were augmented by numerous talented forces. This situation has remained essentially unchanged.

Based on the Leninist concepts, the theoretical cadres, practical workers and workers in the arts are displaying a creative approach to the solution of problems of relations between the old and the new, traditions and innovation, and the distinction between true and false innovations and between the true demands of the people and blind imitation of foreign "fashion." Our party's Central Committee clearly indicated in the ideological concepts formulated at creative association congresses the principles which must be observed consistently: literature and art are a front and the workers in those fields are the fighters; in the course of their development literature and art are

guided by the firm acceptance of the party's political tasks and are maintaining a permanent and close tie with the life of the working people. They are efficiently serving the objectives of the revolution. Vietnamese literature and art must inherit the splendid traditions of the nation and adopt everything that is best in the world. They must introduce new features in the content and the descriptive means used in their works. The revolutionary writers and painters must steadily intensify their communist outlook. They must upgrade their party consciousness and firmly master the method of socialist realism. This is a prime prerequisite for the development of their talent and for serving the revolution, the homeland and the people. A struggle must be waged against liberalism, on the one hand, and against conservatism and stagnation in artistic activities, on the other. It would be an error to ignore the fact that the struggle between old and new and between conservatism and stagnation and the requirements of renovation is an internal law of all development, the law of development of culture, literature and art in particular. Under the circumstances of today's Vietnamese society, however, the main feature is the struggle between the two ways of development--the socialist and the capitalist--a struggle which is of a fierce class nature.

On the other hand, if we consider the entire set of tasks relative to the development of a new culture and if we look at the future, it becomes entirely clear that conservatism and inertia displayed in management methods are inconsistent with the requirements of culture, literature and art and are an obstacle to be eliminated. On the ideological level the reasons for conservatism and stagnation in culture lie not only in capitalism but in the feudal outlook and other nonproletarian ideas (backward customs, religious beliefs, superstitions and prejudices. This is a bridgehead which the enemy can easily use in mounting an offensive against socialist culture. That is why on the ideological front we must not only struggle against the influence of bourgeois culture but also criticize the various petit bourgeois and feudal ideas, all cases of stagnation and conservatism and everything that is old and obsolete and grant greater rights and create conditions for creativity and experimentation and encourage debate, for as a rule any new development is harder to recognize from the very beginning. It is asserted only through struggle and multiple tries.

The problem of satisfying the cultural needs of the people is quite difficult to resolve under the conditions of a country which is forced to work for the elimination of the consequences of a long war and, at the same time, to struggle against a variety of subversive enemy activities.

The objective of socialism is the increasingly fuller satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of working people. This objective is included in the CPV program and the various political concepts and steps taken by the party and the state are aimed at gradually attaining it. We must be concerned with the material and technical base of our culture. Thanks to the joint efforts of state bodies and working people, many good culture houses and clubs have been built and are under construction in the local areas. However, state capital investments are needed for major cultural projects.

Concern for the development of cultural construction is one of the manifestations of the advantages of our system. Naturally, however, in this case we

must take the real economic conditions into consideration. The allocation of capital investments for cultural needs must be correlated with the conditions of the country's national economy, in the way that the question of meeting the cultural needs of the people must be closely linked with the sharp ideological struggle being waged between socialism and capitalism. This question must be posed simultaneously with problems related to increasing our attention to theoretical activities, concretizing the party's line in the cultural area and using Marxist-Leninist theory in the study of various literary and artistic phenomena.

The adoption of Soviet culture is not only a necessary but a legitimate prerequisite in our development.

From the very beginning, the organic combination of patriotism with proletarian internationalism and national independence with socialism has been a feature of the Vietnamese revolution. Marxism-Leninism, the Great October Socialist Revolution and the national liberation revolution are an inseparable entity in both the minds and the actions of Vietnam's communists. Every Vietnamese is well familiar with the way Comrade Ho Chi Minh sought the way to national salvation. He was touched to the bottom of his soul by Lenin's theses on the national and colonial problems. In a small attic room in Paris, alone, he exclaimed as though turning to the masses: "My unhappy and tortured compatriots, that is what we need. This is the way to our liberation!" Comrade Pham Van Dong, CPV Central Committee Politburo member, accurately told workers in literature and the arts at the end of 1983 that "to the Vietnamese people socialism is like coming across something beautiful and desired."

The October Revolution inaugurated a new era in the history of mankind. The Soviet Union, the homeland of the October Revolution, was the first to build socialism and to create a socialist culture. Since that time, and particularly after the appearance of the socialist commonwealth, with the help of the USSR and the other fraternal countries, countries such as Vietnam can accomplish their transition to socialism while bypassing the capitalist stage of development. As to culture, this help is assuming a number of favorable aspects. The experience of the Soviet Union, the principles governing the creation of a new culture in the land of the soviets, and the achievements of the USSR in various areas, in the realm of culture in particular, are of international significance. Soviet culture, which began with the October Revolution, is enriching the cultures of different nations. Other nations which are following the socialist path adopt it in accordance with their specific conditions. This has become a pattern in the development of socialist culture. To observe it means to wage a decisive struggle against Western reactionary bourgeois culture and against all forms of ideological aggression which the imperialist countries, headed by the United States, have mounted in the field of culture against the national liberation movement and the socialist system.

During the dark years of French colonial domination, "Mother," M. Gor'kiy's novel, was passed on from one jail to another, together with Lenin's works. During the period of legal and semilegal struggle against the culture of the

French colonizers and reactionary currents in literature and art, our party always considered Soviet culture a source of inspiration for the masses and for strengthening its own forces. In 1946, during the period of preparations to repel the attack mounted by the French colonizers, the Soviet film "She Is Defending the Homeland," which was shown in our country as "Pasha Defends the Homeland," was being shown in Hanoi. This motion picture inspired the population of the capital and its defenders, instilled faith in the victorious revolution and strengthened the resolve to defend the revolution's gains. During the period of the fierce war of resistance in the jungles of Viet Bak, before starting their combat assignments our army fighters looked at Soviet films and carried in their hearts the characters of Matrosov, Mares'yev, Chapayev and the Young Guards. There was always a place for books by Fadeyev, N. Ostrovskiy, Polevoy and Simonov in the backpacks of our cadre political workers and troops.... It was as though Simonov's poem "Wait for Me," translated by Tho Hyu, expressed the feelings of all Vietnamese. During the hard struggle against the American aggression we were visited by many Soviet culture personalities who shared with the Vietnamese people the burden of the trials of war.

Naturally, in all areas relations among fraternal countries are based on voluntary participation and are conducted in a spirit of profound proletarian internationalism. The first Cultural Cooperation Agreement was concluded between Vietnam and the Soviet Union on 15 February 1957. It helped to strengthen our cultural relations which became reorganized on a planned basis. Since then cooperation between our countries has been marked by numerous events and accomplishments. In areas such as culture, art, publishing, the press, radio and television and, particularly, in the training of scientific and management cadres, it is developing on a planned basis. The adoption of the most progressive culture of mankind by Vietnam is becoming increasingly systematic. This contributes not only to strengthening Vietnamese-Soviet friendship but the development of Vietnamese culture as well. One of the major achievements of such cooperation was the publication in Vietnamese of V. I. Lenin's "Complete Collected Works" in 55 volumes, completed at the beginning of the 1980s. This is a valuable acquisition by the party members and all future Vietnamese generations and a firm foundation for the dissemination of Leninism in Vietnam and the education of our people in its spirit.

From the very beginning true proletarian internationalism became one of the structural elements of Vietnamese socialist culture, mainly thanks to the rapid adoption of the achievements of Soviet culture, the influence of which is tremendous and priceless. We are continuing to translate into Vietnamese works by Soviet authors; plays about Lenin and the Soviet people are staged in our theaters. A monument to Lenin will soon be erected in Hanoi. All of this is an intrinsic part of Vietnamese socialist literature and art.

In accordance with the resolutions of the Fifth CPV Congress and the subsequent party Central Committee plenums, seven Vietnamese creative associations held congresses between 26 September and 27 November 1983. They summed up the results of their work for the previous period and earmarked trends of future activities. The country's creative intelligentsia is actively supporting the party's course of building socialism and defending the socialist

homeland and the party line in culture and is expressing its firm resolve to achieve new accomplishments in the development of socialist spiritual culture in the new stage. More than ever before reality is proving the loyalty of the men of culture and the arts to the Communist Party of Vietnam. This precisely is the source of faith which the creative intelligentsia in our country has in its beloved party. It is also precisely this which guarantees the confident development of Vietnamese culture as an inseparable part of the world's socialist culture.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/14

OBJECT LESSON OF REVOLUTIONARY ENDEAVOR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84) pp 92-103

[Article by Prof V. Mushinskiy, doctor of juridical sciences]

[Text] The start of the Portuguese revolution, one of the most noteworthy and significant events of the past decade, was made with the overthrow of fascism in Portugal on 25 April 1974. The social and political change which resulted became an important structural component of the offensive mounted by the forces of progress and democracy in the world arena in the 1970s. As to Portugal itself, its history over the past decade became, essentially, the history of its revolution. It is entirely natural for its experience and exceptionally rich, meaningful and varied forms of revolutionary creativity of the masses, tried in the course of intensive class battles, that continue to draw the attention of both friends and enemies of the revolution.

To the Soviet people and all communists the world over this experience is particularly valuable because of the outstanding role which the heroic Portuguese Communist Party played in the popular movement over the long decades of struggle against fascism and subsequent to its collapse.

Once again the PCP provided an expanded evaluation of the historical destinies of the Portuguese revolution at its 10th Congress, which was held in December of 1983. This assessment reflects the vital truth of the uninterrupted confrontation between the popular forces which were awakened to revolutionary creativity and the fiercely counterattacking reaction. The democratic revolution in Portugal, the PCP accountability report stated, is a "durable historical reality" and some of the objectives of the democratic revolution have become an "already irreversible reality." "Whenever assertions are made," Alvaro Cunhal, the PCP secretary general, said, "that the Portuguese revolution is a case of betrayed hopes and that the April carnations have wilted, we state that the cause of

the revolution lives in the aspirations and the will of the people; the people want to extent this April and this April will win."

It is above all the tireless struggle waged by the Portuguese Communist Party in defense of the basic interests of the working class and the country's entire toiling people which is a guarantee for this future victory. "The PCP," state the CPSU Central Committee greetings to the Congress, "is in the vanguard of the forces which oppose the offensive mounted by monopoly capital and the reaction on the revolutionary gains of the Portuguese people--nationalization, agrarian reform and the democratic rights of the working people..." The fact of this counterrevolutionary offensive cannot delete the truly historical significance of the gains of the Portuguese revolution. In the light of present-day experience, paying the closest possible attention to them and their intensified study of the struggle in the course of which they were attained have retained their sharply relevant political and theoretical significance.

The following article is a discussion of these problems.

The questions of the revolution, the transition to socialism and the assertion of the leading role of the working class in society are being extensively discussed in the international communist and worker movements. The creative specific historical approach to the solution of such problems under the circumstances of the individual countries is a mandatory requirement of revolutionary theory and practice. It is precisely this approach which also presumes the fact that it is based on the acknowledgment of the general laws of the revolutionary process and the creative application of the experience of other countries. This is confirmed by the practice of all truly profound popular revolutions of our century: each one of them opens new ways and new opportunities for the revolutionary forces of our epoch, thus intensifying and concretizing our understanding of the overall laws and features of the revolutionary process.

This fully applies to the Portuguese revolution. The movement of the popular masses, the leading role of the working class and the truly innovative strategy of its vanguard, the Portuguese Communist Party, are an object lesson of creative Marxism-Leninism in resolving specific problems of the revolution in its ascending stage and under conditions in which the popular forces were forced to convert to strategic defense and protection of their revolutionary gains. It is a question of the historical experience of the nationalization of monopoly capital, worker control and agrarian reform in the southern part of the country and the experience gained in the revolutionary implementation and subsequent protection from the encroachments of bourgeois governments.

The present notes, which could be described as notes on the margins of PCP documents and Comrade Alvaro Cunhal's speeches, express views on this experience.

The nationalization of Portugal's big industry was a direct response to General Spínola's counterrevolutionary conspiracy. It was the material and political manifestation of the revolutionary upsurge of the masses, their revolutionary resolve and their victory over the counterrevolution. Naturally, it was also a reprisal taken against the enemies of the republic.

Although the nationalization began with government decrees, the blue- and white-collar workers were its motive force, those who initiated and implemented it. They earned this nationalization which reached its peak with the defeat inflicted on the conspiracy of monopoly capital. The failure of the conspiracy confirmed the drastic superiority of the political forces of the working people over the monopoly forces. Nationalization was the result of the political victory of the working people over monopoly capital. In describing the nature of the nationalization in Portugal, A. Cunhal said: "Not all nationalizations are revolutionary. In the capitalist countries they frequently become a factor of capitalist development.... The nationalization which was accomplished by the Portuguese revolution was of a radically different nature. It was carried out on the initiative of the toiling classes and revolutionary forces confronting the fierce opposition of financial capital, monopoly groups and all reactionary and conservative forces" (AVANTE!, 16 March 1978, p 6).

The dogmatists on the left failed to understand the revolutionary and anti-capitalist nature of the nationalization, limiting themselves to the simple view that since the nationalization was the work of the bourgeois state it could only be bourgeois. Yet the nationalization process in Portugal reveals both its universal significance in the struggle against the bourgeoisie as well as the profoundly creative approach of the working class and its vanguard, the PCP, in the utilization of this tool under the country's specific historical conditions and in the search for specific national means of socialization of productive capital.

In Portugal, as in a number of countries of real socialism in their time, the road to nationalization went through worker control. Initially, the intervention by the workers was aimed at purging the enterprises of their fascist owners and their agents. Subsequently, from resolving strictly political problems this control switched to production problems caused by the fleeing of enterprise owners, sabotage efforts on their part, swindles, waste, etc. In May 1975 the worker commissions (trade unions) passed a special resolution on worker control which stipulated that "it means a manifestation of the revolutionary vigilance of the working people, which would put an end to fraud, as well as self-defense in the face of a boycott which threatens the guarantees." In citing cases of wastefulness and squandering of capital by the owners, A. Cunhal emphasized that worker control appeared in order to meet an objective situation and as a step needed in defense of the national economy and the right of the working people to work (see A. Cunhal, "A Revolucao Portuguesa--O Passado e o Futuro" [The Portuguese Revolution--Past and Future], Avante, Lisbon, 1976, pp 77-79). In most cases it appeared not as an essential trend or a universal solution but as a solution caused by exceptional circumstances. Therefore, it was not a question of duplicating already familiar "models," but of a similarity with such models in an objective situation. It was precisely this objective situation which defined the

content of such control: monitoring fund movements, bank accounts, use of loans, levels of utilization of raw materials, semifinished goods and output and purchases. The trade unions directed the working people toward exercising actual control over the basic decisions determining the future of the enterprises.

In the course of the organization of worker control, the workers formulated its procedure, objectives, order and organizational network, all of them profoundly democratic. Suffice it to say that the control commissions themselves did not make decisions but reported their conclusions and suggestions to general worker meetings which acted as decision-making bodies.

Worker control frequently developed into enterprise management and the thus-acquired experience proved the ability of the working people to manage. It strengthened their unity within the enterprises, regardless of position or profession.

In summing up the results of worker control features, A. Cunhal pointed out that it had become a powerful tool for the transformation of economic structures (ibid., p 84). Many industrial enterprises were saved and survived, and many among them increased their output despite the exceptionally difficult situation thanks to worker control. Furthermore, worker control became an institution of Portuguese democracy, entirely belonging to the working people both in nature and content of activities and origin. It is precisely because it was the result of an actual movement of the masses and their class struggle against the bourgeois, their initiative and their concern for the national interests that this control became a means of achieving and concentrating the real political force of the working class. The fundamental law codified the right of the working people's commissions to democratic intervention in enterprise life: their rights to control enterprise activities and to participate in enterprise management. This right is not on paper only, for the official constitution and the actual constitution agree on this matter.

Worker control became a stage in and a structural element of the nationalization of monopoly capital.

Nationalization, A. Cunhal points out, is the logical consequence of the aggravation of the class struggle and the attack mounted against the revolution by big capital. The banks and the monopoly companies remained as a powerful base of the counterrevolution. They resorted to sabotage and export of capital abroad. They generously financed the counterrevolution in general and the right-wing parties in particular.

The first nationalizations were made on 15 September 1974 and the state assumed ownership of three emission banks: the Portuguese, National Overseas, and Angola.

However, it was only on 14 and 15 March 1975, in the aftermath of General Spínola's putsch that the Revolutionary Council passed its historical resolutions on the nationalization of banks and insurance companies (other than foreign). This marked the beginning of a period of nationalization of monopoly enterprises, as a result of which the fundamental structures of

monopoly capital were practically undermined or, as A. Cunhal writes, "monopolies, the domination of financial capital and state-monopoly capitalism were eliminated."

A striking feature which emerges from the study of the nationalization process in Portugal is its similarity with similar processes which took place in the USSR, the Eastern European people's democracies and Cuba. As was the case with these countries, in Portugal it was triggered and accelerated by the aggravation of the class struggle and the requirement of depriving the counterrevolution of its material base. As in the people's democracies it began even before the proletariat gained political power. As in Cuba, it took place essentially within a short period of time. Here again the interdependence between a general law and its historically specific manifestation may be traced quite accurately. In the course of the Portuguese revolution worker control and nationalization developed as its objective requirements.

Nevertheless, the process of creating a state sector in the course of the revolution had major peculiarities and the types of enterprises within this sector are quite varied. In addition to state enterprises a major group of enterprises with state participation appeared in Portugal: there are 200 enterprises in which state capital accounts for more than 50 percent and a large number of enterprises with 20 to 50 percent state capitalization. In his work, A. Cunhal views this participation by the state as one of the most original aspects of the Portuguese revolution (*ibid.*, p 92), which appeared as a result of the appeal to the working people to help the state given the extraordinary circumstances, such as 103 cases of owners' sabotage, 88 cases of imminent bankruptcy and 20 cases of owner absenteeism (*ibid.*). Material assistance was given to such enterprises. Administrative commissions were appointed to manage them or else they were converted to self-management. Together with the nationalized enterprises, they are part of the public, *i.e.*, the state sector, without being state enterprises in the usual meaning of the term. Nor are they of the mixed state-private variety: although part of their capital belongs to the state, the balance does not belong to the private owner but is public property.

Furthermore, in addition to state and state-public enterprises, a powerful cooperative sector appeared in industry: cooperatives were formed at 840 large and 787 medium and small enterprises (*ibid.*, p 93).

In accordance with these changes, the Portuguese constitution stipulated that three ownership sectors were functioning in the country at the stage of transition to socialism: 1) public (state): state enterprises and enterprises belonging to other public collectives (state-public); property and enterprises used and managed by the working people; and communal property used and managed by local societies; 2) cooperative; 3) private.

How does the communist party assess the social nature of the state sector? A. Cunhal points out that, like the cooperative sector, it emerged from the realm of capitalist exploitation and control and is the base for rebuilding the Portuguese economy on a noncapitalist basis. Cunhal considers the date at which wide-scale nationalization began--14 March 1975--a turning point in the Portuguese revolution from democratic to socialist (*ibid.*, pp 89-90).

This was live historical experience: the nationalization--a vector indicating socialism--was made not by a socialist but a revolutionary-democratic government. However, although the working class had no political power, it was the main motive and autonomous force of the revolution. Within the "People-Armed Forces Movement" alliance it helped political hegemony and acted as the organized vanguard in determining the direction taken by social change.

Here again another peculiarity of nationalization in Portugal becomes apparent. It not only did not eliminate worker control but strengthened it even further. Worker control over administrative activities was not replaced by state control from above (ministerial) but became both the official and the actual institution of permanent people's control. In directly influencing the economic policy of the state sector, such control is giving it a new socioeconomic content. This is a case of live dialectical contradiction: the state preserves its bourgeois nature and the bourgeoisie remains in control of the executive power and its apparatus to a significant extent, although the state sector is no longer the common property of this "overall capitalist" but tends to assume the features of a truly social national sector. Furthermore, the constitution stipulates clearly and unequivocally that "any nationalization made after 25 April 1974 is the irreversible gain of the toiling classes." As A. Cunhal concluded, "nationalization is a historical gain of the Portuguese revolution. As stipulated by the constitution, it is irreversible. It is an integral part of the economic organization of the Portuguese Republic, a part of it which opens socialist prospects" (AVANTE!, 16 March 1978, p 6). Since the bourgeoisie cannot take over what was nationalized, it can only try to destroy it. Actually, in pursuing such a policy, the subsequent bourgeois governments greatly damaged nationalization. Nevertheless, A. Cunhal writes, the Portuguese people opposed denationalization so firmly that to this day no single directly nationalized enterprise has been transferred to private capitalist ownership.

Let us now consider another essential gain of the Portuguese revolution, the agrarian reform.

In the southern part of the country the agrarian reform was a most extensive agrarian revolution which reorganized agriculture in that area of Portugal. The semifeudal estates were replaced by collective production enterprises of working people, the socioeconomic nature of which was characterized by the following features: 1) they were the result of the revolutionary agrarian reform with a socialist prospect; 2) they were created not by the peasantry or the petty owners but by the working class, by one of the most advanced detachments of the Portuguese proletariat--the rural workers; 3) these enterprises are the social, economic and political result of the elimination of the landowners' class and the expropriation of a total of 1,170,000 hectares of land without compensation; 4) the expropriation of the landed estates and the organization of enterprises which were given the name of cooperatives took place under the guidance of the political and professional organizations of the working class--the Portuguese Communist Party and the Agricultural Workers Trade Union; 5) the 550 collective enterprises and their land were put at the disposal of 100,000 agricultural workers and their families and operated on the basis of principles excluding the exploitation of man by man.

The agrarian reform as well was not granted by the authorities but was a direct acquisition of the masses. The organized working class, which acted as an organized revolutionary force guided by its revolutionary party, resolved in the interests of the country a most important socioeconomic and political problem on the basis of its own, consistently class-oriented, i.e., socialist principles.

The solution of a political problem--the elimination of landed estates in response to sabotage, threat of hunger and unemployment--allowed the working class to undertake the solution of its production problem: to increase agricultural output and reduce unemployment in the zone covered by the agrarian reform. The hegemonistic role of the working class began to appear in the production area as well, where it set the example of efficient economic management in the interests of the working people and the national economy. Within a short period of time huge land areas, neglected by the private owners, were put in economic circulation; employment increased and poverty, hunger and the migration of the rural population away from the agrarian reform areas were eliminated.

The reform was started in the autumn and winter of 1974-1975, a period particularly difficult for the farmhands in the south, when the estate owners engaged in unparalleled sabotage. The agrarian reform law was passed when the revolutionary process had obviously gathered strength. The law also encouraged the acceleration of the reform and by October 1975 20 percent of the entire country's farmland was in the hands of the working people.

The connection between production and politics becomes particularly clear during a severe economic crisis. Hundreds of enterprise collectives are not only production units but also groups of politically organized working people. Relations within a cooperative are characterized by the following features: a) there are no exploiters or exploited; b) the principle of wages based on labor is applied; c) the working people themselves manage the enterprise. However, the nature of such relations cannot become entirely socialist, for the cooperatives operate under the conditions of a capitalist market and the predominance of a private ownership economy; they depend on the general economic situation and have no decisive influence upon it.

The Portuguese cooperatives are not cooperatives in the strict meaning of the term. Their members earn fixed salaries established on the basis of a collective contract concluded between the Agricultural Workers Trade Union and the Ministry of Labor. Furthermore, they are independent of the state which does not appoint their administration or interfere in their activities. The workers are unwilling to have even a minute private plot or to become land owners. At the end of the year, farm profits are invested in the further development of collective production. Autonomous management and fixed wages are two of the peculiarities of such enterprises. They are not owned by labor collectives, for they are not associations of petty owners. They are self-managing enterprises within the state sector. For that reason, A. Cunhal believes that of the two names they are given--"cooperatives" and "collective labor associations" (or "collective production farms"--a translation from the journal PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, No 4, 1979, p 48) the latter is more

accurate, for it emphasizes the original nature of noncapitalist production enterprises in the agrarian reform zone.

The very fact that the production of goods previously imported from abroad, such as grain, meat, sugar, tobacco and oil, increased as a result of the agrarian reform and the activities of the collectives in production farms and cooperatives, increased the political weight of the working class in resolving the problem of the economic crisis. In resolving production problems with the participation of all working people, the working class is manifesting its national role in the fact that it inseparably links the defense of its own class interests with those of all working people.

A clear example in this area was the struggle which the working people in collective associations waged against the speculative campaign mounted by the agrarian industrialists during the 1978 cork bark harvest. The private farm owners, who had remained in the reform zone, tried to disorganize the work of the bark collecting associations by paying the harvesters daily wage rates which, in some cases, were triple or quadruple the standard wages. They hoped that some of the manpower, particularly the petty producers, hired by the cooperatives, would prefer to work in the private farms and that the cooperatives, which would lack the necessary manpower for the harvest, would be forced to triple and quadruple the wages they paid to their own workers. This would sharply increase market prices and would assist the speculative machinations of the large middlemen who would raise the prices in order to capture the entire market. In response to these efforts, the union of cooperatives in the Couz district decided to pay its members a fixed (i.e., standard) wage. The cooperative farmers exposed the political underlining of this estate owners' maneuver, aimed at dividing the working people, as an attempt to egg them on against each other. "Those same farm owners who are promising high earnings to the working people today will refuse work tomorrow to those who, surrendering to their illusions, would break their ties with the cooperatives and would sacrifice their guaranteed work in cooperative farms for the sake of immediate benefits" (AVANTE!, 26 May 1978, p 6).

An acute political confrontation arose between the two economic management methods: on the one hand, the private capitalist and self-seeking corporate method, and the defense of the national interests of producers, on the other. Furthermore, the purely political aspect of this confrontation lies in the struggle for influencing the broad toiling masses and in the fight for their unity. Let us note the fact that the cooperatives, as political institutions for the unification of the masses, proved to be a new powerful weapon in this struggle. They can guarantee to the working people steady work and earnings, something which the capitalist cannot. In the agrarian reform zone the economic dependence of the working people on estate owners is being undermined which drastically weakens the political influence of private farm owners on the masses. It is particularly in the rural areas that the economic dependence of the working people on the estate owners led to their political and, in some cases, also individual dependence.

The reform destroys not only the economic but the political structures of landed estates. It creates a new political structure: the alliance between

worker cooperatives and small (medium) farmers, based on freedom from landed estates. Collective labor associations are the political foundation and political institution of this alliance and this freedom.

It is thus that historical practice showed that even under the conditions of a bourgeois social system a nonexploitive national economic sector exists with a socialist trend and development prospects and elements of national property. We must point out that this experience has also been the target of dogmatic (at least right-wing reformist) criticism: the establishment of such a sector in Portugal was proclaimed to be an "improper" anticipation (according to some, a rushing ahead), for the revolution in the country is not socialist and the proletariat has not acceded to state power. Such is the position concerning the agrarian reform essentially held by the right-wing leadership of the socialist party, which is insisting on dividing the land for the individual use by rural workers and turning them into petty farmers.

However, such a division would be suicidal for the revolution. The point is that the establishment of a collective sector was the result of the revolutionary creativity of the masses themselves and was dictated by vital economic requirements based on the economic situation and the historical characteristics by virtue of which, as A. Cunhal wrote as early as 1970, "capitalist production relations in economically backward Portugal are quite highly developed and capitalism is developing at a fast pace even in agriculture, where the product process has preserved its archaic nature" (A. Cunhal, "Stranitsy Bor'by" [Pages From the Struggle], Mysl', Moscow, 1977, p 83). There could be no question of dividing the land in Alentejo and Ribatejo, two of Portugal's southern provinces. Even during the fascist period the farmhands in these provinces were an organized conscious revolutionary force with a heroic experience in the struggle. They accounted for the overwhelming majority of the active rural population in these provinces--85 percent--and in the Beja, Evora, Portalegre and Setubal areas there were 10 times more farmhands than petty peasant owners. As A. Cunhal emphasizes, the farmhands made their own reform, which was revolutionary and antibourgeois. That is precisely why the reform was systematically supported by one political party--the PCP. The truly creative approach which was displayed by the PCP to the agrarian reform allowed it to become a tool for the expansion and intensification of the revolution, a means for accelerating the revolutionary process in its ascending stage, a bastion of revolutionary forces and a stabilizing factor in the political situation at a time when these forces had to convert to strategic defense.

Naturally, the existence of an entire economic sector of the nonexploitive type within a bourgeois economic system has nothing in common with the social democratic versions of the "peaceful" growth of capitalism into socialism. To begin with, this sector appeared not within capitalism or as the logical development of its economic forms but despite it, as an element of incompatibility and destruction of capitalist structures. It is opposed to the still-dominating capitalist relations. Secondly, the class struggle, which brought about its existence, could be confidently described as a "cold civil war" because of its fierceness, the fierceness of the bourgeoisie and the firm opposition shown by the working people in economics and politics. In the same speech in which Cunhal spoke of the failure of the attacks mounted against

the agrarian reform in 1977 he cautioned that "it would be a fatal error to believe that the threat to the agrarian reform is over. Numerous and severe dangers exist and continue to threaten the cooperatives (AVANTE!, 21 January 1977, p 6).

The law proposed by Minister Barreto, a socialist party member, became the official program for mounting an offensive on the agrarian reform. Entitled "General Principles of the Agrarian Reform," it is aimed at asserting the concept of the autonomous producer and granting a variety of privileges to estate owners. The communists described it as a law on agrarian anti-reform and exposed it as anticonstitutional and as aimed at restoring capitalism.

The cooperatives were severely damaged under the government of Mario Soares, although at that time as well the working people were able to prevent its implementation. The offensive against the reform and the cooperatives was initiated with unparalleled fierceness under the governments of the right-wing parties. This was literally a frontal attack. As a result, by the end of 1982 600,000 hectares of land were taken away from the cooperatives and to date no more than 250 cooperatives are cultivating approximately 500,000 hectares. Their output is higher than that of owners whose land is triple the size of that of the cooperatives!

However, it is not a question merely of a physical reduction of the area of agrarian reform but of the fact that the political system also has economic pressure levers, such as credits and the production marketing system. Thus, sometimes the cooperatives become dependent on private middlemen who buy their output at low prices and resell it at speculative prices. This in itself threatens with changing the social function of the cooperative itself. The contradiction between the social nature of the political system and state ownership hinder the full display of the new social potential of the country's state sector.

The Portuguese revolution experienced and is continuing to experience the fierce pressure of the reaction, despite which the working people have been able to preserve their essential gains and defeat the plans of the counter-revolution aimed at abolishing the democratic regime. In his speech at the 26th CPSU Congress, A. Cunhal said in this connection that "the situation in Portugal remains complex and dangerous. The struggle is continuing for holding back and routing the counterrevolutionary offensive which has been waged over the past 5 years by subsequent governments against the main gains of the Portuguese revolution--the political rights and freedoms of the working people, the nationalization, which put an end to the monopoly groups, and the agrarian reform.... However, the workers and the popular movement are offering a strong resistance to this offensive."

In September 1982, in connection with the revision of the constitution, which was conceived by the right-wing forces, Cunhal reemphasized that, as confirmed by reality, the reaction could apply any kind of illegal, arbitrary and violent action against the democratic regime and the democratic rights and freedoms of the peoples existing in Portugal. However, it would be unable to defeat the will of the working class and the working people and terminate their struggle (AVANTE!, 16 September 1982).

The following question naturally arises: how and why were the working people able to preserve a significant share of the revolutionary gains?

The explanation is, above all, that the power of the bourgeois system had been undermined in the course of the 18 months of the ascending phase of the revolution, in the course of which the old socioeconomic and political structure of the country was destroyed. The repressive fascist apparatus, the colonial system, landed estates and the domination of monopoly capital were essentially eliminated. On the other hand, the nationalized sector, the agricultural cooperatives and worker control, which appeared as a result of the revolution, were a strong material foundation for the political strength and unity of the working people. It is against this political strength that the reactionary attacks break down. Since both nationalization and agrarian reform were carried out less from above than from below, the working class was able truly to master such most important productive capital and, with the help of their management mechanism, which was created during the revolutionary period, has retained their possession, thus ensuring the functioning of state ownership in the interest of the public, i.e., of the national interests at the present stage. While the bourgeoisie was able to regain a limited domination in the political area by using the opportunistic policies of the right-wing circles of the socialist party, some "command heights" in the economic area remained largely in the hands of the working class. This limits and weakens capitalist dominance in Portugal. The political weight and political strength of the working class are unquestionably supported by such "command heights," thanks to the actual position which the working class holds in the country's economy.

This means that during the period of the ascending stage of the revolution, the economic foundations for the hegemony of the working class appeared in Portugal. This hegemony, however, did not penetrate the realm of politics. Nevertheless, we cannot fail to see the objective material prerequisites for the political influence of the working class on the power structure, for the solution of national problems is possible only through the consolidation and intensification of the agrarian reform and the nationalization rather than through capitalist-landowners' restoration. To destroy the public sector of the national economy means to destroy the country's economy. Such is the real situation which no system can ignore. This literally defeats the reactionary slander according to which the nationalized sector is "losing" and is merely taking money out of the taxpayers' pockets. In other words, national problems cannot be resolved against the will of the working people and the PCP, but only with the working people and the PCP.

"We live under conditions of freedom," Cunhal said. The freedom of the Portuguese working people--as a manifestation of their real position in the country's socioeconomic structure--is measured today to a large extent by the status of the public sector in the country's economy and the social role of the working class. In the areas of politics and rule this freedom means that the bourgeois system cannot engage in systematic violence against the people or take mass repressive measures against them. The constitution allows the people to defend their rights through political means. Naturally, the risk of a right-wing coup d'etat is never excluded in a revolution. However, while pointing this out, A. Cunhal specified that "despite major changes,

such as the armed forces were subjected to starting in 1975, current circumstances do not favor a putsch" (POLITYKA, No 7, 1979, p 11).

It is precisely in order to create conditions which would favor a putsch that the reaction planned and made a revision of the constitution in the part concerning the status of the armed forces.

Quite characteristically, however, the revision of the constitution did not affect the actual socioeconomic gains of the revolution: the irreversible nature of the nationalization was reasserted and the rights to worker control, free trade union activities and strike were recognized; lockouts were banned, the stipulations of the agrarian reform were preserved, etc. Therefore, the power of the revolutionary impulse which the country acquired in the course of the stormy 1974-1975 events was secretly manifested as in the past. It is this precisely which explains the fact that the policy of capitalist restoration triggered a profound crisis in the bourgeois political system, for the counterrevolution is not abandoning its efforts to apply and increase frontal pressure.

In discussing the characteristics of the Portuguese revolution, we pointed out that it went beyond its bourgeois framework in Portugal not with the assertion or institutionalization of the power of the working class but by capturing of some economic "command heights" by the working class. These working people's gains were legalized and institutionalized not by a proletarian government but a government representing a broad coalition of social democratic forces--the working class, the nonproletarian toiling masses, the petite town and country bourgeoisie and a segment of the middle bourgeoisie willing to ally themselves to the working people against the monopolies and fascism. The nationalization of the monopolies and the agrarian reform were both programmatic demands of this radical bourgeoisie. The means through which such steps were carried out in Portugal no longer depended on it, the more so since objectively no other means existed. The working class was not only in a position of hegemony but actually indirectly controlled the monopoly bourgeoisie and the estate owners, although in the realm of political power it was not its representatives or, more accurately, essentially its representatives who wielded the weapons for such control.

Did this affect the reforms which were made? In terms of the agrarian reform, the answer is clearly yes. We already pointed out that the PCP alone supported a systematic reform. The reform was also supported on an individual basis by some members of the military. As a whole, however, the support of the armed forces was irregular and unstable, reflecting the petit bourgeois limitations of some revolutionary leaders, whose main inclination was to keep the mass movement within the legal framework.

It was precisely such fluctuations in the realm of political power and the gradual growth of a trend toward moderation among population sectors which had not ideologically rejected bourgeois and petit bourgeois influence which enabled the bourgeoisie to regain partial control of the governmental system. Here again we come across yet another characteristic in the development of the class struggle. Usually, the restoration of bourgeois control over the governmental system has led to a heavy defeat of the revolution, the elimination of its gains and the establishment of authoritarian regimes. This did

not occur in Portugal. Here the development of the revolution was stopped but not turned back. To a certain extent the main objectives of the anti-fascist national democratic revolution were attained. In this connection, A. Cunhal indicates its main objectives: destruction of the fascist state and establishment of a democratic regime, elimination of monopoly power, economic development, agrarian reform, giving the land to those who cultivate it, enhancing the living standard of the toiling classes and the people as a whole, democratization of education and culture, liberation of Portugal from imperialism and pursuit of a policy of peace and friendship with all nations.

These revolutionary gains were characteristic features of Portuguese democracy as a "democratic political system with an economic organization free from the domination of the financial oligarchy, a democracy which had charted a course toward socialism."

The major achievements accomplished in the implementation of these targets and the subsequent "halt" in the process of intensifying the revolution led to the appearance of an original political system and state. Portugal remains a bourgeois state in which the bourgeoisie controls the power. However, it is a democratic state in which the working class has gained a wide range of freedoms and rights, socioeconomic included. Such rights and freedoms are no longer encased within the specific framework of bourgeois democracy. They are no longer of a bourgeois democratic nature, for they are guaranteed to the working people through national public ownership and worker control of private enterprises. These real rights and freedoms enjoyed by the working people restrict the power of the bourgeoisie. In Portugal the conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat assumed the institutionalized forms of conflict between the executive power and state ownership and between the power of the bourgeoisie and the freedom of the working class. This contradiction gave birth to an original political system. To begin with, many enterprises in the state (public) sector retained their autonomy from the state and from the bourgeois political power as being public property; at the same time, however, being no longer the property of the "overall capitalist," they did not become national property for the precise reason that in order to develop the national nature of such state property the social and class unity between public ownership and political power is needed. Public property restricts predominant private ownership relations.

Secondly, after the revolution a democratic system for local self-management was established in the country. In areas in which self-managing production units are concentrated, the self-management organs are controlled by the working people and their parties, naturally, the PCP above all. In these areas the self-managing enterprises in the public sector rely on the support of the local self-management organs and it is possible to speak of a single "bloc" in opposition to the bourgeois central government.

Worker control, which extends to private enterprises, became the third and most important element of the political system. A rather peculiar situation developed in the "mass-institutions" relation. Whereas the bourgeoisie controls the political system, the working class has the possibility of controlling, to one extent or another, the economic activities of individual

bourgeois. The bourgeoisie has retained extensive opportunities for striking at democratic institutions through their "legal" curtailment or even abolition. This is a major threat to the revolutionary gains. On the other hand, however, the toiling masses have the actual strength for ensuring the functioning of legally weakened institutions, as was the case, for example, with worker control.

Fourthly, the Portuguese Communist Party and the united trade union National Intersindical Center, play a very specific role. They not only defend the interests of the working people and not only represent them in the areas of politics and labor relations and they not only organize and ensure the unity within the working class and coordinate the struggle waged by its various sectors particularly within the state ownership framework but also work extensively to organize the production process, to upgrade labor productivity, to strengthen the economy of noncapitalist enterprises, to develop new labor and social customs in them and to establish new social relations.

It is no accident that the party's prestige and influence are rising steadily. The best proof of this is the growth in the ranks of the PCP which today numbers more than 200,000 members. This is a truly unique case: under the conditions of a reactionary offensive the revolutionary party has doubled its ranks!

This fact is a concentrated manifestation of the revolutionary potential of the toiling masses, the truly creative Marxist-Leninist nature of the party's policy and the entire peculiarity of the country's political situation.

This situation, however, gives the impression of an unstable ratio of forces which cannot be maintained indefinitely as it is, although it could be extended to a more or less lengthy period of time. On the one hand, as the BCP Central Committee concluded at its 13 March 1984 Plenum, "the economic, social and political situation in the country is so dangerous that unless it is changed in the immediate future it would be difficult to avoid a truly national calamity...." Meanwhile, the plenum emphasized, the struggle waged by the masses and discontent with the existing situation have attained such a scope that "a real base of social and political support has been laid for pursuit of a democratic and patriotic policy." According to the Portuguese communists, the struggle waged by the people's masses was and remains the decisive factor of the social evolution.

Be that as it may, the revolutionary experience of these past years will justifiably become part of the treasury of the world labor movement as an example of true revolutionary creativity during the period of the ascending phase of the revolution and an example of the ability to defend the revolution and its gains in a changing ratio of forces. This experience gives us all the necessary reasons for displaying a healthy optimism, such as was sounded in A. Cunhal's words: "Ten years have passed since the time fascism was overthrown and today, brimming with faith in the future, the Portuguese people proclaim that 'April will triumph!'"

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

xCSO: 1802/14

WOMEN IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE, EQUAL RIGHTS AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84) pp 104-113

[Article by V. Tereshkova, Soviet Women's Committee chairman]

[Text] Peace.... Life.... War.... How frequently history has strung these words side by side, instilling in the hearts of millions of people hope, confidence, pain or concern. Never before, however, have they rung as they do today, when the threat of nuclear war hangs over the entire planet and when the question of the very existence of our civilization is being resolved. The course of imperialism, American above all, of preparations for a new world war and the threat of nuclear death have triggered a counteraction on the part of the people's masses on all continents unheard of in terms of scope and power. The women are in the leading ranks of this historical movement of opposition to war.

A special explanation of the role which women have always played and still play in mass movements and the revolutionary liberation process of our time is unnecessary. It is accurately expressed in Marx's words emphasizing that "great social changes are impossible without the ferment provided by women" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 32, p 486). "There can be no real mass movement without women," V. I. Lenin emphasized in a talk with Klara Zetkin ("Vospominaniya o Vladimire Iliche Lenine" [Recollections About Vladimir Il'ich Lenin]. In five volumes. Volume 5, Moscow, 1979, p 49). Toward the end of the 19th century, in his book "The Woman and Socialism," A. Bebel confidently predicted that "the future belongs to socialism," i.e., above all to workers and women." At the same time he pointed out that women were as yet to prove that they had understood their true position in the struggle for a better future and were ready to participate in it.

Today, one century later, we can claim with full justification that the women have proved this. Our age is characterized by the wide participation of women in the economic, social and cultural life of society and a substantial enhancement of their role in resolving most important international problems, including activities aimed at strengthening peace. The international democratic women's movement, which arose as inseparably linked with the struggle waged by all democratic forces against imperialism, militarism and reaction and for peace, national independence and social progress, is most closely linked with all topical problems of social life.

"If the working woman wants to shorten the period of suffering related to the age of imperialist wars," Lenin wrote in 1915, her aspiration toward peace

must turn into indignation and struggle..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 26, p 207). Lenin's concept of the need for the active involvement of women in the antiwar struggle was practically developed in the activities of the communist and worker movements. The decisions passed by the Comintern and the four international conferences of communist women (1920-1926) on the extensive involvement of women in the common struggle waged by the working people for their rights, against the rising threat of fascism and for peace, democracy and socialism helped to mobilize the working women for active participation in mass actions against the omnipotence of capital and the subsequent creation of an antifascist women's front during World War II.

The mass democratic women's movement which developed in many countries throughout the world in the course of the liberation struggle against German fascism and Japanese militarism, which was part of the single antifascist popular front, became widespread after the war. Millions of women from the socialist countries, representing a powerful and active social force, are most actively participating in it. The movement was joined by women in the young independent countries, which had broken the chains of colonial slavery, and of countries whose peoples are struggling for freedom and independence. The members of the movement in the developed capitalist countries are engaged in extensive and varied activities which frequently demand a great deal of resolve and even courage.

The Women's International Democratic Federation, one of the largest public organizations in the world, stands at the head of the contemporary democratic women's movement. The "Women's International Democratic Federation, which was founded on 1 December 1945, after the end of World War II," stipulate the federation's bylaws, "was an expression of the will of women the world over to unite in the struggle against war, oppression and poverty and to build a future which would ensure progress, freedom, justice and peace." In addition to the most important social problems of protecting the rights of women and children, the WIDF program includes topical problems of the struggle for disarmament, peace and national independence. No single previous organization of women had ever set itself such a variety of broad tasks.

In rereading today the documents relative to the founding of the WIDF one is unwittingly amazed at the unanimous way in which women expressed at that time the need for friendship, cooperation and solidarity among the peoples of the world, how strong and inflexible was their desire for peace and the urgency with which they warned of the threat of a terrible catastrophe which could befall our planet--for Hiroshima and Nagasaki had been destroyed in August of the same year, 1945--if the atom bomb were to be used again.

"Although many organizations deal with problems of peace..., we operate from the women's point of view and protection and present in our struggle women's arguments," noted Eugenie Cotton, the noted physicist and outstanding French public figure, who was the first president of the WIDF. "...Our arguments are that we, those whose human dignity has been violated for so long, can better than anyone else understand the entire depth of humiliation of nations suffering from the oppression of colonialism and imperialism, aggression and war."

The federation is open to women regardless of race, nationality or religious and political views. It includes progressive women's organizations from countries with different sociopolitical systems. Ever since it was founded the WIDF has been most closely related to the three revolutionary forces of our time: the social organizations in the countries belonging to the world socialist system, the worker and democratic movements in the developed capitalist countries and the national liberation movement. This largely determines the objectives and tasks of the federation and the anti-imperialist trend in its activities and helps it to realize the entire complexity of the problems of the contemporary world and their interconnection. It contributes to the education of women in a spirit of true international solidarity. The active position which the WIDF holds on problems of war and peace and its invariable support of peoples fighting for freedom and independence, combined with specific activities for the defense of the rights of women and children, enhance the reputation and prestige of the federation on all continents and help to involve in its ranks new detachments of progressive women. Today the WIDF rallies 135 women's organizations in 117 different countries.

The desire to cooperate and engage in joint activities with other international organizations is a characteristic feature of the federation's activities. This includes not only the World Federation of Trade Unions, the World Peace Council, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, and others, but also organizations with different social structures and objectives, such as the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Pan-African Women's Organization, the International Women's Council, the International Cooperative Alliance, the World Association of Young Women's Christian Association, the World Council of Churches and others. The WIDF also cooperates with various women's circles outside women's associations.

Such comprehensive cooperation has been fruitful in recent years in sponsoring major international public meetings based on a broad program of common demands, the demand for peace above all. Let us mention in this connection the World Congress, which was dedicated to the International Year of the Woman (Berlin, 1975), the World Conference "For the Peaceful and Happy Future of All Children" (Moscow, 1979) and the World Congress of Women "For Equality, National Independence and Peace" (Prague, 1981). The Prague congress alone was attended by representatives of 275 different women's organizations from 130 countries and 96 international and regional organizations.

Participation in preparations for and holding the Universal Assembly "For Peace and Life and Against Nuclear War" (Prague, 1983) was a convincing example of successful cooperation among representatives of groups with different political orientations. Women participated in virtually all national delegations. They chaired meetings and worked in the leading organs of this forum. A fruitful dialogue among representatives of 93 women's organizations of a great variety of persuasions took place in the course of the work of the "Women's Center" and the special women's meeting organized within the assembly.

Its unity of views on the exceptional importance of rallying all peace-loving forces for the sake of preventing the threat of new world war is being hammered out forum after forum, with the steadily broadening social and political

range of participants. Thus, the participants in the World Congress of Women, which was held in Prague, wrote the following in the unanimously adopted appeal: "Whether our children will live in peace or whether all life on our planet will be destroyed in a nuclear war depends on us too, the women.... Let us raise our voice!... Let us act together! United, we can save our peoples and all mankind!"

It is important to note that the voice of the democratic women's public is reaching increasingly wider women's circles in many countries and exerting increasing influence on the growth of their political awareness.

Millions of women in all continents warmly responded to the appeal of the WIDF on holding a universal women's action campaign for peace and disarmament. Directing on two occasions its representatives to attend the special sessions of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament in 1978 and 1982, from the high rostrum of the United Nations the WIDF proclaimed the inflexible will of the women on earth for peace and their firm resolve to fight for disarmament and for strengthening detente.

The antiwar actions held annually on the initiative of the WIDF in connection with the Women's Day of Struggle for Disarmament (25 October) and on the occasion of International Women's Day, 8 March, which has been celebrated for the past several years as a day for women's opposition to the threat of a nuclear war, have become truly mass events.

The federation and its journal WOMEN OF THE WORLD are working actively to expose the true sources of military danger and tension in the world as well as the notorious myth of the "Soviet war threat." Such federation activities help women in different countries to see more clearly the essential differences between the consistent and constructive approach taken by the USSR and the other members of the socialist commonwealth to problems of peace and disarmament and the demagogic and obstructionist position held by the U.S. administration and the ruling circles of the other NATO countries, which are doing everything possible to hinder their solution.

The specific, effective and clear peace suggestions contained in the speeches of Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet presidium chairman, are consistent with the expectations and aspirations of women the world over. As Freda Brown, the WIDF president, pointed out, "the USSR's pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons triggered tremendous enthusiasm. Even the most politically naive women can understand that if all nuclear powers assume the same obligation the mortal danger of a nuclear war could be eliminated."

The further energizing of the antiwar and antimissile women's movement held the center of attention at the meeting of the WIDF Council, which was held at the end of 1983. The participants approved the federation's program for the next 2 years. It calls for intensifying the women's movement for peace and disarmament in all continents, holding a "peace course" for exchange of experience in antiwar activities in different countries, holding peace weeks by European women under the sign of the struggle for safeguarding peace on

the European continent, holding a regional seminar on the participation of African women in the struggle against imperialist aggression and for national liberation and peace, sponsoring an international meeting on "Three Generations of Women Against Fascism and War" and many others. The appeal by the WIDF session to the women of the world formulated specific assignments for the participation of women in the general struggle against the threat of a new world war and against imperialist intervention and aggression. "Women of the world, at plants, offices, cities and villages, wherever you may live and work," the appeal states, "double your efforts and involve every woman in the struggle for life!... Time does not wait. Let us become aware of our responsibility! Let us save peace!"

Many noted women public figures of different countries and generations have been awarded the international Lenin Prize "For Strengthening Peace Among Nations." They include Freda Brown (Australia), Dolores Ibarruri (Spain), Miriam Vire-Tuominen (Finland), Tsola Dragoycheva (Bulgaria), Wilma Espin de Castro (Cuba), Jeanne Martin Sisse (Guinea), Aruna Asaf Ali (India), Nguyen Thi Din' (Vietnam), Ortensia Bussi de Allende, Olga Poblete (Chile) and others. Many other outstanding figures in the women's movement on all continents are making a substantial contribution to the struggle waged by the peoples for national independence, social progress and peace; many new young activists are joining this struggle today!

The women's antiwar movement of the 1970s and 1980s includes, along with the already existing women's democratic organizations, numerous new groups and associations of women brimming with a feeling of high responsibility for the destinies of the world. These include the "Women for Peace" movement which arose in the countries of northern Europe, the Netherlands, Greece, the FRG, West Berlin, France, Switzerland and other countries; the "Mothers for Peace" Movement in Great Britain, "Women's Movement for the Prevention of Nuclear War" in Japan, the "Women in the Struggle for Peace" in Italy and the "Peace Link. Women Against Nuclear War" in the United States.

It is important to note that women are not only taking an active part in the steadily growing joint struggle waged by all peace-loving forces but are initiating their own action, with a feeling of inventiveness, enthusiasm and emotion. It is precisely women who frequently initiate mass antiwar actions such as peace marches and raids and forms of antiwar protest, such as picketing American military bases and setting up peace camps.

For more than 2 years the participants in the British peace camp of Green Common, where the new American cruise missiles were deployed, have been waging a courageous antimissile struggle, which has become universally known, and have enjoyed sympathy and broad international support. "We cannot remain silent when it becomes a question of the destruction of life and the murder of women and children," the leaflet distributed by the camp participants reads. "We can no longer passively look at our men going to war and dying. Henceforth we are initiating a most decisive struggle against the threat of war." The entire world has witnessed that neither repression nor arrests can stop this struggle. On the contrary, ever new forms of protest against the deployment of American Pershings and cruise missiles are appearing.

The antiwar movement in general, and the women's movement in particular, have had to act under the new circumstances which developed after the deployment of American missiles was undertaken in Western Europe. Despite all efforts on the part of militaristic circles to demoralize the movement and to insinuate the idea of the senselessness of the struggle, the women's antiwar activities became a permanent factor. The participants do not limit themselves merely to condemning the deployment of the Pentagon's weapons on foreign land. The program of the women's antiwar movement is widening and encompassing increasingly new requirements ranging from the creation of nuclear-free zones in Europe to a revision of the entire U.S. political and military strategy and the angry exposure of the aggressive course of American imperialism.

Having rejected the Bundestag's decision to deploy American nuclear missiles in the FRG, the West German peace workers are now raising the demand for a referendum on this vitally important problem. The women in Denmark, Belgium, The Netherlands, Norway and other countries are taking part in so-called warning strikes, sending "peace ambassadors" from one city to another and organizing protest posts.

The women in the United States itself are opposing the spirit of nuclear war with increasing resolve. Even traditional women's organizations, which previously concerned themselves only with problems of women's equality, today base their activities on the conviction that "peace is also a matter for women." An increasing number of American women today are adopting an active political stance on problems related to preserving the peace, independently of the views of their husbands, fathers or brothers. The percentage of those who oppose the arms race and increase the military expenditures is higher among women than among the population as a whole. It was precisely women who organized the first peace camp in the United States in Seneca Falls, where Pershings to be deployed in Western Europe are stored.

Women's organizations in the developing countries are playing an increasing role in the struggle for peace and against the threat of nuclear war. Those same women who, by virtue of age-old traditions and colonial systems were isolated from public life, are today actively opposing the arms race and increased international tension. Women in Asia, Latin America and Africa are increasingly realizing that American nuclear missiles in Western Europe are threatening the security of all nations and all continents. "In today's tense times, when the Geneva talks were interrupted by the fault of the United States," the appeal of the Pan-Arab Women's Federation states, "all of us must dedicate maximal efforts to strengthen the peace on earth, which is more precious than anything else."

The fact that the contemporary women's antiwar movement is quite heterogeneous cannot be ignored. It involves the participation of women from any different social circles and with different ideological and political convictions. We must take into consideration the various trends within this mass movement, determined by the affiliation of women with various classes and population strata, and the influence which different political parties and organizations exert on them.

The women in the socialist countries are making a worthy contribution to the universal women's peace movement. This is manifested in mass labor peace watches, money collections for peace funds and holding meetings and dialogues among women from different countries on problems of the struggle for peace. The "Stockholm-Moscow-Minsk" peace march (1982) which was held on the initiative of the Soviet public and the women in northern European countries, the peace march of women in Balkan and Danube countries, organized by the Bulgarian Women's Movement Committee (1983) border meetings with foreign women's organizations sponsored by Czechoslovak women and the invitation which GDR women extended to foreign women to participate in mass peace meetings and many other antiwar actions are contributing to the better reciprocal understanding among women of countries with different sociopolitical systems and to expanding cooperation for the sake of preventing a new world war.

The Soviet women have gained rich experience in the struggle against militarism, fascism, aggression and war. They made a truly tremendous contribution to the historical victory over German fascism and Japanese militarism, the 40th anniversary of which will be celebrated by our country and all progressive mankind next year. The Soviet women defended the right of their people to freedom and the right of all people on earth to live in peace through their dedicated toil in the rear and daring and courage in the battlefield. During that difficult period for our country, the women firmly joined in the struggle for the unification of all forces opposing fascism and militarism.

The Antifascist Committee of Soviet Women was created during the first months of the Great Patriotic War. The tasks which the Soviet women have set for themselves in the creation of their social organization, at the first antifascist women's meeting on 7 September 1941, was to call upon the women in the countries occupied by the fascists to engage in joint struggle, to establish relations with women's organizations in allied countries and to unite against the common enemy, German fascism. The participants in the meeting appealed to all women in the world to join in the struggle against the Hitlerite aggressor.

Women in Great Britain, the United States, India, Australia and other countries sent thousands of answers to the Soviet women's appeal. It was thus that the first contacts were established between the Antifascist Committee of Soviet Women, which was renamed Committee of Soviet Women after the war, with progressive women's organizations and groups in foreign countries. These contacts expanded and strengthened after the great victory of the peoples over fascism. Today the committee maintains friendly relations with national organizations in more than 120 countries.

Throughout its activities the committee has considered the struggle for preserving and strengthening peace one of its main tasks.

The Committee of Soviet Women has held plenums on the participation of Soviet women in the international women's antiwar movement; the same item has been discussed at republic, kray, oblast and city women's rallies in our country. In their speeches at rallies and congresses and their numerous letters to the committee and the editors of women's journals, the Soviet women are expressing

their warm support of the CPSU course of strengthening the defense capability of our country, safeguarding peace and preventing nuclear war.

In today's difficult and dangerous period in international relations, the Soviet people cannot allow the military strategic balance in the world to be disturbed by the United States and its NATO allies which are manifesting their hatred for the socialist system in preparations for war, provocative adventures and "crusades" and are trying to suppress the national liberation movement of the peoples. The women of our country consider as their contribution to the struggle of the peoples for peace above all their tireless toil which makes it even more powerful and able to counter the intrigues of the enemies of peace. The Soviet women ascribe great importance to raising the growing generation in a spirit of peace, friendship and reciprocal understanding among nations.

The Soviet women are permanent participants in international and regional peace forums. The committee sponsors bilateral seminars with women's organizations in different countries against the threat of war. For example, last year's seminars with Japanese, American and Indian women and women representing northern European countries made possible a fruitful exchange of views on problems of women's participation in the antiwar movement. Such friendly and frank dialogues are particularly important under the circumstances of the worsened international tension and increased anti-Soviet hysteria in the capitalist countries. Here is what the Japanese women wrote in the local press back in their homeland: "What impressed us most was that wherever we went...everyone warmly spoke of peace and disarmament." Libby Frank, who headed the American delegation to the Soviet-American seminar, pointed out that the members of the delegation were particularly inspired by everything which the Soviet leadership has been and is doing to deflect the threat of war.

The Committee of Soviet Women considers its efforts to help and support women in countries struggling for national independence, freedom and democracy and women in the young liberated countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America one of the forms of the struggle for a lasting and just peace on earth.

The participation of Soviet women in mass political measures in defense of peace in the country proves the high political consciousness and active life stance assumed by the women in socialist society. Let us also point out that as more than one-half of the deputies in local power bodies and one-third of the USSR Supreme Soviet deputies, the Soviet women are directly engaged in formulating and making important political decisions, including decisions dealing with problems of peace and disarmament. The decisions of the April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum call for the broader and more initiative-minded participation of Soviet women and the entire Soviet people in the political life of developed socialist society.

The sociopolitical activeness of Soviet women is an important part of the overall process of the conscious creative participation of our entire people in building socialism and communism, in the struggle for lasting peace and for the unity and cohesion among all peace-loving forces on earth. The international activities of women in the Soviet Union are a substantial contribution to the international women's democratic movement.

The United Nations' proclamation of the Decade of the Woman (1976-1985) marked a new stage in the development of the international women's movement. This decade is a recognition of the important role which women play in the contemporary world. It also proves that problems of women's equality are still far from being resolved in many countries throughout the world. The slogan of the decade--"equality, development, peace"--reflects the most important and closely interrelated problems facing mankind. Women's equality largely depends on their participation in the development of their countries and the establishment of a just economic order. This can be achieved only under conditions of universal peace and removing the threat of nuclear war hanging over the planet. It is quite natural, therefore, that the Decade of the Woman was marked by the energized struggle waged by the broad women's circles for disarmament and peace.

An increasing number of women are realizing that the arms race and the atmosphere of tension are causing economic and social instability, increased unemployment and inflation and are leading to poverty, hunger and disease. The arms race increases discrimination against women in all realms of life and seriously hinders the implementation of important United Nations documents such as the Universal Plan for Action and the Action Program for the second half of the Decade of the Woman.

Increasing women's unemployment which, according to the International Labor Organization, has reached 50 percent or more in some parts of the world, is a subject of great concern. In France, for example, women account for 39 percent of the workforce but for over one-half of the unemployed. The corresponding figures for the FRG are 38 and 55 percent.

It is quite natural that most of the women's antiwar actions are conducted under the slogans of "Work Not Missiles!" and "Jobs Not Missiles!" Thus, the participants in the antiwar march of unemployed FRG women, which took place last year, demanded a reduction of the military budget and the use of the available funds for the creation of jobs. Studies conducted by the organization of "Women for Racial and Economic Equality" (United States) in 1982 indicate that the funds spent by the U.S. administration for military purposes would open more than 1.5 million jobs in services, in which as many as 54 percent of the workers are women, or more than 1 million jobs in state institutions in which women account for more than half the manpower. According to that organization, 58 percent of the total number of American citizens who are today under the poverty level are women.

Increasing military budgets at the expense of social programs leads to acute shortages of preschool institutions, deprives women of the possibility of combining work with motherhood and harms women's vocational training. As a rule, because of discrimination in general and vocational training, women are less qualified for jobs than men. Disparities in male and female wages, which are as high as 60 percent in some capitalist countries, remain considerable.

To women in the developing countries military expenditures mean failure to implement programs for improving the living conditions of women and children. Increased imperialist aggressiveness, of late such countries have been forced to spend about 6 percent of their GNP in military construction, compared with 2.8 percent on education and no more than 1 percent on health care, at a time

when 90 percent of small children who die in these countries could be saved through timely vaccination, proper nutrition and necessary medical aid.

Particularly difficult is the situation of women and children in countries with racist and dictatorial regimes and under conditions of armed aggression and occupation. Racial discrimination, from which millions of people are suffering, women and children above all, is increasing in a number of countries. The shameful apartheid system and the inhuman conditions which those who are forced to live in refugee camps must endure insult the dignity of women and doom them to rightlessness and suffering. Thousands of women and children are being killed by bombs, left widowed and orphaned, wasting away in jail or subjected to cruel torture. The UN Declaration on the Defense of Women and Children Under Extraordinary Circumstances and During Periods of Armed Conflicts is being grossly violated.

In the socialist countries, where the equality of women is legislatively codified and is successfully implemented and where women's employment is the highest in the world, concern for working women and mothers has been raised to the level of state policy.

In the Soviet Union the United Nations Decade of the Woman coincided with two five-year plans in the course of which important steps aimed at further improving the conditions which allow women to combine their duties as mothers with active participation in professional activities and public life have been implemented. A new USSR constitution was adopted in 1977, which once again legislatively codified the gains of socialism in the area of women's equality. It is particularly important that in accordance with the new constitution women's rights have been significantly increased and the material guarantees which back them have become substantially stronger. In accordance with the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress, a number of new steps were taken in the 11th Five-Year Plan to increase concern for working women and mothers and to continue to increase state aid to families, to improve the system for the protection of motherhood and childhood, to ensure the further development of the network of children's institutions, to increase payments and benefits from social consumption funds and to ensure the further development of housing construction. However, these achievements could have been even more significant had our country not been forced to allocate considerable material resources for strengthening defense capability, resources which are so greatly needed for upgrading the well-being of the working people and implementing the great plans for building a communist society.

On the initiative of the USSR, the 34th United Nations General Assembly (1979) adopted a Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. This has been one of the most important achievements of the decade. At the start of 1984 the convention had already been initialed and ratified by 55 countries. For the first time in international law a document of a juridically obligatory nature was passed combining the basic progressive principles governing women's rights with many of the demands of the democratic women's movement.

One of the most important international documents on ensuring the women's right to live in peace and other basic rights is the Declaration on Women's Participation in Helping International Peace and Cooperation, which was

passed at the 37th UN General Assembly Session (1982). The declaration emphasizes that the creation of conditions for ensuring a lasting peace, detente, disarmament and international security depends on the equal participation of women in the struggle for attaining these objectives. What makes the adoption of such an international document even more important is the fact that during the entire decade representatives of a number of Western countries tried to emasculate the political content of this most important campaign and to separate the problem of women's equality from the global problems of our time, the struggle for preserving the peace above all. The approval of the declaration by the UN General Assembly is a political success in the women's struggle, a success of the democratic peace-loving forces.

Currently active preparations have begun for holding the third universal conference of the United Nations Decade of the Woman, which will be held in Nairobi (Kenya) in 1985. As indicated by the course of the preparations for the conference, the women's problem was and remains one of the fronts in the acute ideological struggle. Bourgeois ideologues of all hues are doing everything possible to cast aspersions on the Marxist-Leninist theory of the social liberation of women and to discredit the experience of the socialist countries, the Soviet Union above all, in resolving the women's problem.

Aware of the major political and social role which women play in contemporary society, the reactionary circles in capitalist countries are trying to turn the women's movement toward the so-called neo-feminism, which is characterized by substituting official-legal problems or searches of the origins of discrimination in the areas of biology and psychology for the socioclass ways of resolving the women's problem. They are making use of all means at their disposal for influencing women ideologically and thus dividing the women's movement, drawing it away from the anti-imperialist struggle waged by the peoples and creating difficulties in drafting programs for joint activities and defining the future of the struggle for emancipation.

The imperialist efforts to divide the women's movement is countered by the struggle for unity within its ranks. The struggle against the threat of nuclear war is the cementing foundation for achieving such unity at the present stage.

In our days women--communist, social democrat, feminist, Catholic, Muslim and Protestant--are finding increasingly new opportunities for joint action against the threat of nuclear catastrophe. The effectiveness of such cooperation is confirmed by the actions of protest against the deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe, against the American invasion of Grenada and the aggressive actions against Nicaragua in Afghanistan, the American-Israeli Middle East aggression and many others, organized by women's organizations in different countries.

Today mankind faces vital problems, eliminating the threat of nuclear war above all. This demands of the international women's movement even better organization, unity and activeness. The cohesion of women of all continents and their joint activities are dictated by the present international situation and are an urgent necessity in our time.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

YESTERDAY IN TODAY'S WASHINGTON

AU180600 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84)
pp 114-125

[Article by V. Falin; words in all capitals published in italics in the original]

[Text] Everything is in constant flux. Everything--both around us and within us. Much of what was or seemed true yesterday needs to be amended today and cannot be applied to tomorrow. This is totally natural: Movement is development, development--change, change--renewal. Why must we return to this truth again and again? Because socioeconomic laws do not operate in their pure form--particularly in the international sphere. There exists only a certain mean of constant fluctuations reflecting the antagonism of classes and of attempts by the old to determine the limits of growth, subject ideas arising on new soil to biased censorship, and exert an influence upon the very essence and direction of movement.

Every class and every social formation has its own ideals and own features. Under the capitalist production method (K. Marx noted, "Circulation becomes a colossal social retort into which everything is drawn to emerge as crystals of money. Even the relics of the saints cannot withstand this alchemy..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 23, p 142)). Only that which can be produced with a profit is produced. "If capital is taken abroad, the reason for this is not that it could not be used within the country," emphasized Marx. "The reason is that it can be invested abroad at a higher rate of profit" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 25, p 281).

Ponder on these extremely topical appraisals and conclusions that reveal the inner nature of the capitalist system, a nature which, without exception, has been inherited by imperialism. Without cognition of this nature, the founder of communist teaching warned, scientific analysis of competition (and, in the broad sense, of the policy of confrontation, is just as impossible as the visible movement of heavenly bodies is incomprehensible without knowledge of their real, but imperceptible movement. These appraisals and conclusions show the motive and aim of the capitalist production method which are the core of contemporary imperialism's "vital interest" and form the background to its actions and positions, including on cardinal problems of war and peace. "The general and essential trends of capital," wrote Marx, "must be differentiated from the forms of their manifestation" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 326). The forms, instruments and technology of policy

become more complex, accumulate levels of superstructures and become more impenetrable to the detached observer. "The deception of the popular masses," wrote V. I. Lenin, "is artistically developed with regard to the 'affairs' of foreign policy..." (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 32, p 335). It is sometimes more difficult to delimit the true and the false in policy than it is for physicists to split isotopes. Difficult but not impossible.

I

Last Christmas Eve, President R. Reagan lapsed into frankness and made a very remarkable admission in an interview: If in 1945, Japan had had nuclear weapons, the United States would not have used its own against it. By touching upon the past, the President explained the American present and alluded to the future. He laid bare the common denominator of Washington's militarist doctrines, concepts and plans which would turn the U.S. monopolies into the autocrats of the whole earth.

There is no point in making the United States either better or worse than it is. We will attempt to examine the motives and circumstances behind the demand made by U.S. ruling circles that the "world be run the American way" on the basis of established facts, authentic documents and the evidence provided by the participants in events themselves. So, what started the ball rolling?

Discussions on how to "do good" not only to the Indians, but to the whole of mankind have been held in Washington for quite a long time. Let us recall the speech of Senator Henry C. Lodge on 7 January 1901: "The American people and the economic forces that are the basis of everything are drawing us forward to economic domination of the world." Another senator went still further and advanced the claim to "govern the peoples," referring to "the Most High." Let us note that "the communist danger" had not yet been conceived of at that time, "civilization had not been saved," and "freedom" and "democracy" did not have the market price they were to later receive in the eyes of the West when the world was split along the social meridian.

And the matter was not reduced to discussions alone. The "big stick" was set in motion both in the New World and in the Old. It was noted in the resolution of the 6th Congress of the RSDWP(b) (26 July-3 August (8-16 August) 1917): "A new imperialist giant and aspirant to world hegemony has appeared on the scene--America." Hegemonist aspirations even brought a U.S. expeditionary corps to Soviet Russia. From intervention to intervention its characteristic signature and its greedy appetite gradually took shape.

Thanks to Henry R. Luce, an influential figure in the White House, we know for sure that powerful groups within the United States saw World War II as a chance to turn this century into the first in which "America would occupy a dominating position in the world." In the cabinets of the State Department and the Pentagon, in the Capitol, and behind the tightly closed doors of the secret services, work was begun on developing a strategy and tactics calculated to win a "decisive advantage" both in the war against Germany and Japan and against the new "aggressor," by which the not unknown Admiral U. Lehigh,

future associate of H. Truman, meant the USSR. This was said within a "closed circle" in 1943 when the ruins of Stalingrad were smoking and the armor plating of the tanks on the Kursk Bulge was melting, when the River Dnepr was red with the blood of the Soviet soldiers who had given their lives to free mankind from the Nazi plague, and when the United States was publicly swearing its loyalty to its duty as an ally and was signing agreements with the USSR on postwar cooperation. As early as 1944, the leaders of the American Armed Forces were set for an "inevitable" World War III with the "totalitarian state aggressor" and determined the make-up of the troops for the occupation of Germany accordingly. It is true, the forecasts of the Joint Committee of Chiefs of Staff (the Joint Chiefs of Staff), which were brought to the attention of the U.S. secretary of state, for example, in May and August 1944, were not overflowing with optimism. The United States, the chiefs of staff reported, "would not be able to conquer Russia" even "in alliance with the British empire."

I have no wish to cast aspersions on the policies of F. Roosevelt. They cannot be called simple, but one also cannot deny that they were honest. However, it would be wrong to close one's eyes to the fact that, during all the years he was in power, Roosevelt was opposed by an ultrareactionary clique that had been awaiting its hour to continue what it considered to be the main line of Washington's policy--the struggle against communism, a struggle which had been interrupted by the "family quarrel" with Germany and Japan. This clique had its people in every unit of the state apparatus and in the Army. It was not without their knowledge that operations in Europe in which the American Armed Forces participated were planned in such way that Hitler's Wehrmacht should not be "drawn too much away" from the Eastern front and so that the ultimate common success of the anti-Hitlerite coalition should be secured at the cost of the highest efforts and losses for the "potential enemy"--the USSR--so that postwar development in the world should fulfill the aims of the United States "at least by 85 percent" to quote Truman).

Nevertheless, the desired "decisive advantage" for future battles did not materialize. Instead, something qualitatively new appeared--nuclear weapons. "Economic might and a nuclear monopoly," Secretary of Defense G. Stimson exulted, "were the same for the United States as a royal flush in poker--the highest hand and the one that beats all others." "The atom bomb," President H. Truman was told in 1945 by his adviser, future Secretary of State G. Burns, "can make it possible for us to dictate our conditions at the end of the war." To make the point more forcibly and for purposes of edification, Hiroshima and Nagasaki were reduced to ashes.

Perhaps the American leaders, honestly mistaken, really thought that the Soviet Union was intending to attack the United States, or Britain, or France? No. They were well aware that this was not the case. "The main aim of Soviet foreign policy is to support and safeguard the security of the USSR," we read in a document of the joint intelligence committee (Report No 250/1 of 31 January 1945). Its compilers denied the Soviet Union having any "aspirations to world domination." Let us take a report by the joint committee for military planning No 416/1 of 8 January 1946. "During the next 10-15 years at the very least," it says, "efforts to fulfill domestic policy aims under conditions of peace will predominate (in the USSR) over prospects for

attaining foreign policy aims that are possibly connected with the risk of war." Or perhaps the opinion of adviser to the head of the American military administration in Germany, R. Murphy: "We have never believed and do not believe for a minute in the threat of Soviet aggression."

A great-power policy is formulated primarily under the influence of internal causes. Yet another detachment of international imperialism felt itself ready for struggle against everyone and for "world leadership." It is cramped within national boundaries. It craves to exploit the whole earth. And the temptation is great. As a result of World War II, the United States' main imperialist rivals were either utterly defeated or seriously weakened. If the Soviet Union could be eliminated, nothing would stand in the way of global domination, no matter how soon it would be necessary to start a war for this purpose.

Deputy Secretary of State G. [Gryu] wrote in a memorandum dated 19 May 1945: "If anything can be completely certain in this world then it is a future war between the USSR and the United States." Preparing for this war, commander of the U.S. Air Force and member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General G. Arnold demanded: "For our strategic might to be successfully utilized we must have bases located around the world in such a way that we would be able to reach any target we find it necessary to fire at."

This is just how they reason in the American capital now. "If we decide that we must fight for the Persian Gulf, which provides us with oil," says R. Reagan, "then we will fight." "Find it necessary to fire," "decide that we must fight," guided by mercenary political, military, economic, or ideological considerations, so we will act--this is the key to deciphering Washington's way of thinking. And for the purposes of disinformation they have shouted and still shout about the "Soviet threat."

In March 1948, the U.S. National Security Council, which had been formed not long before, formulated the tasks of American foreign and military policy in its Memorandum No 7 as follows: "The utter defeat of the forces of world communism, led by the Soviets, is of vitally important significance for the security of the United States. This aim cannot possibly be attained by means of a defensive policy. Consequently, the United States must take upon itself the leading role in organizing a world-wide counteroffensive for the sake of mobilizing and strengthening our own forces and all anticommunist forces in the non-Soviet world, and in undermining the power of the communist forces."

And what "nondefensive" means were considered appropriate by the United States for the purposes of fulfilling "vitally important aims," and in particular for preventing Soviet predominance over "Europe's potential irrespective of whether this predominance is gained by means of armed aggression or political and subversive means?" "Means below the threshold of war" and war itself. Together they formed the "strategy of cold war." They oriented themselves toward the assumption that "war with the Soviet Union would be 'total' in an even more horrific sense than any other war until now" (report by C. Clifford to H. Truman of 24 September 1946). Once begun such a war would be waged relentlessly for the sake of fulfilling "America's main task"

--"routing the forces of world communism" until the enemy would be forced to unconditionally capitulate. The "main task" was supplemented and set off by a whole series of "military aims" which envisaged, apart from anything else, the dismemberment of the Soviet state and exclusion of the possibility of "forms of government arising that would be dangerous to the security of the United States and international peace." Flying into a rage, the National Security Council recommended avoiding "final or premature decisions" in some way tying the hands of the United States for the future in its fulfillment of its "responsibility to rectify political, economic, and social changes inevitable by virtue of their connection with war" (Memorandum No 20/4 of the National Security Council, 23 November 1948).

In the form of a directive approved by H. Truman, the aims of the National Security Council were sent down to the executors with a significant footnote: War will take the USSR unawares, since "close analysis of the most diverse factors shows that the Soviet government is planning no military operations at present calculated to draw the United States into a conflict." Washington was leading the matter up to a "war for ideological reasons" (Document of Joint Chiefs of Staff, 9 April 1947) and had no need of external causes.

The reports, memorandums and other documents cited above were not the ravings of lone fanatics or the fruit of excessive zeal on the part of officials from military departments killing time by playing games in militarist playpens. They embodied state policy, the principles of the new "nuclear diplomacy," and American imperialism's claim that everything was permissible. These documents were guarded at that time as the deepest of secrets. Directions were given to wear the mask of defenders of "freedom," "democracy" and "law for the benefit of the public.

"Naturally, it must be taken into account," it was noted in National Security Council Memorandum No 68 of 14 April 1950, "that proclaiming the proposed political course could be utilized by the Soviet Union for its peace campaign and could have a reverse psychological effect in some parts of the free world until we reach a certain level of our potential. Consequently, with any renewal of policy and adoption of measures, their fundamentally defensive nature must be stressed and, insofar as it is possible, a restraining influence exerted upon undesirable reactions both within the country and from abroad." For the same reasons the Joint Chiefs of Staff spoke in favor of "waging an extensive psychological war with the aim of depriving the governments of the USSR and its allies of the support given them by the population" in its "proposals on military planning."

A special apparatus dealing with "psychological strategy" was accordingly formed under the Department of State, which became a directorate on the problems of psychological war under the National Security Council in 1951, and 2 years later--a committee on the problems of psychological war under the President. This committee was later reorganized into the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) and functions in this capacity at present.

J. F. Dulles calls this course "balancing on the brink of war." But Secretary of the Navy F. Matthews, who began openly expatiating on the policy that would

make it possible for the United States "to proudly call itself the first aggressors in the interests of preserving peace," was retired by H. Truman--for a loose tongue. It made it difficult to mobilize resources, behind the talk of "democracy," for "D-Day"--the secret date by which the United States would be completely prepared for an attack upon the Soviet Union.

In June 1946 the Joint Chiefs of Staff drew up the first "experimental" plan for a nuclear war against the USSR under the code name Pincher. Its compilers proceeded from the fact that war would break out as early as 1946 or 1947. They began to waver and took 1964 as the borderline between peace and war. Then they thought again and, so as not to allow "time to work for the USSR," planned to launch a campaign, first by 1 April 1949, and then by 1 July 1949. Finally, they decided upon 1 January 1957 as the optimum period for passing sentence on socialism. It was thought that by this time America's allies in Europe would have "gained political stability" and would have gotten back on their feet economically, and that their armies would have been rearmed and thus ready for significant, coordinated actions in Western Europe and able to "be utilized directly on D-Day." And for their own peace of mind --a happy ending: "The Russians' military and economic potential will not essentially increase by 1957." This was noted in the Joint Chiefs of Staff's military plan Dropshot of 19 December 1949 on the basis of which the United States rearmed, the military mechanism of the North Atlantic bloc was formed, and the FRG developed its militarization process in the 1950s.

II

Wars based on both ideological and racial grounds stand out by the fact that their primary is not conquest and subjugation, but annihilation and destruction. For these concepts nuclear and other mass destruction weapons could not be more suitable. It says in the aforementioned report by C. Clifford that "with the aid of nuclear weapons, biological warfare and air raids" it would be possible to "inflict loss upon the Soviet Union," despite "the vastness of its territory." In the Dropshot plan, the use of nuclear weapons together with radiological, biological and chemical weapons would be decided by "considerations of effectiveness and desire for retribution."

A prominent figure in the incumbent administration, F. Ikle, testifies that new technology in the United States is "engendering military theories that urge the use of nuclear weapons in order to prevent a possible American weakness in a conventional military campaign." He knows what he is writing. The degree of saturation of nuclear weapons in the Armed Forces, including the Marines and the National Guard, and the coefficient of linking operational plans with the nuclear component are such that, without the latter, the units and subunits lose their combat ability and appear only as symbols of U.S. military might. Undersecretary of the U.S. Army, Ms Hoeber, who is responsible for work on chemical and biological weapons, also knows what she is saying when she opposes control of weapons and urges that "the Soviet Union be constantly threatened," regarding chemical warfare as "a component of any conflict."

For Washington, the deciding factors in the choice of means are "expediency," the correlation of vulnerability of the sides involved and the balance "for"

and "against," rather than abstract morals. Its own "gain" could consist in the great loss incurred by the enemy. This qualitative and quantitative preponderance in the nuclear and near-nuclear spheres which would place the key to all the continents and oceans at the feet of the American capital without a battle, however, remains an obsession.

Washington considers this juggling with principles, like a pack of cards, to be almost a criterion of "democracy" and its privilege. In its opinion it is perfectly normal if every new master of the White House not only changes the furniture around in his residence, but also "combs through" the international obligations undertaken by the United States, "shearing off" whatever seems superfluous or gets in the way. Having betrayed the cause of the anti-Hitler coalition and carried on the Nazi Reich's tradition of struggle for world domination, everything else seems child's play to the United States. Yesterday it subscribed to the principle of parity and equal security, today it does not wish to recognize this principle; yesterday it acknowledged the existence of parity, today with one stroke of the pen, parity is no more; yesterday it pledged not to strive for military superiority, and today it once again extols superiority as the universal panacea.

The 1980 Republic election program promised to "spend for defense over a long-term period as much as is necessary to achieve the military superiority that the American people want." Commenting on the militarist program for the 1980s announced by R. Reagan, E. Meese, the President's closest associate, said that the aim of the program is to "restore the U.S. strategic superiority over the USSR within 10 years." It is for this purpose that the Republic administration has spent 3 years of its time and about \$1 trillion in state funds.

Superiority remains superiority even if it is called "advantage," "security reserve," "reserve strength," or any other term. "Reserve" for some implies a decrease in security for others; "advantage" for the West is infringement on the position of the East--and vice versa. However, the countries of socialism do not demand for the East--and vice versa. However, the countries of socialism do not demand for themselves either a "reserve" or "advantages" or "forward-based defense" in the areas of direct visibility [vidimost] of American shores. Our real advantage is primarily in the consistency and peaceableness of Soviet policy, in its firm devotion to principles and in the readiness and ability to fulfill assumed obligations.

The claim to the "leading role" based on superiority is not a joke. Therefore, we will not deal with any concoctions but will address ourselves to the primary sources.

"For the sake of planning," the Dropshot plan says, "we proceed from the assumption that, by 'D-Day,' the level of development of nuclear weapons in the USSR will give the United States a 10 to 1 quantitative advantage and that the USSR will be lagging behind the United States to some extent in developing both offensive and conventional weapons." Let us leave aside such an essential element as the self-exposure of the fiction that the United States has been allegedly "compelled" to accumulate piles of nuclear weapons because

of the USSR superiority in conventional weapons. This is a separate topic. We only note now that at no stage of postwar development has Washington ever succeeded in achieving a "comfortable" 10 to 1 superiority in relation to the Soviet Union, a superiority which it did enjoy in its recent attack on Grenada.

This also answers the question why, regardless of the multitude of detailed variations of preventive strikes against the "potential enemy," the United States has, in the final analysis, refrained from fatal steps. At the same time, this also provides an answer to the question of what impels the United States to build and deploy ever newer systems, frequently without any due consideration to the consequences for its own security. By the beginning of the 1970s, the United States had initiated the construction of 23 of the 25 new large weapons systems that appeared in the world at that time, and these figures have not remained static.

According to the reports of American experts, by 1967 the United States had in its arsenals a total of 32,000 nuclear warheads--that is, it had exceeded in this respect the level of armaments of all other nuclear powers combined. It was simply absurd to continue to further increase this quantity unless one wanted to harm oneself. R. Barnett, a well-known American researcher, says in his book "True Security. Restoration of American Power Under the Condition of a Dangerous Decade": "Since 1945 the United States has spent nearly \$3 trillion to ensure its national security. Our security is now less reliable than previously. Our military spending exceeds the total spending of all other countries. We are the only power that maintains hundreds of military bases far from our shores. We possess a destructive might that exceeds that of any other power. But we are obviously unable to transform this monstrous arsenal of lethal weapons into a political force." In the present situation, R. Barnett notes, the "political basis of a successful application of gunboat diplomacy is lacking."

And in the 1970s, in the context of the joint Soviet-American efforts to reduce the threat of a nuclear war, the United States began to be inclined to correct its current plans. It concentrated its efforts on improving the technical characteristics of its nuclear arsenal and fundamentally increasing its strategic nuclear potential. However, R. Reagan considered that a nominal "deployment" [nominalnoye "svertyvaniye"] of American nuclear forces smells of "pacification." He decided that the program of "technical and moral rearmament" should also include increased stockpiling, improved combat qualities, and a greater number of types of warheads, thus enlarging the list of models [katalog modeley] of their possible practical use.

As the U.S. economic and political importance in the world shows a relative decline, the military factor acquires an ever greater importance in the eyes of Washington. It is precisely the fact that it has placed its stake on force as the ultimate trump card and not any mythical difficulties of control or the notorious "lag" in conventional weapons that has turned the United States into an opponent of proclaiming mass destruction weapons illegal and that prevents it from committing itself not to be first to use these weapons --with or without a commensurate renunciation of the first use of any other weapons.

"Without the concentration of a superior military power..." one of the U.S. government documents states, "the policy of deterrence, which is in fact a policy of deliberate and consistent pressure, is nothing more than a bluff." guided by precisely these considerations, the masters of the White House have derailed the SALT II Treaty, wrecked the negotiations on nuclear weapons in Europe, and are in fact placing the entire cause of arms limitation and disarmament in a state of idling.

III

The aim of the imperialist policy is to ensure the necessary internal and external conditions under which the nature and method of the "combination" of the workers and the means of production would immutably remain capitalist and under which the absolute law of capitalism, the law of pressure, would reign over everything. The capitalist system is shaken by economic crises whenever money and the means of production cease to function as capital, that is cease not to produce goods--no matter what kind--but rather cease to yield profits. R. Reagan has expressed this very clearly: "What I want to achieve above all is to ensure that this country will continue to be a place where one can enrich himself." How is not important.

The policy of detente entered a period of crisis in the United States when the resources invested for weapons ceased to yield guaranteed financial profits accumulating in the accounts of the industrial concerns and sufficient political profits because of the "onerous," supposedly unbalanced commitments that limited Washington's freedom of action. And the most reactionary and frankly aggressively inclined section of the American ruling class raised a veritable revolt as soon as the prospects of a stabilization of international relations on the basis of military parity and equal security threatened to depreciate all the investments in weapons, eliminate the need for all subsequent investments and erode the ground on which the military-industrial complex has flourished and grown fat.

Military parity undoubtedly clips the claws of aggressive doctrines and, as a result, invites serious thinking about lowering the level of military antagonism. The latter is possible only under the indispensable condition that the internal logic of the arms race, the striving for military superiority, is broken. The principle of parity and equal security devalued the policy of confrontation, made cooperation the norm of life and confirmed the practice of good-neighborly relations and mutual consideration of interests. The social systems found themselves in a position in which they would have to compete, not under the extreme conditions on the brink of war but, for the first time, under normal conditions of peace. However, precisely that which attracts the broadest masses of people frequently provokes counteractions by official circles in the West. The vigilant eye of the custodians of the imperialist dogmas perceived a "demoralizing" effect of nuclear parity between the USSR and the United States.

Science, technology and economics accept an objective fact as a sign of solution or interdiction. In politics, however, contradictory conclusions can be arrived at from the same premises. R. Nixon's team tried to bring the desirable and the real closer together and suffered a defeat in the struggle for

power against the more deft and energetic factions that had enormous financial resources at their disposal and acted according to rules--and all the worse for the facts if they failed to satisfy the imperial arrogance. It is through concentration of forces that the neoconservatives try to break the trend of lowering the standards of political return from the capital invested in weapons.

In the same way in which capital compensates for the tendency toward lowering the rates of profits, they would like to raise the overall effect by accumulating mass--forcing the development of, in principle--new means of warfare, by opening up ever newer spheres of military rivalry, and by "increasing to a gigantic extent the burdens under which the Soviet system would have to function." It is reckoned that the impasse of military parity can be overcome by an absolute development of machines of destruction and by transferring the arms race to space.

Turn back to the documents of the 1940s and project them to everything prophesized in our time by the head of the Washington administration, his secretaries of state and advisers, and the interpreters of the President's vision, and you will understand the value of words in contemporary American political vocabulary--the value of the words about peace, the words about war and the words about trust, because the logic of peace and the logic of war are mutually exclusive and not mutually complementary concepts. You will convince yourselves that what is involved are not simple parallels, analogues or resemblances. What we witness is a plagiarism of the political baggage that has been smashed by the experience of life. Only the temperaments and the levels of cynicism differ, but the leitmotif is unchanged--and it is to annihilate the opponent, dismember his national territory, destroy his social institutions and statehood, take physical reprisals against the promoters of the philosophy that is alien to the American oligarchy and consolidate American hegemony.

The policy "from a position of strength" has exhausted itself. Force no longer breaks force, but makes it powerless. However, the mind educated to bend before force is not ready to recognize the primacy of reason and accept the principle of parity and practical equality as a blessing and not as a punishment. The society in which the cult of force reigns supreme augurs the reproduction of ideas, customs, actions and of those political and moral storms that disturb the atmosphere of the planet. That society was fated to pass through a civil war before it began to regard blacks as humans. And it possibly finds it even more difficult to imagine that people may also differ by their world outlook.

This is why the germs of wisdom which F. Roosevelt tried to implant in American politics, the flashes of evenness that seemed to gleam in J. Kennedy, and the elements of political realism that became apparent during R. Nixon's time were crushed, stifled and rejected by the militant factions of imperialism that do not want to share with anyone else the land, water and air of the planet--in any event, not on an equal footing. The policy of peaceful co-existence is not to their liking. They crave American leadership which would confirm the U.S. right to disregard the rights of others.

The starting point of H. Truman's criticism of F. Roosevelt's policy was the claim that his predecessor allegedly adopted the Soviet views about the nature of World War II and subordinated the fundamental interests of the U.S. ruling class to the "current conditions and demands" for achieving success in that war. "War for ideological motives" impressed Truman more than continued cooperation with the USSR on an antifascist basis. "Peace [mir] is not for democracy but for the United States" was also his belief.

The main point of R. Reagan's attacks on J. Carter and R. Nixon is that they "weakened" the pressure in the anticommunist boiler and "allowed" the Soviet Union to balance its military force with that of the United States and reduced the ability of the American Armed Forces to fulfill "those traditional tasks which are placed before them" (the White House report on R. Reagan's presidency, January 1983). Senator S. Nunn introduces a more precise definition in this formula. He speaks about "expanding" the commitments of the U.S. Armed Forces. There is no contradiction here.

If the commitments were "expanded," parity and equal security would also begin to be confounded. The commitments entail the concept of the use of the military forces, the military programs and, naturally, the military budgets.

W. Goethe called behavior a mirror in which everyone shows his face. Military-political doctrines are a mirror which reflect the face of the socio-economic systems and their true attitude toward the first and foremost human right, the right to life. The doctrine of direct antagonism adopted by the Reagan administration is oriented to exerting pressure over the entire world, to the United States achieving "escalating domination" through the deployment of first-strike nuclear systems and to provoking and fanning conflicts for the benefit of Washington's military-political tasks. National Security Directive No 32 signed by the President in May 1982 makes it incumbent upon the Armed Forces to prepare both for a protracted global conflict involving nonnuclear weapons and for a victorious nuclear war. The directive sets the framework for waging "small" wars (a type of aggression against the "blessing" of peace) to allegedly avoid bigger ones and also to "limit Soviet influence." It is envisaged that the operations in one theater would be coordinated with the operations in another, and the Armed Forces must be constantly prepared for these operations growing into a world war. Briefly, of all the military doctrines engendered by the imperial policy of force, Reagan's doctrine is the most costly, the most inhuman and the most hostile to peoples.

Nuclear weapons push the folly and cruelty of war to absurd limits. This is probably their only merit, if it is at all appropriate to speak about any merits in relation to nuclear weapons. The NATO thesis that U.S. nuclear power and the overall military efforts of the Atlanticists have prevented a third world war and secured peace for two generations is false and malicious. The Broiler, Charioteer, Half Moon, Off Tackle, Dropshot and other plans were prepared, as they themselves state, not for defense but for waging offensive wars dictated by the imperialist interpretations of "freedom," "justice" and "democracy." These wars have not taken place, but this was not because of any altruism or kindheartedness on the part of Washington. The plans of

aggression were constantly revised, replaced and rejected because the ardor of the adventurists was cooled by Soviet might and because the lesson that our socialist state once taught German imperialism forced the new pretenders to world domination to think again and again before throwing all caution to the wind.

And if, despite reason and all facts, the West still continued to zealously perpetuate the thesis of the beneficent nature of the arms race, it does so solely to justify both the past as well as the present and future spending for war. Admitting that trillions of dollars have been thrown to the wind, that the Soviet "military threat" has been invented as a "happy pretext for doing what we (the United States) would do under any circumstances," that this is as absurd to the label "Soviet aggressor," and that, on the contrary, it is possible to live with the socialist countries in good relations and that it would be worth doing so, would imply admitting that for nearly 4 decades imperialism has forced the people dependent on it to live in a world of illusions.

One falsehood leads to another. The dividing line between views and goals and between what is desirable and what is possible is lost. Challenging reality and common sense, Washington charges the current "U.S. defense policy" with the task of "successfully waging both conventional and the nuclear war deep in the territory of the opponent" and maintaining peace by being prepared for war. It understands "deterrence" as "rolling back" and "rolling back" as reprisals against disagreeable regimes and against all who have given way to "sedition."

How many weapons are really needed for deterrence--that is, real deterrence without quotation marks? Are there really too few warheads to be able to wipe out all large cities on both sides at once? Every objective person would answer that there are enough of them and more than enough. Proceeding from the actual targets of these weapons, it would take four Ohio class submarines on the part of the United States and their equivalent on our side, plus some kind of further limited potential taking into account the weapons of other nuclear powers. All the rest should be left alone as unnecessary. But Washington and its NATO allies do not want to even think about regulating matters in this manner. For what purpose do they need tens of thousands of nuclear warheads? They based the needed quantity on the "main task" that gives them no rest and on the list of designated targets to be hit in the territories of socialist countries. They tie the increased arsenals to the plans for waging real war and the hope for victory. We will not tire of repeating: illusion, adventurism. But we again recall Marx: "Ignorance is a demonic force and we fear that it will be the cause of many more tragedies" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 1, p 112). Countless such tragedies have taken place since 1842 when young Marx wrote that.

What is associated with the incumbent American president is not only a return to mass reliance on military force but also a return to the rule to move toward agreements with the USSR on military issues only when it is no longer possible to avoid the regulating accords, and to use the lack of such accords to the unilateral American advantage. "We will get our way through negotiations or without them," representatives of the Reagan administration say.

Can something of this kind really occur to any politician who intends to negotiate? This is the language of ultimatums, disrespect for the rights of others and contempt for the interests of a majority of people.

It is no secret that the United States sabotaged the Treaty on Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons for a long time and moved to accept it only when the American concepts of proliferation failed. Literally repeating the subterfuges of the 1950s and 1960s used against the nonproliferation treaty, the United States is now obstructing a complete ban on nuclear weapons tests, the freezing of their production and the end of development of new systems and new types of weapons which represent an increased danger to peace, and is engaged in actions to militarize space. The following incontrovertibly confirms this: At the latest session of the UN General Assembly, the United States voted against 14 of the 17 major resolutions on nuclear disarmament, it abstained from voting on two of them, and supported only one which it itself initiated. For comparison: The Soviet Union opposed two draft resolutions, including the draft hailing the deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe, abstained from voting on one resolution and voted in favor of 14 resolutions.

What is preventing the United States from renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons after the USSR has already accepted a corresponding commitment? Why does Washington so stubbornly oppose the conclusions of a world treaty renouncing the use of force in international relations? What is involved are not the difficulties of verification. The difficulties here are obviously of a different political and ideological nature.

The Pentagon is the buyer and user of the most highly perfected computers. These computers are engaged in round-the-clock calculations to determine how to inflict maximum losses on the opponent and win the war for the United States as cheaply as possible. It never occurs to the mindless machines that striving for peace is more productive. Weapons do not destroy ideas but rather their individual promoters. It is not the technology in itself or the released atom, or the chemical agent, or the laser beam, but the concepts of their use that are the most destabilizing factors.

Even if only robots were engaged in waging war, their victims would still be humans. No one of sound mind can deny this. Belief and reason are not opposites. They should not be, with the reservation, however, that the goal does not suppress principles, does not justify unscrupulousness in means, and does not reduce the conviction itself to the position of a mere appendix. However, it is really obvious that there is nothing more constant than the temporary and nothing more internal than a foreign policy. As Marx pointed out, "the entire capitalist method of production is only a relative method of production the limits of which are not absolute at all, but for it and on its basis they are absolute" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 25, part I, p 282). The same thing is obviously true also in relation to the political philosophy of capitalism. It is most likely unable to renounce violence without renouncing itself.

The mercenary interest has narrowed the horizons of thought and reduced everything to a matter of cash. Satisfying the need for security must also

yield profits. The right to life must be paid for, and paid for dearly. and the "powerful one" will collect tribute both from his own and from others. As the well-known professor J. Galbraith wrote in THE NEW YORK TIMES on 5 February in his discussion on the Reagan administration's relations with the military, "this is not civilian control but a greatly perverted management of the military-industrial complex by the very same military-industrial complex in the interests of the very same military-industrial complex."

Militarism represents a heavy accusation against a system which has retained its muscular corset but has exhausted its spiritual potential to such an extent that it is losing the ability to respond to the most vital demands of the period and to understand that peace is a condition even for controversy. Imperialism is growing decrepit and its nerves are failing. It seems to see a political remedy for any fresh infection. Force and mainly force presents itself as the elixir of external youth of the system. One does not want to think so, but the facts show that the rays of hope which we observed in Washington's policy in the past were mere deviations from the laws of capitalism. And unfortunately, no new positive laws can be deduced from these deviations.

IV

We return to the beginning of all beginnings. Imperialism has decided to limit both the time and the space for the USSR and for the entirety of world socialism, leaving them only 5 minutes to ponder in a crisis situation. The United States would like to compel peoples to rent their apartments in a global American house and to set for every one of them the norms of light, heat, comforts and, the main thing, that is, security, depending on their behavior and servility. And meanwhile it continues to spread explosives over the surface of the earth, to threaten and to wage war in the event that Weinberger's dream of gaining the upper hand without resorting to weapons is not fulfilled.

However, it will not come to pass as it had been conceived. The Soviet Union itself does not aspire to military superiority but, as our party and state leaders have repeatedly emphasized, we will not allow someone else to gain superiority over us. The necessary measures to counter the American infringements on the existing military-strategic parity are already being carried out. Creating new threats to the socialist community, Washington and its fellow NATO travelers inevitably draw adequate threats to themselves. This is all clear.

What is unclear is another thing, and that is when political maturity will come or come at all to the United States and when that mighty state will understand that the problems of the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century do not lend themselves to solutions by methods that were practiced during the settling of the wild West and during the colonization of Central and South America and the Asian and African countries. The era of partition and repartition of the world has passed and is not fated to return. It is impossible to "chart the road ahead by confidently tracing it with a finger on the map of yesterday," as the British newspaper THE OBSERVER wrote

about Reagan on 29 January. It is time to shake off the old deep-rooted habits, no matter how painful that may be. As a matter of fact, nothing else is possible unless the imperialist system contemplates committing collective suicide.

Detente was not a creation of inventive minds. It was not a concession from one social system to the advantage of the other one. The policy of detente expressed the demands of the period which whimsically [prichlivo] joined together those common elements without which no system, no structure and no individual man can exist. It enjoined them not to make each of these systems, structures or individuals forget their sacred things and reject their sympathies. That is not necessary at all. Something else is necessary: to preserve one's ideals while leaving the sword in its scabbard.

Voltaire said it very correctly: The eyes of friendship rarely err. On the other hand, the eyes of hatred see nearly everything in a distorted light. What is the purpose not only of engaging in self-deception, but even of paying an immensely high price for it? In the nuclear age, self-deception is not just harmful. It is extremely dangerous especially when an attempt to rise above everyone else makes the state its own enemy.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/14

BOOK BY A FIGHTER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84)
pp 126-127

[Review by L. Borodin of the book "Klassovaya Bor'ba i Natsional'nyy Vopros" [The Class Struggle and the National Problem] by Michael O'Riordan. Mysl', Moscow, 1983, 351 pp]

[Text] A new book -- a collection of writings -- by Michael O'Riordan, secretary general of the Communist Party of Ireland (national chairman of the CPI as of May 1984) has been added to the "Library of the Labor Movement" series, which includes works by leaders of communist and worker parties.

The readers of KOMMUNIST are well familiar with the name of this outstanding Irish patriot and zealous internationalist, who linked his life from an early age with the struggle of the working class and for social and national liberation. The interconnection of these processes, which determine the content of the book and are reflected in its title, is one of the most complex and grave problems of global social developments.

As O'Riordan notes in his preface to the book, the articles it includes "were written mainly on subjects topical for their time. However, they were not merely a response to one existing situation or problem or another; their broad background is the longest struggle for national liberation ever, the waging of which became the fate of the Irish people" (p 17). This struggle, which cost the Irish people immeasurable casualties, turned its country into a battlefield for the national liberation revolution and into a colonialist (or neocolonialist) antipeople's imperialist counterrevolution. It is widely known that Marx and Engels, followed by Lenin, drew from these historical peculiarities of Ireland data of essential importance to the development of a revolutionary theory, including on the subject of the national question.

The historical background discussed in the preface plays an essential role in the book. The author systematically turns to it, for without this it would be hardly possible to understand the most complex social and national conflict known today as the "Irish crisis."

As the chronologically first English colony, Ireland also became the first link where the chain of Britain's colonial empire broke during the second decade of the 20th century. However, the national liberation revolution which

developed as a result of these events remained largely unfinished and failed to fulfill its historical tasks. The main reason was the fact that although the country's labor movement had laid the path to the revolution it was unable to head the national liberation struggle and remained outside its mainstream.

Half a century later, however, it was precisely the Irish labor movement which took the initiative in the development of a mass democratic movement against British imperialist domination and was able immediately to surmount the barrier of religious discord which had been artificially encouraged for centuries on end. A large center of anti-imperialist struggle appeared in Ireland, in the immediate vicinity of the centers of worldwide imperialism. The latter reacted to it with all means at its disposal, from total terror to most predatory divisive maneuvers. The Irish democratic movement was confronted by a most cruel counterrevolution similar to its contemporary imperialist model. Once again the centuries-old "Irish question" came to the fore in European and world politics. This time, however, the only possible way to resolve it was related more clearly than ever before to the leading social force of our time: the working class.

It is natural for the topic of Ireland to be considered in the book as a structural component of the international class struggle and the universal historical process of our time. That is why the author logically goes back to the topical problems of his native Ireland in discussing a broad range of topics of global politics, above all the gains of world socialism, which he considers the highest accomplishment of the entire liberation struggle waged by mankind. An example of such an overall view of the national and international factors was a comparison, first published in KOMMUNIST and now quite familiar, between the successful resolution of the national problem in Soviet Lithuania and the unresolved problem of Ireland (see pp 67-71). This case is no exception. O'Riordan seeks and finds in the heroic struggle waged by the peoples of Vietnam and Cuba answers to the "problems of life and death and of the national future" of his people (see p 317).

Every single article in the book is imbued with the idea of proletarian internationalism, which is "strictly class-oriented," as the author states, for "the interests and ideals of the working class are the main criteria of principle-minded evaluations and judgements..." (p 254). However, proletarian internationalism is not an "enclosed intraclass solidarity" but a "guiding pivot of international unity of all liberation and democratic forces" (p 255). This is understandable, for as pointed out by the author, the wider the front in the universal struggle against national and social oppression becomes, the richer and more varied becomes the structure of its participants and the greater becomes the responsibility of the working class for the unification of this general movement and for giving it efficiency and a future. Along with the key problems of interaction between the revolutionary worker movement and the other anti-imperialist movements and forces, the struggle for peace, the unity within communist ranks and the role of real socialism, the author discussed the lessons of the historical experience in the area of proletarian solidarity, starting with the national revolutionary struggle in Spain, in which he participated as one of the 125 Irish members of the International Brigades.

Noted examples of internationalism related to the liberation struggle waged by the Irish people, the roots of which can be traced to the history of the First International, are also of great interest in themselves. At that time, the author reminds us, the Irish Section firmly took the side of Marx and Engels in their struggle against anarchism and opportunism, while the international movement for solidarity with the fighters for the freedom of Ireland, inspired by Marx and Engels, was one of the first movements in history based on the principles of proletarian internationalism. The author can be credited with an accomplishment in the field of research for his thoroughly traced history of class relations between the working people of the USSR and Ireland during the 3 decades in which no diplomatic relations existed between the two countries, a fact ignored in bourgeois historiography.

Finally, the book describes the extremely rich Leninist legacy in the treatment of the Irish problem (Lenin referred to it in more than 30 of his works, including articles especially written on this topic). Lenin was the only one at that time to speak out in defense of the struggling Irish masses and their revolutionary leaders, headed by James Connolly, Ireland's national hero. It was precisely Lenin who provided a broad scientific interpretation of the liberation struggle in Ireland, "which was and remains the most reliable and effective theoretical base in the struggle for a free Ireland and for its socialist future" (p 74).

"It is quite amazing," the author polemically notes in this respect, "that the critics of Lenin's theory, who claim that it suffers from "Russian limitations," do not detect on the same basis any Irish, English,, French or other "limitations," for many of the postulates in Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution were derived from the theoretical interpretation of facts borrowed from the social life of a large number of countries as convincingly as from the study of socioeconomic processes typical of Russia... One of the outstanding features of Leninism is precisely the fact that in its universal historical summations it encompasses and considers the specific variety of social practices of mankind under the conditions of the 20th century" (pp 76-77).

The communist party is the heir and bearer of Lenin's ideas in Ireland. Michael O'Riordan's book may be considered an authoritative description of the political and ideological participation of the communist party in the struggle waged by the Irish people for their national and social liberation. The Irish communists comprehensively substantiated and developed the strategy of this struggle, basing it on the political mobilization of the Irish working class, a program which is extensively described in the book.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/14

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 8, May 84 (signed to press 23 May 84)
pp 127-128

- [Text] 1. Marx, K., Engels, F. and Lenin, V. I. "O Kommunisticheskom Vospitanii" [On Communist Education]. S. M. Kovalev general editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 288 pp.
2. Marx, K., Engels, F. and Lenin, V. I. "O Kommunisticheskom Trude" [On Communist Labor]. Collection compiled by I. Yu. Var'yash. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 158 pp.
3. "V. I. Lenin, KPSS o Rabote s Pis'mami Trudyashchikhsya" [V. I. Lenin and the CPSU on Work With Working People's Letters]. B. P. Yakovlev general editor, Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 318 pp.
4. "V. I. Lenin. Kratkiy Biograficheskiy Ocherk" [V. I. Lenin. Short Biographical Essay]. For use in the party training system. By a group of authors headed by A. M. Sovokin. Ninth edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 159 pp with illustrations.
5. "Vladimir Il'ich Lenin." Album of photographs and motion picture documents. Compiled by A. I. Petrov. Second edition. Planeta, Moscow, 174 pp with illustrations.
6. "Fond Dokumentov V. I. Lenina" [Stock of V. I. Lenin Documents]. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 334 pp with illustrations.
7. "Materialy Plenuma Tsentral'nogo Komiteta KPSS, 10 Aprelya 1984 Goda" [Materials of the 10 April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum]. V. V. Pribytkov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 31 pp.
8. Chernenko, K. U. "Narod i Partiya Yediny" [People and Party Are as One]. Speech delivered at the meeting with the voters of Moscow's Kuybyshev Electoral District on 2 March 1984. V. V. Pribytkov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 32 pp.
9. Chernenko, K. U. "Vystupleniye na Zasedanii Komissii TsK KPSS po Podgotovke Novoy Redaktsii Programmy KPSS, 25 Aprelya 1984 Goda" [Speech at the 25 April 1984 Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Commission on the

Draft of the New CPSU Program]. V. A. Pechenev and V. V. Pribytkov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 14 pp.

10. Chernenko, K. U. "Rech na Vstreche s Rabochimi Moskovskogo Metallurgicheskogo Zavoda 'Serp i Molot', 29 Aprelya 1984 Goda" [Speech at the 29 April 1984 Meeting With the Workers at the Serp i Molot Metallurgical Plant in Moscow]. A. I. Vol'skiy in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 32 pp.

11. Dolgikh, V. I. "Ucheniye i Delo Lenina -- v Revolyutsionnom Tvorchestve Millionov" [Lenin's Theory and Accomplishments in the Revolutionary Creativity of the Millions]. Report at the 20 April 1984 ceremonious meeting in Moscow on the occasion of the 114th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 31 pp.

12. "Materialy Pervoy Sessii Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR Odinnadtsatogo Sozyva, 11-12 Aprelya 1984 Goda" [Materials of the First Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Eleventh Convocation, held on 11-12 April 1984]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 80 pp.

13. "XXVI S"yezd KPSS: Yedinstvo Teorii i Praktiki" [26th CPSU Congress: Unity Between Theory and Practice]. Issue No 4. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 703 pp.

14. Baskakov, V. Ye. "V Ritme Vremeni" [In Rhythm With the Times]. The cinematographic process today. Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1983, 335 pp.

15. Vladimirov, V. Kh. "Kuba v Mezhamerikanskikh Otnosheniyakh" [Cuba in Inter-American Relations]. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1984, 304 pp.

16. "Voyna. Narod. Pobeda. 1941-1945" [The War. The People. Victory. 1941-1945]. Articles, essays and recollections compiled by I. M. Danishevskiy and Zh. V. Taratuta. Vol 1-2. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983. Vol 1, 231 pp with illustrations; vol 2, 246 pp with illustrations.

17. "Voprosy Teorii i Zhizn'" [Problems of Theory and Life]. Collection of articles. Issue No 6. Compiled by V. Glagolev and S. Kolesnikov, edited by I. D. Laptev. Pravda, Moscow, 1983, 416 pp.

18. "Istoriya Sovetskogo Rabocheho Klassa" [History of the Soviet Working Class]. In six volumes. Vol 1. The Working Class in the October Revolution and in the Defense of Its Accomplishments, 1917-1920. S. S. Khromov editor in chief. Nauka, Moscow, 1984, 495 pp with illustrations.

19. "K Velikoy Tseli. Vospominaniya Uchastnikov Velikogo Oktyabrya" [Toward the Great Goal. Memoirs of Participants in the Great October Revolution]. N. P. Bogdanov and A. T. Ivanov compilers. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 190 pp.

20. Kuznetsov, V. I. "Yevropa: Bez'yadernaya Ili Sverkh'yadernaya" [Europe: Nuclear-Free or Supernuclear?]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 112 pp.

21. Pel'she, A. Ya. "Put' Bor'by i Sozidaniya" [Path of Struggle and Creation]. Selected speeches and articles. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 526 pp.
22. "Razoruzheniye -- Veleniye Vremeni" [Disarmament Is the Imperative of the Times]. Documents and materials. Issue No 3. Compiled by N. Prozhogin. Pravda, Moscow, 1984, 240 pp.
23. Roshchin, I. I. and Sen'kov I. S. "Partorgi Voennoy Pory" [Wartime Party Organizers]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 351 pp with illustrations.
24. Savin, M. S. "SShA: Pokhod Protiv Podlinnykh Prav Cheloveka" [United States: Campaign Against Real Human Rights]. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1983, 144 pp (Imperialism: Events, Facts, Documents).
25. Serebrovskaya, Ye. "Million Rukopozhatiy" [A Million Handshakes], From the diary of a Leningrad woman. Sovetskiy Pisatel', Leningrad, 1984, 311 pp.
26. "Sovetsko-Finlyandskiye Otnosheniya, 1948- 1983" [Soviet-Finnish Relations, 1948-1983]. The 1948 Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Aid Treaty in action. Documents and materials. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 494 pp.
27. "Sovety Narodnykh Deputatov" [The Soviets of People's Deputies]. Reference. By a group of authors headed by A. I. Luk'yanov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 382 pp.
28. "E. Tel'man. Biografiya" [E. Thalmann. A Biography]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 559 pp.
29. Fedyukin, S. A. "Partiya i Intelligentsiya" [The Party and the Intelligentsia]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 238 pp.
30. Fomichev, V. S. "Letopis Velikoy Zhizni" [Chronicle of a Great Life]. Bibliographic survey of the work "Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biograficheskaya Khronika. 1870-1924" [Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biographical Chronicle. 1870-1924]. Vol 1-12. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 270 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/14

END